

Reviews

The CSP accepts systematic reviews, scoping reviews, and narrative reviews. [Editorial 37\(4\)](#) presents the editorial policy for the topic.

Systematic reviews (see [Editorial 32\(9\)](#)): Systematic reviews must have their own methodological design, based on a specific question, defining an adequate literature search strategy that can be replicated. Inclusion and exclusion criteria must be described for studies, evaluating the risk of bias of the studies included in the review and providing a synthesis of the evidence found, covering implications and limitations, in order to point to future paths of professional practice, public and/or investigation policies. When writing the manuscript, the authors should pay attention to the following:

- We strongly recommended that systematic reviews observe the guidelines in the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) checklist [<http://www.prisma-statement.org/>].
- The selection of databases to be searched must be compatible with the theme analyzed in the systematic review. More details on database selection and other methodological aspects for the development of systematic reviews are provided at http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/pdf/Systematic_Reviews.pdf and <http://handbook.cochrane.org/>.
- The tool developed by the Cochrane Collaboration is recommended when assessing quality/risk of bias in clinical trials.
- To assess quality/risk of bias of observational studies included in systematic reviews, either instrument can be used: (a) Effective Public Health Practice Project Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies; or (b) Research Triangle Institute Item Bank.
- The CSP is particularly interested in reviews that address interventions in public health, including health care. This fact will be taken into account when evaluating this type of review that we wish to encourage. Authors who are interested in this type of investigation should refer to Chapter 3 of the book [Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking review in health care](#) and the document [Finding What Works in Health Care: Standards for Systematic Reviews](#) issued by the Institute of Medicine.

Narrative reviews: this type of review should promote a comprehensive view of a topic linked with public health, based on syntheses of current issues, the state of the art, dilemmas, and knowledge gaps associated with the topic ([Editorial 37\(4\)](#)).