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**Slide 3: Systematic reviews for policy**

Table with 3 columns: Steps in policy making, Policy question, Systematic reviews of…

and 3 rows.

Row 1 – Steps: Defining and framing the problem; Question: What is the need for Intervention…the nature, magnitude and framing of the problem?; SR of observational and qualitative studies

Row 2 – Steps: Assessing potential policy options; Question: What is the appropriate set of policy options to address the problem and what are the effects of these options?; SR of effectiveness studies, economic studies, and studies of views and experiences

Row 3 – Steps: Identifying implementation considerations; Question: What are the potential barriers to the successful implementation of the policy options?; SR of effectiveness studies of implementation, acceptability studies, process evaluations

Source: adapted from Lavis, J. N. (2009). How can we support the use of systematic reviews in policymaking? PLoS Med 6(11), e1000141. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000141. Copyright © 2009 John N. Lavis. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License ([https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Slide 4: Models for policy relevant systematic reviews**

The graphic has 4 boxes, 2 on top left and right, and 2 on the bottom left and right.

Heading on the top is Evidence for multiple audiences

Heading on the left is Key concepts clear and widely agreed

Top left square (check marks on top and left) is circled in red: Common problems, Generalizable evidence, Open Access, Taxonomies & core outcome sets.

Bottom left square (x on bottom): Common problems, Generalizable evidence, Deliberation time

Top right square (x on top): Urgent problems, Policy influence, Rapid, Link to policy teams.

Bottom right square (no check or x): Urgent problems, Policy influence, Rapid and knowledge broker support.

Source: Dickson, K., 2017. Systematic reviews to inform policy: Institutional Mechanisms and social interactions to support their production: Unpublished PhD, London: UCL. Used with permission of the author.

**Slide 5: The Impact of Mental Health and Psychological Support Programmes for Populations Affected by Humanitarian Emergencies – A Systematic Review**

Bangpan, M., Dickson, K., Felix, L., & Chiumento, A. (2017). The impact of mental health and psychosocial support interventions on people affected by humanitarian emergencies: A systematic review. Humanitarian Evidence Programme. Oxford: Oxfam GB. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-impact-of-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-interventions-on-people-af-620214>

**Slide 6: Broad policy questions: Comprehensive and flexible conceptual framework**

Box at top right -MHPSS (mental health and psychosocial support): ‘to protect or promote psychosocial well-being and/or prevent or treat mental disorder’

(IASC, 2007, p.17. Available: [www.who.int/mental\_health/emergencies/9781424334445/en/](http://www.who.int/mental_health/emergencies/9781424334445/en/))

Circle on top left:Population characteristics

* Age
* Gender
* Race & Ethnicity
* Comorbid mental health or physical conditions
* Individual’s risks (e.g. exposure to events, repeated victimization, level of severity) and protective factors (e.g. resilience)

Circle on bottom left:Context

* Humanitarian emergencies (e.g. Natural disasters, armed conflicts, refugee settings)
* High/Low income countries
* Fragile states, political stability
* Culture, beliefs, religion

To the right of the circles:

Tier 4 (top): Specialised Services

Tier 3 (second down): Focused, non-specialised support

Tier 2 (third down): Community and family support

Tier 1 (bottom): Basic services and security

A large arrow points to the right to **Implementation**, then **Mechanism of Impact**

Arrow points to upper right: Mental Health and Psychological outcomes

Arrow points to lower right: Health systems, community, family and other social outcomes

Source: Bangpan, M., Dickson, K., Felix, L., & Chiumento, A. (2017). The impact of mental health and psychosocial support interventions on people affected by humanitarian emergencies: A systematic review. Humanitarian Evidence Programme. Oxford: Oxfam GB. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-impact-of-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-interventions-on-people-af-620214>

Used with permission.

**Slide 7: Review questions and key stages of the Systematic review**

Review scope. The impact of MHPSS for populations affected by humanitarian emergencies

Review questions - RQ1: barriers and facilitators of implementing and receiving MHPSS.

Data study designs: Quantitative “views” data, Qualitative Data.

Critical appraisal: Quality Assessment, Quality Assessment.

Synthesis: Thematic synthesis.

Review questions - RQ2: the effects of MHPSS

Data study designs: Quantitative Data

Critical appraisal: Risk of Bias Tool

Synthesis: Meta Analysis

Cross-study synthesis: Q.3 Key features of effective MHPSS programmes

Source: Bangpan, M., Dickson, K., Felix, L., & Chiumento, A. (2017). The impact of mental health and psychosocial support interventions on people affected by humanitarian emergencies: A systematic review. Humanitarian Evidence Programme. Oxford: Oxfam GB. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-impact-of-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-interventions-on-people-af-620214>

Used with permission.

**Slide 8: Iterative searching process and engage with advisory group including policy makers**

On the left these words are arranged in a circle, with blue arrows connecting each word(s) to the next word(s). Top left to right: Key concepts, Search terms, fdatabases, Websites and other sources, stakeholders.

On the right is an image of unconnected puzzle pieces in different shades of blue.

Image licensed from [Graphics Factory.com](https://www.graphicsfactory.com/)

**Slide 9: Inclusive and transparent in quality assessment process**

List at top of slide:

* Retain all studies, assess quality of individual studies
* Grade the evidence before making summary statements
* Judge relevance of studies with qualitative evidence informing question on implementation

Bottom half of slide:

Bar chart on left. Low risk of bias (highlighted in green), Unclear risk of bias (highlighted in yellow), High risk of bias (highlighted in red)

Random sequence generation: Low 54%, Unclear 42%, High 4%

Allocation concealment: Low 27%, Unclear 73%

Blinding of participants and personnel: Low 8%, Unclear 73%, High19%

Blinding of outcome assessment: Low 50%, Unclear 35%, High 15%

Incomplete outcome data: Low 85%, High15%

Selective reporting: Low 88%, High12%

Table on the right with 4 columns: Outcomes; Study design, number of studies and participants (n) and summary risk of bias; Findings and heterogeneity; Strength of evidence

**Outcome**: PTSD; **Design:** RCTs (3 studies; n=558) 2 low or medium risk of bias studies; **Findings**: ES=.035; 95% CI (-0.74, 0.04); Q=5.9; df=3; p=0.117; 1(2)=49.2%; tau-squared=0.073; **Evidence:** Moderate ++.

**Outcome**: Depression; **Design:** RCTs (2 studies; n=522) 1 medium risk of bias study; **Findings**: n/a; **Evidence:** Insufficient.

**Outcome**: Psychological distress; **Design:** RCT (1 study; n=482) 1 medium risk of bias study; **Findings**: n/a; **Evidence:** Insufficient.

**Outcome**: Prosocial behavior; **Design:** RCT (1 study; n=482) 1 medium risk of bias study; **Findings**: n/a; **Evidence:** Insufficient.

**Outcome**: Resilience; **Design:** RCT (1 study; n=40) 1 high risk of bias study; **Findings**: n/a; **Evidence:** Insufficient.

Source: Bangpan, M., Dickson, K., Felix, L. and Chiumento, A. (2017). The impact of mental health and psychosocial support interventions on people affected by humanitarian emergencies: A systematic review. Humanitarian Evidence Programme. Oxford: Oxfam GB. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/the-impact-of-mental-health-and-psychosocial-support-interventions-on-people-af-620214>.

Used with permission.

**Slide 10: Dissemination through humanitarian networks**

In the center of the slide is the image of a globe, with arrows pointing towards circles arranged around the globe, and words inside the circles. Starting at the top left:

* Conferences
* Peer reviewed journals
* Humanitarian organisations
* Oxfam: websites and webinars, panel discussion
* Blogs: Humanitarian week
* Roundtable discussion
* WHO-ELRHA meeting

(Image of globe licensed from [Graphics Factory.com](https://www.graphicsfactory.com/))

**Slide 11: Thank you**

Mukdarut Bangpan ([m.bangpan@ucl.ac.uk](file:///Users/joannstarks/Desktop/EPPI%20webisodes/4%20-%20webisode%204/m.bangpan@ucl.ac.uk))

Twitter: @mukdarutbangpan

Kelly Dickson ([k.dickson@ucl.ac.uk)](mailto:k.dickson@ucl.ac.uk))

Twitter: @kelly\_dickson

**Slide 12**: **Disclaimer**
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