CHALLENGES OF RAPID REVIEWS IN HTA
Case Study from an Italian Region

Maria Camerlingo, Susanna Maltoni, Antonella Negro, Fabio Trimaglio

Regional Agency for Health and Social Care of Emilia-Romagna - ASSR

Introduction

Rapid reviews are an attractive tool for health technology assessment (HTA) as they may support the decision-making process when time and resources are limited. Methodology on how to carry out rapid reviews is still debated and guidance regarding the most suitable method to apply is lacking. Kaltenthaler [1] have recently proposed a checklist of items to be considered when undertaking a rapid review

Methods

Kaltenthaler [1] have identified issues that are important to reflect on when planning a rapid review. A checklist of some items that should be considered when choosing a rapid review method was elaborated. The checklist reports 4 key points and related items to consider when planning a rapid review. We applied this checklist to our rapid assessment on the use of FD-optical coherence tomography in percutaneous coronary interventions, based on a rapid review of the literature

Checklist key points	Checklist items	The case of FD-OCT rapid assessment	
1. Assess the current evidence base - It is important to have an understanding of the evidence available before deciding which rapid review methods are most appropriate	▪ Scoping searches ▪ Existing systematic reviews ▪ Summary of existing reviews	▪ Scoping search: no useful systematic reviews to answer policy-makers' question and a high number of relevant studies.	✓
2. Consider presentation of evidence - The complexity of the evidence base should be taken into account and an assessment made as to how much data should be presented and in what format	▪ Meta-analysis ▪ Outcome data ▪ Grouping of outcomes	▪ No meta-analysis performed due to paucity of RCTs and high heterogeneity in outcomes' measures ▪ Narrative synthesis reporting outcome data grouped in domains (technical performance, safety, efficacy, change in management).	✓
3. Ensure clear communication with policy makers - It is important that there is a common understanding between reviewers and policy makers as to the purpose of the review and the questions to be answered	▪ In depth analysis vs brief overview ▪ Highlight gaps in the evidence	▪ Analysis of technical performance extremely time-consuming and not providing particularly useful information for the commissioning body ▪ Lack of evidence mostly on efficacy	✗
4. Clearly report rapid review methods used - It is crucial that the reader understands what rapid review methods have been used and the impact this may have on the findings of the review	▪ Description of methods ▪ Discussion of limitations	▪ Description of methods: partial ▪ No discussion of limitations	✗

Conclusions

The checklist by Kaltenthaler [1] helped us reflect on the method we used to carry out rapid reviews and to pinpoint possible solutions to improve it. In light of this we have elaborated a methodological document that describe explicitly the method that we will adopt in our next rapid evaluation.

References

[1] Kaltenthaler E, Cooper K, Pandor A, Martyn-St James M, Chatters R, Wong R. The use of rapid review methods in health technology assessments: 3 case studies. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2016 Aug 26;16(1):108.

MAKE CONTACT WITH Susanna Maltoni <Susanna.Maltoni@regione.emilia-romagna.it> +39 051 527 71 65
Antonella Negro <Antonella.Negro@regione.emilia-romagna.it>