<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>Generic term: published materials that provide examination of recent or current literature. Can cover wide range of subjects at various levels of completeness and comprehensiveness.</td>
<td>Brings together what has been accomplished without repetition and identifying gaps or omission all within a summation.</td>
<td>There is not set method to make sure all the literature on a topic was considered. The chances of the review being biased increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Generic term: summary of the literature that attempts to survey the literature and describe its characteristics.</td>
<td>Allows for board summations and great for those who are new to the topic or subject.</td>
<td>Lack of systematic searching methods and evaluation. Is often overused or used as a synonym for other types of reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Review</td>
<td>Aims to demonstrate writer has extensively researched literature and critically evaluated its quality. Goes beyond mere description to include degree of analysis and conceptual innovation. Typically results in hypothesis or model.</td>
<td>Used to look at the entire body of work on a topic. Can be used to introduce a idea, resolve competing theories, or call for testing on topic.</td>
<td>Does not require the methods of searching, synthesis, or analysis of literature be explicitly stated. The main goal it so identify all the literature on the topic to start the evaluation of a topic and is not the final evaluation product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping review/systematic map</td>
<td>Map out and categorize existing literature from which to commission further reviews and/or primary research by identifying gaps in research literature.</td>
<td>This can help determine if all the literature needs to consider to make an informed decision on a topic, or if a subset can be reviewed due to theoretical perspective, population group, or setting of the study.</td>
<td>Can oversimplify studies being looked at meaning the findings and methods can be highly varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>Technique that statistically combines the results of quantitative studies to provide a more precise effect of the results.</td>
<td>Incorporates small or inconclusive studies into other studies to aid in drawing conclusions that they otherwise are unable to do.</td>
<td>Is only as good as the studies that are used to create it. Some argue that the combination of studies is comparing apples and oranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed studies review/mixed methods review</td>
<td>Refers to any combination of methods where one significant component is a literature review (usually systematic). Within a review context it refers to a combination of review approaches from example combining quantitative with qualitative research or outcomes with process studies.</td>
<td>Has the potential to give a whole picture view that single method review can give.</td>
<td>Is dependent upon the searcher to demonstrate value added that the variety of methods and findings the studies give. There is also difficulty in evaluating the different qualitative and quantitative results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative systematic review/qualitative evidence synthesis</td>
<td>Method for integrating or comparing the findings from qualitative studies. It looks for 'themes' or 'constructs' that lie in or across individual qualitative studies.</td>
<td>Is a strong addition to the quantitative elements of a study.</td>
<td>There are differing opinions about when specific methods are necessary for the review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Review Types and Their Strengths and Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Review</td>
<td>Assessment of what is already known about a policy or practice issue, by using systematic review methods to search and critically appraise existing research</td>
<td>Is designed to done quickly by using less sophisticated search strategies, looking at other reviews, not including grey matter, and doing limited quality assessments.</td>
<td>The shortened time for quality assessment increases the risk of using biased or poor quality studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Review</td>
<td>Preliminary assessment of potential size and scope of available research literature. Aims to identify nature and extent of research evidence (usually including ongoing research)</td>
<td>Are used to determine if a full systematic review will be necessary to form a conclusion.</td>
<td>Are not a financial product and have run a higher risk of being biased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-of-the-art review</td>
<td>Tend to address more current matters in contrast to other combined retrospective and current approaches. May offer new perspectives on issue or point out area for further research.</td>
<td>Gives a reader new to a topic or someone looking for new research opportunities one place to read about current matters.</td>
<td>By focusing on a time constraint of being current the review can give a skewed view of the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Seeks to systematically search for, appraise and synthesis research evidence, often adhering to guidelines on the conduct of a review.</td>
<td>Seeks to include all knowledge on a topic</td>
<td>Is restrictive to focusing a certain method used in studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic research and review</td>
<td>Combines strength of critical review with a comprehensive search process. Typically addresses broad questions to produce 'best evidence synthesis'</td>
<td>Includes multiple types of studies</td>
<td>Without the stated inclusion-exclusion criteria the choosing method can be subjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematized review</td>
<td>Attempt to include elements of systematic review process while stopping short of systematic review. Typically conducted as postgraduate student assignment.</td>
<td>Theyj searching stage is well defined and can help speed up the process of the review.</td>
<td>The quality assessment and the synthesis are usually less defined, this can lead to bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella review</td>
<td>Specifically refers to review compiling evidence from multiple views into one accessible and usable document. Focuses on broad condition or problem for which there are competing interventions and highlights reviews that address these interventions and their results.</td>
<td>Compiles the results of multiple reviews to answer a specific question. Creates a balance between big picture reviews and reviews that are fragmented because of their specificity.</td>
<td>Is dependent upon there already being a narrower component reviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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