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- Facilitates and scales evidence-informed decision making in public health organizations
- Provides high-quality resources, real-world training and practical mentorship that respond to the evolving needs of public health
- Advances stronger public health, driven by the best-available evidence, to improve the health and well-being of every person living in Canada
Background

Rapid evidence reviews intend to provide syntheses of best available evidence as a basis for decision making.

However, perspectives of people who may be most affected by the subsequent decisions are often absent.

To improve relevance of rapid reviews, the NCCMT’s Rapid Evidence Service (RES) invites citizen partners with lived experience to participate in the development of rapid evidence reviews.
Aims

1. Engage public partners in rapid review process

2. Improve the relevance and applicability of reviews, and help interpret and contextualize research evidence
Results

Engaged **21** citizen partners

Across **16** rapid reviews

- Citizen partner perspectives sought when framing questions, and interpreting and contextualizing findings, bringing unique perspectives that improve relevance

- Perspectives represented in the final report as part of the summary of findings or pulled out into a separate report
Limitations

- Tight timelines of the rapid review process limited time to build relationships and train researchers and citizen partners on meaningfully collaborating and participating.

- Finding citizen partners with the experience and background needed for a specific review can be challenging.

- If no citizen partner meets criteria for inclusion, citizen perspectives cannot be integrated into that rapid review.

**Strategies to combat limitations:** agreeing on roles and responsibilities from the onset, offering training and resources for researchers and citizen partners ahead of time and recruiting through multiple channels.
Conclusions

1. Rapid reviews benefit from involvement of people with lived experience throughout the evidence synthesis process.

2. The NCCMT’s RES engagement with citizen partners addresses a significant gap in the evidence synthesis and decision-making process.
Conclusions

3. Citizen partners provide valuable insights into gaps in the existing research and the implications of the findings

4. The standard rapid review protocol for the NCCMT’s RES now includes a public engagement process
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