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Plain language summary

Review title

The title should be in headline style summarizing the main findings of the review e.g. ‘Enforcing conditions makes cash transfers more effective in increasing enrolments’ and ‘Detention of asylum seekers has adverse effects on mental health’. The title for empty reviews can state that there is no evidence, e.g. ‘There is no rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of refugee resettlement programs’. Titles can also reflect the size of the effects or the quality of the evidence, e.g. ‘Limited evidence and limited effects of advocacy to reduce intimate partner violence’.

The review in brief

A short summary of the main findings of the review. This section may be no more than one sentence, and should not exceed 50 words. For example, ‘Custodial sentences are no better than non-custodial sentences in reducing re-offending.’ Selective outcome reporting is to be avoided. So reviews with several primary outcomes will require a longer review in brief section, e.g. ‘Intensive advocacy may improve everyday life for women in domestic violence shelters/refuges and reduce physical abuse. There is no clear evidence that intensive advocacy reduces sexual, emotional, or overall abuse, or that it benefits women’s mental health. It is unclear whether brief advocacy is effective.’

What is this review about?

This section should include:

- A ‘problem statement’ of the issue being addressed. For example, ‘Half of all crime takes place in small, localised areas, or hot spots’; and ‘Forests are an important resource for managing climate change because they store carbon, which helps mitigates the effect of carbon emissions. However, the amount of forest cover, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), is declining. Deforestation is responsible for 10-17 per cent of global carbon emissions.’

- A clear description of the intervention being assessed. For example, ‘Payment for environmental services are voluntary contracts to supply a well-defined environmental
service in exchange for payment. For the purposes of this review, the service must involve the maintenance or rehabilitation of natural forests.’

- The outcomes included in the review. For example ‘this review looked at whether custodial and alternative non-custodial sanctions have different effects on the rates of re-offending.’

- Optional: the policy question being addressed. For example, ‘the review considers evidence regarding the debate about whether PESs should also aim to reduce poverty, or whether doing so would undermine conservation efforts.’

---

**What is the aim of this review?**

People do not always understand that the results of a plain language summary come from a systematic review rather than a single study. Some also wrongly assume that the review authors have carried out the studies themselves. A text box should be included on the first page stating what the review studied, and how many studies were included.

For example: This Campbell systematic review examines the effects custodial sentences on re-offending, compared to the effects of non-custodial sentences. The review summarizes evidence from fourteen high-quality studies, including three randomized controlled trials and two natural experiments.

---

**What are the main findings of this review?**

First sub-heading: ‘what studies are included?’
A brief description of the number of included studies and key characteristics (e.g. study design and region or country). For example, ‘This review includes studies that evaluate the effects of custodial and non-custodial sanctions on re-offending. A total of 38 studies were identified. However, only 14 of these were assessed to be of sufficient methodological quality to be included in the final analysis. The studies spanned the period from 1961 to 2013 and were mostly carried out in the USA, Europe and Australia.’

Optional: add a statement about the quality of the evidence. For example, ‘the studies all had some important methodological weaknesses. None of the included studies used experimental designs (random assignment).’

Additional sub-headings state the question being answered in that section, for example, ‘Does focusing crime prevention efforts on crime hot spots reduce crime?’ and ‘What factors affect how well PES programmes work?’.

These sub-sections give a short summary of the review evidence to answer that question. Present the results consistently, using similar words and expressions for similar levels of effect (see Appendix 1 for suggested wordings). Ensure that the results are reported consistently between the plain language summary and the main text of the review, including the abstract, results, and summary of main results. For example, ‘Yes. There is an overall reduction in crime and disorder when hot spots policing interventions are implemented. The
largest reductions are in drug offences, violent crime and disorder offences, with smaller reductions in property crime.’

Notes:
(1) The findings are presently directly, and in the present tense. So do not write ‘the authors found’ or ‘the review found’.
(2) Avoid selective reporting. The results for each main outcome must be presented in the section called “What are the main findings?” (or a variation specific to the review such as ‘Does focusing crime prevention efforts on crime hot spots reduce crime?’). If you found no data on an important outcome, you must present the outcome anyway, but explain that no data were found.

Using qualitative statements when presenting the effects of the intervention: You may be able to increase the accessibility of the review by avoiding numbers and using qualitative statements to present the results. By ‘qualitative statements’ we mean an expression of your results in plain language, using similar words and expressions for similar levels of effect. Qualitative statements about effect are difficult to get right. It is easy to cause confusion and misinterpretation by using words inconsistently or statements such as “a high likelihood of somewhat small but possibly important effects”.

Optional sub-heading: How has this intervention worked?
Present here the evidence relating to the main assumptions and links in the theory of change for the intervention(s) being assessed. The findings with respect to intermediate outcomes can be reported here.

What do the findings of this review mean?

Include here the main policy relevant findings and their implications for policy and further research. Reviews do not make policy recommendations. Include also implications for research.

How up-to-date is this review?

State here when the review authors searched for the included studies: ‘The review authors searched for studies up to 2015. This Campbell Systematic Review was published in January 2017.’
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- Studies excluded, with reason of not being an empirical study of kinship care (n = 4528)
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Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.05; Chi² = 12.68, df = 4 (P = 0.01); I² = 68%

Test for overall effect: Z = 3.48 (P = 0.0005)
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