

A rapid review process for Evidence Aid: Electric fans for reducing adverse health impacts in heatwaves

Allen C¹, Gupta S², Murray V², Clarke M^{1,3}, Carmichael C², Simpson C⁴, Chan EY⁵, Gao Y⁵

¹Evidence Aid, UK; ²Health Protection Agency, UK; ³All Ireland Hub for Trials Methodology Research, Queen's University, Belfast, UK; ⁴Health Canada, Canada; ⁵CERT-CUHK-Oxford University Centre for Disaster and Medical Humanitarian Response, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.



Background:

This Cochrane Review was carried out to determine if electric fans have a harmful or protective effect on the general population during heatwaves. It was prepared rapidly through Evidence Aid with the aim to inform the 2012 Heatwave Plan for England.

Objectives:

To complete a rapid review for Evidence Aid by an international review team (members from three continents). None of the authors were working on this review full time.

Results:

More than 4500 records were identified and 120 full text articles were assessed. None met the criteria for the review. The evidence identified does not resolve uncertainties surrounding the health effects of electric fans during heatwaves; continued research is needed to address the ongoing confusion. The review sets out the need for new research, with the design for a randomized trial in the review. It was press-released by the publishers of *The Cochrane Library*, John Wiley and Sons Limited, on 11 July, Tweeted and added to the Evidence Aid Facebook page the following day. Some of the many media stories of the next few days are included in this poster.

Methods:

Conception to birth in about nine months...

The initial approach to The Cochrane Collaboration was made in late September 2011, and the title was registered with the Gynaecological Cancer Group on 9 November 2011 as part of their 'orphan' topic reviews. The review was completed over the subsequent 9 months and published on 11 July 2012. This speed contrasts with the average two or more years from title registration to review completion for other Cochrane Reviews. The Gynaecological Cancer Group took editorial responsibility and supported the review's rapid progress. The protocol was published in Issue 5 and the full review followed in Issue 7, 2012 of



The Cochrane Library. An extensive search sought potentially relevant research, on English, Indian and Chinese databases and relevant websites, with independent peer review of the search strategy. Experts in the field were contacted for additional studies, published or unpublished, and retrieved articles were checked for further references. At least two review authors assessed each article for eligibility. Teleconferences of the review team were held every few weeks between January and May 2012 to maintain progress.



Conclusions:

This process shows that rapid reviewing for Cochrane Reviews is possible with limited resources, and can be used as a model to promote a rapid turnaround of Cochrane Reviews on issues of major, global importance.

Timeline:

