Guide to editors and authors on how to construct reviews for ER: Health

The **Summary** should be no longer than 300 words and divided into the following sections: Background, Methods/Design, Review results/Synthesis and Discussion. Up to 7 Keywords should also be provided. The total length of the article is flexible.

The **Background** section needs to present the rationale for why a systematic review of this topic is needed along with a history of what has been done to date and an expectation of what will emerge from the review, especially if quantitative meta-analyses of studies are being considered.

The Methods/Design section needs to describe how articles in the reviews were identified and what criteria were used for justifying inclusion in the review. We encourage reviews that are set up as
so-called "systematic reviews" (as outlined by the Cochrane Review procedure which initiated the process in the medical and health science: **https://www.cochranelibrary.com/about/about-cochrane-reviews**) and this journal aims to lead the way in publishing more quantitative, meta-data driven reviews. The reviews may or may not include meta-analysis.

For reviews using web search engines in their methodology, authors should list point-by-point (1) which search engines were used (Yahoo, Baidu [Chinese], Yandex [Russian], Google) or whether special web crawlers were applied, (2) the date(s) of the last search, (3) list of the databases that were searched (e.g., Web of Science, newspaper archives, Google Scholar, FAO depository [http://www.fao.org/documents/en/], Library bibliographies, archives), (4) mention
the Territory from where the search was executed (because in some countries unrestricted access to internet data is restricted), (5) identify which type of sources you used (double-refereed journal papers, books or chapters in books published by academic publishers, grey literature, mediaeval charters, interviews, etc.), (6) list key words and search strings used in the search, and (7) which time periods were selected.

For reviews not using automated search engines, the procedures are essentially the same but somewhat more cumbersome. Again, authors should list point-by-point (1) which library catalogues were used, (2) the date(s) of the last search, (3) list the Library bibliographies or archive catalogues that were used, (4) identify which type of sources you used (double-refereed journal papers, books or chapters in books published by academic publishers, grey literature, mediaeval charters, interviews, etc.), (5) list key words and search strings used in the search, (6) list the languages in which the searches were executed, and (7) which time periods were selected. ER: Health does not want to exclude reviews that are not based on electronic search machines but strives for transparency and repeatability.

Criteria for including and excluding studies as well as criteria for assessing and assigning quality must be included in the review article. This is especially important if data are to be manipulated and then methods for data manipulation also need to be described. Authors should clearly state what weightings of evidence were used for article inclusion and drawing of conclusions.

The Review Results/Synthesis section presents the findings of the analyses.

The Discussion section highlights the general conclusions, emphasizes novel findings, puts them in context and identifies issues and inferences for future work or policy considerations.

All references should be presented in alphabetical order and should also be bundled in ways that will help the reader to find those that are germane to each of the themes, topics, or issues that the authors have used to organize the review. Such a matrix will be included
as supplementary material. ER: Health has no standardized format for subdividing references by cross-cutting themes, but guidance from editors will be helpful to authors.