



[Month and year] – SUPPORT Summary of a systematic review

[Title]

[Short background Text]

Key messages

- [Text]
- [Text]
- [Text]
- [Text]



Who is this summary for?

[Text]

! This summary includes:

- Key findings from research based on a systematic review
- Considerations about the relevance of this research for low-income countries

X Not included:

- Recommendations
- Additional evidence not included in the systematic review
- Detailed descriptions of interventions or their implementation

This summary is based on the following systematic review:

[Text]

What is a systematic review?

A summary of studies addressing a clearly formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, and critically appraise the relevant research, and to collect and analyse data from the included studies

SUPPORT was an international project to support the use of policy relevant reviews and trials to inform decisions about maternal and child health in low- and middle-income countries, funded by the European Commission (FP6) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Glossary of terms used in this report:
www.supportsummaries.org/glossary-of-terms

Background references on this topic:
See back page

Background

[Text]

How this summary was prepared

After searching widely for systematic reviews that can help inform decisions about health systems, we have selected ones that provide information that is relevant to low-income countries. The methods used to assess the reliability of the review and to make judgements about its relevance are described here:

www.supportsummaries.org/how-support-summaries-are-prepared/

Knowing what's not known is important

A reliable review might not find any studies from low-income countries or might not find any well-designed studies. Although that is disappointing, it is important to know what is not known as well as what is known.

A lack of evidence does not mean a lack of effects. It means the effects are uncertain. When there is a lack of evidence, consideration should be given to monitoring and evaluating the effects of the intervention, if it is used.

About the systematic review underlying this summary

Review objective: [Text]

Types of	What the review authors searched for	What the review authors found
Study designs & Interventions	[Text]	[Text]
Participants	[Text]	[Text]
Settings	[Text]	[Text]
Outcomes	[Text]	[Text]

Date of most recent search: [Month and year]

Limitations: [Text]

[Citation]

Summary of findings

[Text]

1) [Text]

[Text]

→ [Findings Text]

About the certainty of the evidence (GRADE) *

⊕⊕⊕⊕

High: This research provides a very good indication of the likely effect. The likelihood that the effect will be substantially different† is low.

⊕⊕⊕○

Moderate: This research provides a good indication of the likely effect. The likelihood that the effect will be substantially different† is moderate.

⊕⊕○○

Low: This research provides some indication of the likely effect. However, the likelihood that it will be substantially different† is high.

⊕○○○

Very low: This research does not provide a reliable indication of the likely effect. The likelihood that the effect will be substantially different† is very high.

* This is sometimes referred to as 'quality of evidence' or 'confidence in the estimate'.

† Substantially different = a large enough difference that it might affect a decision

See last page for more information.

(Use the top rows for dichotomous outcomes when there is a meta-analysis. Use the bottom row for other outcomes.)

[Text]			
People	[Text]		
Settings	[Text]		
Intervention	[Text]		
Comparison	[Text]		
Outcomes	Absolute effect*		Relative effect (95% CI)
	Without [text]	With [text]	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])		
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])		⊕⊕○○ Low
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])		⊕⊕○○ Low
[Text]	No included studies		-
Margin of error = Confidence interval (95% CI) RR: Risk ratio GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)			
* The risk WITHOUT the intervention is based on [Text]. The corresponding risk WITH the intervention (and the 95% confidence interval for the difference) is based on the overall relative effect (and its 95% confidence interval).			

(Use this format if there is not a meta-analysis or if the results are reported in such a way that they cannot be summarised quantitatively in a consistent way for each outcome.)

[Text]		
People	[Text]	
Settings	[Text]	
Intervention	[Text]	
Comparison	[Text]	
Outcomes	Impact	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
[Text]	[Text]	⊕○○○ Very low
[Text]	[Text]	⊕+○○ Low
[Text]	[Text]	⊕+⊕○ Moderate
[Text]	[Text]	⊕+⊕+ High
GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)		

(Use this format if the results are reported in such a way that they can be summarised quantitatively in a consistent way for each outcome.)

[Text]			
People	[Text]		
Settings	[Text]		
Intervention	[Text]		
Comparison	[Text]		
Outcomes	[Text] * [Text]	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕○○○ Very low	[Text]
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+○○ Low	[Text]
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+⊕○ Moderate	[Text]
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+⊕+ High	[Text]
GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)			
* [Text]			

(Use this format if the results are reported in such a way that they can be summarised quantitatively in a consistent way for each outcome and comments are not needed.)

[Text]		
People	[Text]	
Settings	[Text]	
Intervention	[Text]	
Comparison	[Text]	
Outcomes	[Text] [Text]	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕○○○ Very low
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+○○ Low
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+⊕○ Moderate
[Text]	[Text] [Text]	⊕+⊕+ High
GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)		
* [Text]		

2) [Text]

[Text]

→ [Findings Text]

→ [Findings Text]

[Text]				
People	[Text]			
Settings	[Text]			
Intervention	[Text]			
Comparison	[Text]			
Outcomes	Absolute effect*		Relative effect (95% CI)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
	Without [text]	With [text]		
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	No included studies		-	-

Margin of error = Confidence interval (95% CI) RR: Risk ratio GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)

* The risk WITHOUT the intervention is based on [Text]. The corresponding risk WITH the intervention (and the 95% confidence interval for the difference) is based on the overall relative effect (and its 95% confidence interval).

3) [Text]

[Text]

→ [Findings Text]

→ [Findings Text]

[Text]				
People	[Text]			
Settings	[Text]			
Intervention	[Text]			
Comparison	[Text]			
Outcomes	Absolute effect*		Relative effect (95% CI)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
	Without [text]	With [text]		
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	[?] per [?]	[?] per [?]	RR [?] ([?] to [?])	⊕⊕○○ Low
	Difference: [?] [text] per [?] [text] (Margin of error: [?] to [?] [text])			
[Text]	No included studies		-	-

Margin of error = Confidence interval (95% CI) RR: Risk ratio GRADE: GRADE Working Group grades of evidence (see above and last page)

* The risk WITHOUT the intervention is based on [Text]. The corresponding risk WITH the intervention (and the 95% confidence interval for the difference) is based on the overall relative effect (and its 95% confidence interval).

Relevance of the review for low-income countries

→ Findings	▷ Interpretation*
APPLICABILITY	
→ [Text]	▷ [Text]
EQUITY	
→ [Text]	▷ [Text]
ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	
→ [Text]	▷ [Text]
MONITORING & EVALUATION	
→ [Text]	▷ [Text]

*Judgements made by the authors of this summary, not necessarily those of the review authors, based on the findings of the review and consultation with researchers and policymakers in low-income countries. For additional details about how these judgements were made see: www.supportsummaries.org/methods

Additional information

Related literature

[References in review, ask authors or other experts, or perform search]

This summary was prepared by

[Authors, Institute, Country]

Conflict of interest

[Text]. For details, see: www.supportsummaries.org/coi

Acknowledgements

This summary has been peer reviewed by: [Name, Country;]

This review should be cited as

[Text]

The summary should be cited as

[Summary authors]. [Summary title]. A SUPPORT Summary of a systematic review. [Month and year]. www.supportsummaries.org

Keywords

All Summaries:

evidence-informed health policy, evidence-based, systematic review, health systems research, health care, low and middle-income countries, developing countries, primary health care

[Add additional summary-specific keywords. Will be taken out of the text and used only in the Properties field]

(example text) This summary was prepared with additional support from:



The South African Medical Research Council aims to improve South Africa's health and quality of life through promoting and conducting relevant and responsive health research. www.mrc.ac.za/



Cochrane South Africa, the only centre of the global, independent Cochrane network in Africa, aims to ensure that health care decision making within Africa is informed by high-quality, timely and relevant research evidence. www.mrc.ac.za/cochrane/cochrane.htm

About certainty of the evidence (GRADE)

The “certainty of the evidence” is an assessment of how good an indication the research provides of the likely effect; i.e. the likelihood that the effect will be substantially different from what the research found. By “substantially different” we mean a large enough difference that it might affect a decision. These judgements are made using the GRADE system, and are provided for each outcome. The judgements are based on the study design (randomised trials versus observational studies), factors that reduce the certainty (risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision, and publication bias) and factors that increase the certainty (a large effect, a dose response relationship, and plausible confounding). For each outcome, the certainty of the evidence is rated as high, moderate, low or very low using the definitions on page 3.

For more information about GRADE: www.supportsummaries.org/grade

SUPPORT collaborators:

The Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group (EPOC) is part of the [Cochrane Collaboration](http://www.cochrane.org). The Norwegian EPOC satellite supports the production of Cochrane reviews relevant to health systems in low- and middle-income countries. www.epocoslo.cochrane.org

The Evidence-Informed Policy Network (EVIPNet) is an initiative to promote the use of health research in policymaking in low- and middle-income countries. www.evipnet.org

The Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research (HPSR) is an international collaboration that promotes the generation and use of health policy and systems research in low- and middle-income countries. www.who.int/alliance-hpsr

Norad, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, supports the Norwegian EPOC satellite and the production of SUPPORT Summaries. www.norad.no

The Effective Health Care Research Consortium is an international partnership that prepares Cochrane reviews relevant to low-income countries. www.evidence4health.org

To receive e-mail notices of new SUPPORT summaries or provide feedback on this summary, go to: www.supportsummaries.org/contact