## Title (short conclusion or question)

# Conclusion. This Cochrane review (if not a Cochrane review, change to the appropriate type or name) shows that…followed by a short description of the main conclusion, preferentially about main outcomes and, or adverse effects that gives more in-depth information than the title alone.

#### What does the research tell us?

In systematic reviews, available research is collected and critically appraised. The research question in this systematic Cochrane review was: What is the effect of (intervention) among people that (health problem) compared to (comparison)? You can split up the last sentence or adjust it according to the issue or question.

Results

* Result for main outcome 1 (similar text as in the table, preferably standardised statement)
* Result for main outcome 2 (similar text as in the table, preferably standardised statement)
* Result for main outcome 3 (similar text as in the table, preferably standardised statement)
* Result for main outcome 4 (similar text as in the table, preferably standardised statement)
* etc., BUT please do limit the number of outcomes (the whole summary should be no longer than two pages)

Table for dichotomous outcomes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What happens? | WITHOUT intervention | WITH intervention  | Certainty of evidence1 |
| Outcome 1(Intervention) reduces the number of people that (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 24per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 14per 100people/women/patients etc. (10 to 19)\* | High |
| Outcome 2(Intervention) probably reduces the number of people that (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 24per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 14per 100 people/women/patients etc. (10 to 19)\* | Moderate |
| Outcome 3(Intervention) may reduce the number of people that (outcome 3) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 24per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 14per 100 people/women/patients etc. (10 to 19)\* | Low |
| Outcome 4We are uncertain about the effect of (intervention) for this outcome because the certainty of the evidence is very low. This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | We do not report numbers of results of very low certainty | Very low |
| \* The confidence interval (95% CI) reflects the extent to which the [play of chance](http://getitglossary.org/term/chance%2C%20play%20of)may be responsible for an [effect estimate](http://getitglossary.org/term/effect%20estimate) from a [study](http://getitglossary.org/term/study). 1 Indicates the extent to which one can be confident that an estimate of effect is correct. Plus other relevant information. |

Table for dichotomous outcomes where you have multiple comparisons and few main outcomes (two to three)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What happens? | WITHOUT intervention | WITH intervention  | Certainty of evidence1 |
| Effect of intervention 1 |
| Outcome 1(Intervention 1) probably increases the number of people that (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 17per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 26per 100 people/women/patients etc. (23 to 30)\* | Moderate |
| Outcome 2(Intervention 1) probably increases the number of people that (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 17per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 26per 100 people/women/patients etc. (23 to 30)\* | Moderate |
| Effect of intervention 2 |
| Outcome 1(Intervention 2) may increase the number of people that (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 20per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 32per 100 people/women/patients etc. (24 to 42)\* | Low |
| Outcome 2(Intervention 2) may increase the number of people that (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 20per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 32per 100 people/women/patients etc. (24 to 42)\* | Low |
| Effect of intervention 3 |
| Outcome 1(Intervention 3) probably increases the number of people that (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 35per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 46per 100 people/women/patients etc. (39 to 54)\* | Moderate |
| Outcome 2(Intervention 3) probably increases the number of people that (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 35per 100 people/women/patients etc. | 46per 100 people/women/patients etc. (39 to 54)\* | Moderate |
| \* The confidence interval (95% CI) reflects the extent to which the [play of chance](http://getitglossary.org/term/chance%2C%20play%20of)may be responsible for an [effect estimate](http://getitglossary.org/term/effect%20estimate) from a [study](http://getitglossary.org/term/study). 1 Indicates the extent to which one can be confident that an estimate of effect is correct. Plus other relevant information. |

Table for continuous outcomes with mean difference (MD). NB! It is important to inform what the MD is about (is it years, days?)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What happens? | WITHOUT intervention | WITH intervention  | Certainty of evidence1 |
| Outcome 1(Intervention) may make little or no difference to (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 4.3points on a 0-10 patient satisfaction scale | 0.40 morepoints on a 0-10 patient satisfaction scale (0.12 to 0.68)\* | Low |
| Outcome 2(Intervention) may reduce (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | 2.2hospital days | 1.40 fewerhospital days (-0.90 to -1.9)\* | Low |
| \* The confidence interval (95% CI) reflects the extent to which the [play of chance](http://getitglossary.org/term/chance%2C%20play%20of)may be responsible for an [effect estimate](http://getitglossary.org/term/effect%20estimate) from a [study](http://getitglossary.org/term/study). 1 Indicates the extent to which one can be confident that an estimate of effect is correct. Plus other relevant information. |

Table for continuous outcomes with Standardized Mean Difference (SMD)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What happens? | How large effect? | Certainty of evidence1 | The numbers behind |
| Outcome 1(Intervention) may increase (outcome 1) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | Large | Low |

|  |
| --- |
| 0.81 SMD2 better/higher/larger *outcome 1*(0.56 to 1.36)\* |

 |
| Outcome 2(Intervention) may increase (outcome 2) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | Moderate | Low |

|  |
| --- |
| 0.56 SMD2 better/higher/larger *outcome 2*(0.18 to 0.86)\* |

 |
| Outcome 3 (Intervention) may slightly increase (outcome 3) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | Small | Low |

|  |
| --- |
| 0.29 SMD2 better/higher/larger *outcome 3*(0.03 to 0.56)\* |

 |
| Outcome 4(Intervention) may make little or no difference to (outcome 4) compared to (comparison). This text should be informative, but short – and with standard sentences reflecting the certainty of the evidence and the magnitude of effect | Little or no effect | Low |

|  |
| --- |
| 0.10 SMD2 worse/lower/less *outcome 4*(-0.10 to +0.23)\* |
|  |

 |
| \* The confidence interval (95% CI) reflects the extent to which the [play of chance](http://getitglossary.org/term/chance%2C%20play%20of)may be responsible for an [effect estimate](http://getitglossary.org/term/effect%20estimate) from a [study](http://getitglossary.org/term/study). 1 Indicates the extent to which one can be confident that an estimate of effect is correct. 2 Standardized Mean Difference is used as a summary statistic in meta-analysis when the studies all assess the same outcome but measure it in a variety of ways. For interpretation of the SMD, 0.2 is considered a «small effect», 0.5 a «moderate effect» and 0.8 a «large effect». Plus other relevant information. |

#### Background

In the background section you should include the most important information about the topic. Describe the population/problem and the approach(es) / (intervention(s)) described in the review to approach the problem, preferentially one section about each. For international summaries, a good idea is to use statistics and facts from [WHO](http://www.who.int/) in addition to the review’s information (remember to cite the sources when it is not information from the review).

If local/national setting information is desirable to include, you can write a paragraph about that here (for instance what local/National Guidelines says, what is done in practice etc.)

#### What is this information based on?

In the first paragraph we have standard sentences: The Cochrane authors searched for relevant studies in research databases up to (insert month and year). They identified (insert number) studies (randomised controlled trials) with a total of (insert number) of people/participants/adults/children etc. that they included in this review.

Furthermore, we should try as best as possible to give information about what the review authors were interested in and what they actually found for the whole PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome).

In the last paragraph, it is of great value to explain why the certainty of the evidence has been downgraded (to moderate, low or very low). Few and small studies and so on.

Working table to help gather important information for this section of the summary. If you prefer to use the table instead of text only, that is fine, but let the first text paragraph stay. It is also possible to combine table and text if space allows it.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PICO | What did they search for? | What did they find? |
| Study design |  |  |
| Population | Who are these people? Gender, age, degree of problem/challenge etc. | Who are these people? Gender, age, degree of problem/challenge etc. |
| Intervention and comparison | Which interventions and comparisons? | Which interventions and comparisons did they find?It is important to provide enough information about the interventions and comparisons (content, frequency, dose, who gave/provided it, how long did the intervention/comparison last etc.)If limited information is provided about these issues, it is just as important to highlight that this information is missing or not reported. Imagine you are a person considering implementing the approach in practice or is a carer/patient or a policymaker. |
| Outcomes | Which primary outcomes (and secondary outcomes)?  | Which primary outcomes (and secondary outcomes)? This is the part where you might have to limit the numbers of outcomes that you report because we report the most important outcomes for the purpose of the summary. You should clearly state if you report on all or just a small number of the outcomes reported in the review. How were the outcomes defined? How were the outcomes measured? What was the follow-up time for the outcomes (Were they measured once, right after the intervention was finished, and/or did they measure it a while later? How many times?) Have the review authors missed out on reporting important outcomes that would be important or interesting to also have included?  |
| Setting | Which countries and health settings? | Which countries and health settings? |
| Certainty of evidence | They used GRADE to assess the certainty of the evidence. | Describe the certainty of the evidence and the reasons for downgrading for different outcomes (keep the text short) |

#### Systematic review

In systematic reviews you search for and summarise studies that answer a specific research question. The studies are identified, assessed and summarised by using a systematic and predefined approach (read more [Cochrane Consumer Network](file:///%5C%5Cfhi.no%5Cconsumers.cochrane.org%5Cwhat-systematic-review)).

#### Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)

When we summarise studies and present the result (effect estimate), we also need to say something about how certain we are about this result. The certainty of the evidence tells us something about how sure we can be that the result reflects real life or reality. [GRADE](https://training.cochrane.org/grade-approach) is a system (or a tool) that we use to make these judgements. Among the elements we judge in GRADE are:

* how well the studies were conducted
* if the studies are large enough
* if the studies are similar enough
* how relevant the studies are
* if all relevant studies have been identified

#### Reference

Put in reference

Available from: put in link

Summarised by (put in name (and workplace)

Responsible editor: (put in name and workplace)