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Refining a QES Question

• Thus far Cochrane and non Cochrane reviews have explored a limited set of QES questions ‘barriers and facilitators to intervention implementation’

• We need to be more innovative with question development

• QES question development may also be iterative …. 

• Question development is vital for applying CERQual (relevance component)
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CERQual Relevance considerations

**Specify the context of the review question, including:**

**Micro-context**

**The Population** - Specify any specific characteristics, perspectives or subgroups of the population. (e.g. Pregnant African women living in Africa)

**The Setting** (such as hospital, private provider, timeframe of interest. (e.g. Publicly funded hospitals from 2000 to present time)

**The Place** (such as geographical location, political system. (e.g. Africa – state-funded healthcare)

**Meso-context**

**The Intervention (where applicable)** - Specify the intervention and components of interest. (e.g medically assisted birth in a state-funded hospital)

**Macro-context**

**The policy, political issues, social climate or legislation** – such as the policy context and legal framework associated with the phenomenon of interest. (e.g updating pan-Africa clinical and midwifery guidelines to promote safer birth and woman-centred care)

Cross cutting:

**The Phenomenon of interest** - (e.g. The experiences of African women regarding medically assisted birth in public hospitals in Africa)
# Question formulation frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PICO</th>
<th>PICOS</th>
<th>SPIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis and patient/service user</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care services</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Phenomenon of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named types of qualitative data collection and analysis</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences, perceptions</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative or qualitative method</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Research type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question formulation: SPICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Phenomenon of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Engagement

Q9: What are the best ways to engage communities in emergency risk communication activities to respond to events/contexts?

- **Setting**: In the context of preparing for and responding to events/emergencies with public health implications in high, low, middle income and fragile states
- **Perspective**: National governments and relevant subnational authorities (e.g., local/district health departments), responding and implementing partners, at-risk communities and stakeholders
- **Phenomena of interest**: Strategies and tactics for encouraging participation of at-risk communities in emergency risk communication planning and response
- **Comparison**: Differing tactics: integration of at-risk communities into planning processes, providing incentives to community leadership, use of formal reporting systems and feedback loops, others. Equity considerations
- **Evaluation**: Impact on level of engagement and retention of community participation, public trust in health protection information, level of coverage of information sharing, perceived relevance among communities of national response to local questions/concerns
- **Time scope**: 2003 to present
Think about developing a logic model

Box 1. Added value of using logic models in systematic reviews

- Scoping the review
  - Refining review question
  - Deciding on lumping or splitting a review topic
  - Identifying intervention components

- Defining and conducting the review
  - Identifying relevant study inclusion/exclusion criteria
  - Guiding the literature search strategy
  - Explaining the rationale behind surrogate outcomes used in the review
  - Justifying need for subgroup analyses (e.g., age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status)

- Making the review relevant to policy and practice
  - Structuring reporting of results
  - Illustrating how harms and feasibility are connected with interventions
  - Interpreting results based on intervention theory and systems thinking

Anderson et al. 2011 Using logic models to capture complexity in systematic review
Maternal factors that impact on poor child outcomes age 5 years

Source: Using information and intelligence to improve local decision-making for high quality, cost effective services, Child and Maternal Health Observatory
Slum upgrading review

Turley et al 2013 Slum upgrading review: methodological challenges that arise in systematic reviews of complex interventions

Fig. 1: Logic Model clarifying different aspects for the review (taken from fig 1, Turley et al.1).
Guidance for review authors on choice and use of social theory in complex intervention reviews
Stop, think and do exercise:

Formulate your own review question using SPICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Phenomenon of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stop, think and do exercise:

Take your review question and draw a diagram to show some simple logic

Eg: important concepts and anticipated relationships and outcomes