

What Makes a Good Question for CHRSP?

In order to provide decision support in a timely manner for the most pressing issues facing the provincial health system, all questions submitted to CHRSP are reviewed according to a specific set of **filtering criteria**:

AT THE TOPIC SELECTION STAGE:

IMPORTANCE

- ✓ The question/topic is viewed by health decision makers and other stakeholders as important and of high priority to the healthcare system
- ✓ There is a policy purpose or impending decision that justifies conducting a synthesis on the topic
- ✓ The decision will have an impact on a significant portion of the NL population, or is crucial for an identified sub-population of NL
- ✓ The decision has the potential to improve health outcomes

TIMELINE

- ✓ The timeline for providing decision support is appropriate (i.e., approximately six months for a full CHRSP or one month for a Rapid Evidence Report)

FEASIBILITY

- ✓ The question is clearly worded to avoid ambiguity about what is to be studied and can be formulated as a researchable question

AT THE FINAL ASSESSMENT STAGE:

AVAILABILITY OF EVIDENCE

- ✓ Once we have identified the topics of importance, the CHRSP team will confirm that the question can be answered on the basis of high-level research evidence (see the box to the right) for a full CHRSP; where the evidence base is less robust and/or the topic is of a highly urgent nature, the topic may be better suited for a Rapid Evidence Report
- ✓ Sufficient local input (e.g., key informants, statistical data, grey literature) must be available to inform the contextualization

AVAILABILITY OF A TEAM

- ✓ A Team Leader with expertise in the subject area is available to lead the project
- ✓ Local health system experts are committed to the project
- ✓ Local academic support is available
- ✓ Local consultants can provide input into the contextual factors of interest in NL

High-level research evidence refers to reports of research studies on a topic that have been *synthesized* in a systematic way. For example, *A systematic review* responds to a specific research question, identifies and selects all relevant primary research based on set criteria, critically appraises the studies and summarizes the results.

A meta-analysis goes one step further and combines the statistical results from the individual studies comprising the review.

A health technology assessment (HTA) provides a comprehensive, systematic assessment of the conditions for and consequences of using a health technology (i.e., a drug, a therapeutic or diagnostic device, or a process for the organization or delivery of care).

Other forms of evidence may be useful in informing CHRSP projects but may not, in the absence of high-level review literature, be sufficiently robust to justify a full CHRSP report. These include, for example,

- Government reports
- Program evaluations
- Statistical data
- Expert opinion
- Clinical Practice Guidelines