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Authors' objectives
The objectives of this report were:

To assess current practice in the preparation of rapid reviews by HTA organisations nationally and internationally,

To examine the current evidence base pertaining to the methodology of rapid reviews

To determine if there are differences in the essential conclusions of rapid and full reviews on the same topic.

Authors' conclusions
This report has identified that the current rapid review products being produced by HTA agencies are not well defined and are highly variable in their methodology. It is recommended that, rather than developing a formalised methodology by which to conduct rapid reviews, which may inappropriate and oversimplified, agencies work to increase the transparency of the methods utilised for each review. It would thus be useful if HTA agencies could clearly identify their HTA products, with respect to the commissioning group and purpose of the review along with some general details outlining the methodologies used in their preparation. Despite this, it should be appreciated that certain parts of a comprehensive systematic review (such as an independent and complete economic evaluation) may not realistically be completed in a rapid timeframe. Furthermore, methods for incorporating the advice of expert panels in a timely manner need to be developed to ensure that rapid reviews reach appropriate conclusions at both clinical and policy levels.

A rapid review should be written in answer to specific questions, rather than as a quick alternative to a comprehensive systematic review. In this manner, rapid reviews could be used to inform specific policy decisions in a timely manner without losing any of the important information that may be expected from a comprehensive review.
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