characteristics of available quality appraisal tools for assessing the quality of primary qualitative studies in qualitative evidence syntheses (QES). This presentation will also offer a critical discussion on the use of reflexivity as a de facto quality criterion, and how methodological reporting may influence the application of quality criteria in QES.

METHODS:

We conducted a systematic search to identify quality appraisal tools of qualitative research designed for use in QES. This search built upon the work of Santiago-Delefosse and colleagues by extending their search to 2016.

RESULTS:

We identified eight appraisal tools intended for use in the quality appraisal process of a QES. We provide a description of the structure, content, objectives, and philosophies of tools followed by considerations concerning their historical antecedents, common patterns regarding structure, content, and purpose, and the implications of these patterns on the QES process.

CONCLUSIONS:

Quality appraisal of qualitative research is an important step in QES, and there have been a proliferation of tools for this purpose. By providing an overview of available tools detailing their intent and strengths, this presentation will assist those engaging in QES to choose an appropriate tool for their work.

OP120 Rapid Qualitative Reviews: A Scoping Review Of Guidance And Examples

AUTHORS:

Fiona Campbell, Laura Weeks (LauraW@cadth.ca), Andrew Booth, David Kaunelis, Andrea Smith

INTRODUCTION:

Decision-makers are increasingly recognizing the usefulness of qualitative research to inform patient-centered policy decisions, and are accordingly increasingly demanding qualitative evidence as part of health technology assessment (HTA). In the context of tight HTA timelines, a new form of evidence synthesis has emerged—rapid qualitative reviews. The need for rapidity requires either an increase in resources or, more commonly, a compromise in rigor, yet guidance on appropriate compromises for qualitative reviews is lacking.

METHODS:

In order to inform de novo guidance, we conducted a systematic scoping review to identify existing guidance and published examples of rapid qualitative reviews. We searched Medline and CINAHL using medical subject headings and keywords related to "rapid reviews" and "qualitative" research, and screened the 1,771 resultant citations independently in duplicate. Additionally, we searched the grey literature and solicited examples from our contacts and other evidence-synthesis organizations. We summarized included guidance and reviews using the Search, AppraisaL, Synthesis, Analysis (SALSA) framework to identify abbreviations in the review process.

RESULTS:

We found no guidance documents specific to rapid qualitative reviews. We found one published peer-reviewed rapid qualitative review, and several more (>10; grey literature search in process) through our organizational contacts. While methods to abbreviate the process are poorly reported, an abbreviated literature search (years and databases searched) and the use of a single reviewer appear common.

CONCLUSIONS:

A number of agencies are producing rapid qualitative reviews, however our review identifies the urgent need to develop and explore methods for the synthesis of qualitative research that balance rapidity and rigor.

OP121 Experiences With Using The GRADE-CERQual Approach In Systematic Review

AUTHORS:

Lotte Groth Jensen (lotte.groth@stab.rm.dk), Kathrine Carstensen

INTRODUCTION:

There are many approaches to synthesis of qualitative studies. The GRADE-CERQual approach (Confidence in the Evidence from Reviews of Qualitative research)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462318001447 Published online by Cambridge University Press