

**APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF DOCUMENTS/INITIATIVES REVIEWED:  
KEY CANADIAN AND INTERNATIONAL SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS OF HEALTH PROMOTION EFFECTIVENESS**

**Understanding This Table**

Document/Initiative Reviewed	The agency or organization that produced the documents that were reviewed is stated here along with the specific documents that were reviewed. Because this study was looking at the procedures and frameworks that governed the review process, documents most likely to have this information were selected for review wherever possible. Web sites for each initiative are listed and it is indicated whether the documents reviewed are not available electronically.
Description of Initiative	The initiative is briefly described in this column, both in terms of the sponsoring organization and the specific project.
Purpose of Initiative	The purpose listed was the purpose of the overall initiative and sometimes the purpose of the particular document that was reviewed.
Key Features	This is a summary of the key features of the review process used by the organization or initiative described in the first column. This is based on our review of their framework in relation to the steps of a review or synthesis process.
Topics of Reviews	Wherever possible, all reviews that have been produced to date by this particular initiative are listed as a potential resource to the reader.

## APPENDIX A. SUMMARY OF INITIATIVES REVIEWED

Initiative/Document Reviewed	Description of initiative	Purpose of Review Initiative	Key Features of Approach	Topics of Reviews
<b>REGULARLY UPDATED SYSTEMATIC REVIEW DATABASES</b>				
<p><b>The Cochrane Collaboration and Cochrane Health Promotion and Public Health Field</b></p> <p>Documents reviewed — “Cochrane Reviewers’ Handbook 4.1,” June 2000</p> <p>Thompson and Rivara, “Pool Fencing for preventing drowning in children.”</p> <p><a href="http://www.update-software.com/cochrane">http://www.update-software.com/cochrane</a></p>	<p>The Cochrane Library offers systematic reviews of effectiveness on a variety of health topics. Reviews are conducted by a combination of volunteers and funders (e.g. NHS Research &amp; Development Program UK, WHO Switzerland, Medical Research Council UK, Institute of Child Health UK, CDC USA). Coordination &amp; Administration for health promotion working group provided by Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.</p>	<p>To prepare, maintain and promote the accessibility of <u>systematic reviews</u> of the effects of health care interventions</p> <p>Ultimately, to help people make well informed decisions about health care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- comprehensive and systematic approach</li> <li>- includes synthesis component</li> <li>- full disclosure of methods, results</li> <li>- international</li> <li>- updated regularly, evolving</li> <li>- historically an RCT emphasis but moving into new territory, ie. beyond RCTs</li> <li>- strong move to make materials accessible to consumers and to increase participation by consumers at all levels</li> <li>- there may be challenges for reviewers of health promotion topics that are not adequately covered in Cochrane Reviewer’s Handbook</li> </ul>	<p>- 77 reviews of health promotion interventions as of Issue 2 2001 in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* cardiovascular health</li> <li>* diabetes</li> <li>* drugs</li> <li>* injuries</li> <li>* infectious diseases/sexual health/HIV/AIDS</li> <li>* mental health</li> <li>* nutrition</li> <li>* oral health</li> <li>* respiratory</li> <li>* tobacco control</li> </ul>
<p><b>National Health Service Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (NHS-CRD, UK)</b></p> <p>Document reviewed -- “Undertaking Systematic Reviews of Research on Effectiveness: CRD’s Guidance for Carrying Out or Commissioning Reviews,” (September 2000 - accessible from web site)</p> <p><a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/welcome.htm">http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/welcome.htm</a></p>	<p>The NHS-CRD offers rigorous and systematic reviews on selected topics, a database of good quality reviews (DARE), a dissemination service and an information service. This helps to promote research based practice in the NHS. The CRD is closely linked to the Cochrane Collaboration and plays an important role in disseminating the contents of Cochrane reviews to the NHS.</p> <p>CRD either conducts reviews itself or receives commissions (and associated funding) from different commissioning agencies.</p>	<p>To undertake <u>systematic reviews</u> of research on effectiveness</p> <p>Practical guidance for commissioning/carrying out reviews in light of current methodology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reviews considered to be and conducted as primary scientific research</li> <li>- teams of researchers of any composition can submit a proposal to conduct a review</li> <li>- detailed guide re: review process developed for those commissioning and conducting reviews</li> <li>- comprehensive literature search of published primary studies with positive or negative results</li> <li>- suggests weakest study design allowed should be clearly stated; explicit quality assessment procedures</li> <li>- preference to quantitative synthesis of review results</li> <li>- diagnostic analysis of field of practice to inform dissemination strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 21 reviews are underway</li> <li>- 84 reviews completed since 1995, few are health promotion-related (major focus on health care interventions). For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>95 - health service interventions to reduce variations in health</li> <li>96 - Older people (3 reviews -- Preventing falls, preventing heart disease, influenza vaccination)</li> <li>97 - Health promotion with young people re substance misuse, alcohol misuse, unintended teenage pregnancies (3 reviews)</li> <li>97 - mental health promotion in high risk groups</li> <li>97 - obesity prevention &amp; treatment</li> <li>98 - Smoking cessation: what the health service can do</li> <li>98 - Mass media interventions for preventing smoking in young people</li> <li>99 - Preventing the uptake of smoking in young people</li> <li>99 - Health promoting schools and health promotion in schools</li> <li>00 - Community preventions for preventing smoking in youth</li> <li>00 - promoting the initiation of breastfeeding</li> <li>00 - implementing the ‘wider public health’ agenda</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Document Reviewed/ Initiative</b>	<b>Description of Initiative</b>	<b>Purpose of Review Initiative</b>	<b>Key Features</b>	<b>Topics of Reviews</b>
SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SERIES ON SELECTED TOPICS				

<p><b>US Guide to Community Preventive Services</b></p> <p>Documents reviewed -- Am J Prev Med 2000; 18 (1S)</p> <p>Truman et al. "Developing the Guide to Community Preventive Services — Overview and Rationale"</p> <p>Zaza et al. "Scope and Organization of the Guide to Community Preventive Services."</p> <p>Briss et al. "Developing an Evidence-Based Guide to Community Preventive Services — Methods."</p> <p>Zaza et al. "Collection Instrument and Procedure for Systematic Reviews in the Guide to Community Preventive Services."</p> <p>Green and Kreuter "Commentary on the Emerging Guide to Community Preventive Services from a Health Promotion Perspective."</p> <p>(Above articles can be downloaded from website)</p> <p><a href="http://www.thecommunityguide.org">http://www.thecommunityguide.org</a></p>	<p>The Community Guide is a set of recommendations for the use or non-use of population-based interventions for a variety of public health topics. The recommendations are based on systematic reviews of the scientific evidence of effectiveness. The Community Guide is being developed by a 15-member Task Force which has been convened by but is independent of the US Department of Health and Human Services. The primary audience for the Guide is persons involved in planning, funding and implementing population-based services and policies to improve health at state and local levels. This is a multi-year project and only a few "chapters" have been completed to date.</p>	<p>To provide recommendations re: population-based interventions to promote health and prevent disease, injury, disability, and premature death in communities on basis of what is known about a public health problem and its solution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- broad in scope, but linked to <i>Healthy People 2010</i> objectives</li> <li>- multidisciplinary work group developed explicit analytic framework</li> <li>- restricted to English literature</li> <li>- focused on community interventions (with concomitant methodological criteria for inclusion of studies, i.e. a range of study designs )</li> <li>- intermediate as well as final outcomes included</li> <li>- provides recommendations, including cost-effectiveness estimates</li> <li>- given national public health prominence through CDC support</li> </ul>	<p>Guide lists all 15 intended chapters but only 3 have been completed to date (in bold):</p> <p>Changing Risk Behaviours</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Tobacco Product Use Prevention and Control (Nov, 2000)</b></li> <li>2. Alcohol Use and Miuse (Spring 2002)</li> <li>3. Other Addictive Drugs</li> <li>4. Physical Activity (fall 2001)</li> <li>5. Nutrition</li> <li>6. Sexual Behaviour (winter 2002)</li> </ol> <p>Reducing Diseases, Injuries and Impairments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Cancer (winter 2001)</li> <li>8. Diabetes (June 2001)</li> <li><b>9. Vaccine Preventable Diseases (July 1999)</b></li> <li>10. Improved Pregnancy Outcomes</li> <li>11. Oral Health (fall 2001)</li> <li><b>12. Motor Vehicle Occupant Injury (May 2001)</b></li> <li>13. Injuries due to Violence (summer 2002)</li> <li>14. Mental Impairment and Disability/Mental Health Services (summer 2002)</li> </ol> <p>Addressing Environmental and Ecosystem Challenges</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Sociocultural Environment (Winter 2001)</li> </ol>
---	--	--	---	--

<p><b>Public Health Division of the Dept of Human Services, Government of Victoria, Australia</b></p> <p>Document reviewed — “Evidence-based Health Promotion - Resources for Planning No.2 — Adolescent Health”</p> <p><a href="http://hna.ffh.vic.gov.au/phd">http://hna.ffh.vic.gov.au/phd</a></p>	<p>Public Health Division of Government of Victoria in cooperation with statewide health advancement organizations took initiative to conduct systematic reviews in 4 topics. Series is called “Evidence-based Health Promotion - Resources for Planning.” Only summaries of the systematic reviews were available at the time of this study.</p>	<p>To work towards the provision of quality advice on health promotion practice.</p> <p>To prepare and facilitate access to systematic reviews of the effectiveness of different kinds of interventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- strong health promotion analysis and synthesis re strategies and outcomes</li> <li>- strong theory base</li> <li>- “control” study focus but others acceptable if nothing else available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence-based Health Promotion No. 1 Oral Health</li> <li>- Evidence-based Health Promotion No. 2 Adolescent Health</li> <li>- Evidence-based Health Promotion No. 3 Falls Prevention</li> <li>- Evidence-based Health Promotion No. 4 Child Injury Prevention</li> </ul> <p>(No. 2 &amp; 3 available as pdf files on the web site)</p>
<p><b>Evidence for Policy and Practice Coordinating Centre</b></p> <p>Document reviewed -- “Effectiveness Reviews in Health Promotion” February 1999</p> <p><a href="http://epi.ioe.ac.uk/resources.htm">http://epi.ioe.ac.uk/resources.htm</a></p>	<p>Evidence for Policy and Practice Coordinating Centre is part of the Social Science Research Unit, London University Institute of Education. EPPI-Centre focuses on health promotion and education. The Centre maintains a database of over 400 abstracts of reviews keyworded to health topics, population group, and methods used. In addition, the EPPI-Centre produced a series of systematic reviews of effectiveness on specific topics. It is one of the latter reviews (sponsored by the Department of Health in England) that was included in this study.</p>	<p>To conduct a review of reviews,</p> <p>To develop literature identification methods,</p> <p>To investigate methods used to conduct health promotion effectiveness reviews.</p> <p>To study the effect of different inclusion criteria for primary studies on scope &amp; recommendations of review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- states that a systematic review is distinguished from traditional narrative reviews because it is thorough and systematic</li> <li>- recommended a two-stage commissioning process for reviews: determine the volume of literature in an area of interest, then in negotiation with the commissioner determine the scale of and resources required for the review</li> <li>- review recommended to be framed explicitly in context of user needs</li> <li>- RCTs or sound trials preferred over other methods, the latter probably most feasible for health promotion</li> <li>- review findings recommended to be weighted by quality of studies included</li> <li>- clear and detailed reporting, including a ‘bottom line’ and implications for service planning and research; disseminated widely</li> <li>- latest series of reviews has integrated views of young people alongside experimental studies of effectiveness</li> <li>- have flexible data extraction tools (able to extract data on process evaluations which can illuminate questions of effectiveness)</li> <li>- protocols and frameworks for conducting systematic reviews have been specifically developed for health promotion</li> </ul>	<p>Reviews of effectiveness of Health Promotion interventions conducted by EPPI-Centre that are available online include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Review of Effectiveness of Health Promotion Interventions for Men who have Sex with Men (March 1996)</li> <li>2. A Descriptive Mapping of Health Promotion Studies in Young People (May 1996)</li> <li>3. PHASE: Promoting Health After Sifting the Evidence (Aug 1996)</li> <li>4. Effectiveness Reviews in Health Promotion (Feb 1999)</li> <li>5. A Review of the Effectiveness and Appropriateness of Peer-Delivered Health Promotion Interventions for Young People (Nov 1999)</li> </ol>

<p><b>Central West Public Health Research, Education and Development Unit</b></p> <p>Document Reviewed --  “Effectiveness of School-Based Interventions in Reducing Adolescent Risk Behaviour: a systematic review of reviews,”  Helen Thomas et al (March 1999)</p> <p><a href="http://www.health.hamilton-went.on.ca/CSARB/EPHPP/ephpp.htm">http://www.health.hamilton-went.on.ca/CSARB/EPHPP/ephpp.htm</a></p>	<p>The Public Health Research, Education and Development Unit (PHRED) Program is funded by the Public Health Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. One project of the PHREDs (in 6 public health units across Ontario) is the Effective Public Health Practice Project which conducts systematic reviews that evaluate the effectiveness of relevant public health and health promotion interventions. Linked to the Cochrane Collaboration and submits completed reviews to Cochrane.</p>	<p>To conduct systematic reviews of reviews.</p> <p>For the particular document reviewed:</p> <p>To determine effectiveness of school-based prevention programs in reducing adolescent risk behaviours</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- review of reviews</li> <li>- literature subjected to relevance and quality assessment criteria to identify ‘strong’ reviews</li> <li>- narrative summary of results with effect sizes noted when available</li> <li>- full reports and summary statements available on website</li> <li>- updating or new reviews ongoing</li> <li>- quality assessment tool was designed for use with quantitative studies of all designs to reflect the literature in public health/health promotion</li> <li>- focus on quantitative studies</li> </ul>	<p>20 review reports available as of March 2001 on topics such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- tobacco (coalitions, postpartum smoking prevention, cessation during pregnancy)</li> <li>- adolescent health (pregnancy prevention, risk behaviour, suicide prevention)</li> <li>- sexual health (STD prevention, peer support)</li> <li>- community-based interventions (in heart health, in cervical cancer screening, eating fruits and vegetables)</li> <li>- nutrition (re infants)</li> <li>- injury prevention in children &amp; adolescents</li> <li>- parenting (peer/paraprofessional interventions, parenting groups)</li> <li>- environmental awareness interventions</li> <li>- home visiting in prenatal &amp; postnatal period</li> <li>- electronic support groups</li> </ul>
---	---	--	---	---

<p><b>Central West Health Planning Information Network</b></p> <p>Document Reviewed -- "Mandatory Health Programs &amp; Services in Ontario: Overview of the Research Literature on the Effectiveness of Public Health Interventions"</p> <p><a href="http://www.cwhpin.ca">http://www.cwhpin.ca</a></p>	<p>Central West Health Planning Information Network (7 public health units and 4 district health councils and McMaster University) is one of the Intelligence Units set up by the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. As part of its mandate, CWHPIN produces reports every year summarizing the published literature on specific public health interventions, and providing an assessment of the effectiveness of these interventions.</p>	<p>To review the literature that adds to the knowledge about the health status of the population of Central West Region of Ontario.</p> <p>To provide information that assists in assessing the impact of strategies (part of the impact assessment step of the planning process).</p>	<p>- Mandatory Health Programs and Services provided the framework for a MEDLINE or Cochrane Library search for studies reported in English or French</p> <p>- full articles retrieved only if available at McMaster University library</p> <p>- included RCTs, non-RCTs, cohort or case-control analytic studies, expert papers</p> <p>- annotated table of studies ranked by effectiveness; no critical appraisal of studies</p>	<p>References, annotated tables, and summaries of the research literature (from 1980 to 1998) are all provided for interventions addressing the following health issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Asthma</li> <li>- Alcohol abuse</li> <li>- Cancer — breast, cervical, lung, skin</li> <li>- Cardiovascular disease</li> <li>- COPD</li> <li>- Dental Disease</li> <li>- Diabetes</li> <li>- Drowning</li> <li>- Fall (in seniors)</li> <li>- Illicit drug use</li> <li>- Influenza</li> <li>- Motor Vehicle crash/cycle crash</li> <li>- Neural Tube Defects</li> <li>- Nutrition</li> <li>- Obesity (unhealthy high BMI)</li> <li>- Osteoporosis</li> <li>- Physical Activity</li> <li>- Polio</li> <li>- Reproductive Health</li> <li>- STD/AIDS</li> <li>- Suicide</li> <li>- Tetanus</li> <li>- Tuberculosis</li> <li>- Tobacco Use</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Document Reviewed/ Initiative</b>	<b>Description of Initiative</b>	<b>Purpose of Initiative</b>	<b>Key Features</b>	<b>Topics of Reviews</b>
SUMMARY OF REVIEWS IN ONE PUBLICATION				

<p>Regional Office for Europe of the <b>International Union for Health Promotion and Education</b> with the Dutch Centre for Health Promotion and Health Education</p> <p>Documents reviewed — “Improvement of the Effectiveness of Health Education and Health Promotion,” 1994.</p> <p>“Unintentional injuries in childhood: A review of the effectiveness of health education and health promotion,” 1994</p> <p>(not readily available in electronic or published form)</p> <p>www.iuhpe.nyu.edu</p>	<p>The European Commission funded the IUHPE Regional Office for Europe to conduct a series of systematic reviews of effectiveness of health education and health promotion in 1994.</p>	<p>To gather and store available information from evaluation studies on the effectiveness of health promotion and health education and to improve the accessibility of these data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- commissioned 16 reviews on effectiveness of health promotion/health education initiatives</li> <li>- explicit selection criteria</li> <li>- literature review approach</li> <li>- not updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 10 reviews re specific risk factors (e.g. drug abuse, sexual behaviour, HIV/AIDS) and/or promoting health behaviours (e.g. exercise promotion)</li> <li>- 2 reviews re health benefits of quality prevention programs</li> <li>- 4 reviews assessed the effectiveness of health promotion in specific settings (e.g. schools, workplaces, patient education inside/outside hospitals)</li> </ul>
<p><b>International Union for Health Promotion and Education</b></p> <p>Document Reviewed — “The Evidence of Health Promotion Effectiveness: Shaping Public Health in a New Europe,” A Report for the European Commission 1999-2000</p> <p>(Not available electronically)</p> <p>www.iuhpe.nyu.edu</p>	<p>The previous effectiveness effort was updated with funding from European Commission, US CDC, Dept of Health Promotion, Social Change and Mental Health Cluster, WHO (Geneva). Experts from various health promotion disciplines from Europe, Canada, US, Australia were involved.</p>	<p>To collect and assess the evidence of 20 years of health promotion effectiveness</p> <p>To concentrate on what health promotion actually does and how effective that is.</p> <p>To stimulate debate as Europe heads towards framing its new public health framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- accessible summaries re topics of interest to health promotion</li> <li>- literature review approach</li> <li>- involved audience from the start</li> <li>- cross-sectoral</li> <li>- symbols to assist policy-makers</li> <li>- policy-makers were involved in project</li> <li>- not updated as yet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political Challenges: Aging, Mental Health, Out of School Youth</li> <li>- Health Challenges: Heart Disease, Tobacco, Alcohol and Illicit Drugs</li> <li>- Social Challenges: Nutrition, Safety</li> <li>- Settings: Health Promotion in the Workplace, in Schools, in the Health Care Sector</li> <li>- Lessons from Canada: a case study in infrastructure development</li> <li>- Making Health Gains: a case study in Oral Health</li> <li>- Equity in Health: a Fundamental Human Right</li> </ul>



<p><b>Heart Health Resource Centre, Ontario Public Health Association</b></p> <p>Document reviewed — “International Best Practices in Heart Health, Part I” 1998</p> <p><a href="http://www.web.net/heart">http://www.web.net/heart</a></p>	<p>The Heart Health Resource Centre is a project of the Ontario Public Health Association funded by the Community and Health Promotion Branch of Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care.</p> <p>Approximately 70 experts in heart health interventions identified or shared outstanding practices to conduct this initiative.</p>	<p>To identify &amp; obtain from other jurisdictions best practices having potential for use in community heart health initiatives in Ontario</p> <p>To develop criteria for assessment of best practices, thus providing a methodology for use in the selection of innovative &amp; effective practices for dissemination in Ontario</p>	<p>(Overall framework)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- presentation of best cases rather than synthesis</li> <li>- examples rather than exhaustive</li> <li>- well thought through approach to identifying “best practices”, “promising practices”, and practices “to be tracked”</li> <li>- criteria for rating practice: effectiveness, plausibility, and practicality</li> <li>- framework is being improved (March 2001 symposium held -- broadening the range of research designs included and looking at study execution and quality)</li> <li>- first framework too ‘rigorous’ and excluded too many health promotion-relevant interventions</li> <li>- application is difficult because communities need supporting information/detail not included in the peer-reviewed articles in order to assess applicability of results to own situation</li> </ul>	<p>Best practices are catalogued in 3 documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What Worked for Us (February 1997)</li> <li>2. International Best Practices in Heart Health, Part I (June 1998) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9 international programs identified as ‘best’ or ‘promising’</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. International Best Practices in Heart Health, Part II (June 1999) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 9 international programs identified as ‘best’ or ‘promising’ [update of previous document]</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
---	--	---	--	---

Document Reviewed/ Initiative	Description of Initiative	Purpose of Initiative	Key Features	Topics of Reviews
PROJECT OR EVENT-SPECIFIC REVIEWS				
<p><b>National Forum on Health</b></p> <p>Document Reviewed — Canada Health Action: Building on the Legacy, Papers Commissioned by the National Forum on Health, Volume 1 Children &amp; Youth, 1998</p> <p><a href="http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/forum_e.htm">http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/forum_e.htm</a></p>	<p>National Forum on Health, chaired by the Prime Minister, commissioned 41 studies about health and health care in Canada. The four themes were: Determinants of Health, Striking a Balance, Making Decisions, and the Issue of Values. We reviewed one volume in the determinants of health theme.</p>	<p>To involve and inform Canadians &amp; advise the federal government on innovative ways to improve the health system and the health of Canada's people. Determinants of Health Working Group was charged with fostering debate &amp; knowledge on the best ways to invest Canadian resources for the good of the public's health To formulate advice appropriate to the development of national policies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- general requirements for stories of success and policy implications but lots of variation in how each review was handled</li> <li>- strong determinants of health perspective</li> <li>- literature review approach</li> <li>- not updated/one time only event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 31 papers were commissioned in determinants of health series on issues identified as critical for vulnerable groups or in key settings</li> <li>- Part I - Children (5 papers)</li> <li>- Part II - Youth (4 papers)</li> <li>- Part III - Adults (2 papers)</li> <li>- Part IV - Seniors (5 papers)</li> <li>- Part V - Settings and Context (4 papers)</li> <li>- Part VI - Broad Issues (5 papers)</li> <li>- Part VII - Macro Issues (1 paper)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Alberta Consortium for Health Promotion Research &amp; Education</b></p> <p>Document Reviewed — “Health Promotion Effectiveness in Alberta: Providing the Tools for Healthy Albertans” Thurston &amp; Wilson et al, August 1999</p> <p>(not available via internet)</p>	<p>Supported by Alberta Ministry of Health and Well-Being.</p>	<p>To assess the contributions that health promotion has made to the goal of “healthy Albertans in a healthy Alberta;”</p> <p>To assess the strengths &amp; weaknesses of health promotion projects so that strategic decisions about investing in the most cost-effective health promotion interventions can be made</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- project or program-based rather than intervention review</li> <li>- Alberta health promotion projects only</li> <li>- project inclusion criteria incorporated health promotion strengths as well as evaluation quality</li> <li>- exemplar projects identified and described</li> <li>- Summary and Final Reports produced</li> <li>- documents require expertise to understand and interpret contents for practitioners and policy-makers</li> </ul>	<p>After initial review of health promotion programs, 3 additional projects have been added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Best practices in the delivery of school-based injury and tobacco prevention programs (70 injury reduction and 54 tobacco reduction/prevention projects)</li> <li>2. Evaluation of the 1998-99 Population Health Fund (25 projects)</li> <li>3. Violence reduction health promotion model (60 school-based family violence prevention projects)</li> </ol>

<p><b>Centre for Health Promotion</b> Symposium on the Effectiveness of Health Promotion, 1996</p> <p>Documents Reviewed — J. Raeburn, “How Effective is Strengthening Community Action as a Strategy for Health Promotion?” 1996</p> <p>B. Hyndman “Health Promotion in Action: A Review of the Effectiveness of Health Promotion Strategies” 1998.</p> <p><a href="http://www.utoronto.ca/chp">http://www.utoronto.ca/chp</a></p>	<p>The Centre for Health Promotion held a symposium in 1996 on the Effectiveness of Health Promotion with one Canadian and one international paper for each strategy in the Ottawa Charter. One paper was selected for review and the overview paper written by Hyndman after the event consolidating the evidence produced by all of the papers at the symposium.</p>	<p>To synthesize and communicate evidence regarding the effectiveness of health promotion to practitioners, policy-makers and researchers in health and other health-determining sectors</p> <p>To assemble, assess &amp; synthesize international evidence from industrialized countries on effectiveness of HP</p> <p>To communicate this knowledge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no overall criteria guiding all reviews</li> <li>- strong Ottawa Charter health promotion perspective</li> <li>- each of five Ottawa Charter action areas covered</li> <li>- literature review approach</li> <li>- not updated/one time only event</li> </ul>	<p>One Canadian and one international review on each topic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 reviews on healthy public policies</li> <li>- 2 reviews on supportive environments</li> <li>- 2 on personal skills</li> <li>- 2 on community action</li> <li>- 1 on reorienting health services</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--	--

Document Reviewed/ Initiative	Description of Initiative	Purpose of Initiative	Key Features	Topics of Reviews
PROPOSED FRAMEWORKS				
<p><b>Campbell</b> Collaboration (affiliated with the Cochrane Collaboration)</p> <p>Document reviewed — “The Campbell Collaboration: a proposal for systematic, multi-national and continuous reviews of evidence,” (July ‘99)</p> <p><a href="http://campbell.gse.upenn.edu">http://campbell.gse.upenn.edu</a></p>	<p>The Campbell Collaboration is a Proposal for systematic, multi-national &amp; continuous reviews of evidence in social &amp; behavioural sectors with international collaboration, building on enthusiasm of researchers and located where there is interest and expertise. Linked closely with Cochrane Collaboration.</p>	<p>To stimulate the empirical methodological research required to improve the validity, relevance and precision of systematic reviews and the randomized trials and non-randomized trials on which they are based.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- affiliated with the Cochrane Collaboration, using Cochrane resources, principles and protocols</li> <li>- Randomized Field Trials (RFTs) preferred</li> <li>- under development/no reviews completed at this time</li> <li>- focus on social and behavioural sciences</li> </ul>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>Centre for Health Promotion, University of Toronto</b></p> <p>Document reviewed -- <b>Kahan &amp; Goodstadt</b> “Best practices in Health Promotion Framework to Assess Reviews or Syntheses,” 2001</p> <p>(Not available on web)</p> <p><a href="http://www.utoronto.ca/chp/bestp.htm">http://www.utoronto.ca/chp/bestp.htm</a></p>	<p>This project was funded by Ontario Region of Health Canada. Barbara Kahan and Michael Goodstadt are primary authors with an advisory committee.</p>	<p>To develop a framework to assess reviews or syntheses based on criteria best suited to the health promotion field and related to best practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- health promotion values, theories, concepts are integral part of framework</li> <li>- linked to “best practices” in health promotion</li> <li>- explicit attention to health promotion at every stage of systematic review process</li> <li>- under development/no reviews completed at this time</li> </ul>	<p>n/a</p>

Document Reviewed/ Initiative	Description of Initiative	Purpose of Initiative	Key Features	Topics of Reviews
ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS				
<p><b>NHS Economic Evaluation Database</b>, National Health Service Centre for Reviews &amp; Dissemination</p> <p>Documents reviewed – web-based information pages reviewed.</p> <p><a href="http://agatha.york.ac.uk/nhsdhp.htm">http://agatha.york.ac.uk/nhsdhp.htm</a></p>	<p>NHS Centre for Review and Dissemination has 3 major searchable databases. One of them is the Economic Evaluation Database. It is a collection of abstracts commissioned from health economists around the world. It has a close relationship with the Cochrane Collaboration.</p>	<p>To provide good quality reviews of economic evaluations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- database of abstracts (not synthesis)</li> <li>- reviewers follow a structured abstract</li> <li>- same criteria for economic analysis of any study in any field</li> </ul>	<p>Key word search of database — health promotion (0 hits), disease prevention (17 hits)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cardiovascular disease prevention (6)</li> <li>- clinical or medical therapies (5)</li> <li>- environmental health issues (2)</li> <li>- STD prevention (2)</li> <li>- comprehensive health promotion and disease prevention programs in the worksite (1)</li> <li>- nutrition education (1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Centres for Disease Control</b>, US Dept of Health and Human Services</p> <p>Document Reviewed -- Jeffrey P. Koplan, Stephen B. Thacker et al., “An Ounce of Prevention. . . . What Are the Returns?” 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, October 1999.</p> <p>(Document not available on-line)</p> <p><a href="http://www.cdc.gov">http://www.cdc.gov</a></p>	<p>CDC funded a study of cost-effectiveness of various health and disease topics.</p>	<p>To show how spending money to prevent disease &amp; injury and promote healthy lifestyles makes good economic sense.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- used a standardized method to evaluate the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of each strategy</li> <li>- authors say they have created a starting point for comparing a variety of information</li> <li>- each strategy evaluated on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- health impact of related disease, injury or disability</li> <li>- effectiveness of strategy</li> <li>- costs of disease, injury or disability</li> <li>- cost-effectiveness of the strategy</li> </ul> </li> <li>- definite disease and injury prevention focus</li> <li>- compilation of evidence but not a synthesis</li> </ul>	<p>Topics of one-page cost-effectiveness summaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- bicycle-related head injuries</li> <li>- breast cancer</li> <li>- cervical cancer</li> <li>- childhood lead poisoning</li> <li>- childhood vaccine-preventable diseases</li> <li>- chlamydia-related infertility</li> <li>- colorectal cancer</li> <li>- coronary heart disease</li> <li>- dental caries</li> <li>- diabetic retinopathy</li> <li>- HIV/AIDS transmission</li> <li>- influenza among elderly persons</li> <li>- low birthweight</li> <li>- neural tube defects</li> <li>- perinatal hepatitis B</li> <li>- pneumococcal disease</li> <li>- sickle cell disease</li> <li>- smoking</li> <li>- tuberculosis</li> </ul>