

1. Goodman, C.S. HTA 101: introduction to health care technology assessment. Bethesda, MD:National Library of Medicine. National Information Center on Health Services Research & Health Care Technology; 2004. Available: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/nichsr/hta101/ta101_c1.html.
2. Higgins JPT, Green S (ed). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 updated March 2011. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from <http://www.cochrane-handbook.org>.
3. Porta M (ed). Dictionary of Epidemiology. Fifth edition. Oxford University Press: International Epidemiological Association, 2008.
4. Elshaug AG, Hiller JE, Tunis SR, Moss JR. Challenges in Australian policy processes for disinvestment from existing, ineffective health care practices. Australia and New Zealand Health Policy 2007;4(1).
5. Noseworthy T & Clement F. Health technology reassessment: scope, methodology, & language. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, 28:3 (2012), 201-202.
6. Antman EM, Lau J, Kupelnick B, Mosteller F, Chalmers TC. A comparison of results of meta-analyses of randomized control trials and recommendations of clinical experts: Treatments for myocardial infarction. JAMA 1992; 268: 240-248.
7. Glass GV. Primary, secondary and meta-analysis of research. Educational Researcher 1976; 5: 3-8.
8. Oxman AD, Guyatt GH. The science of reviewing research. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1993; 703: 125-133
9. Booth A. The literature review: its role within research. Chapter1. In: Booth A. Papaioannou D, Sutton A. Systematic approaches to a successful literature review. London: SAGE Publications; 2012.
10. Cook D.J., Mulrow C.D., Haynes R.B. Systematic reviews: synthesis of best evidence for clinical decisions. Ann Intern Med 1997;126:376-380. Available: <http://annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=710356>
11. Oxman A.D., Guyatt G.H. Guidelines for reading literature reviews. CMAJ 1988;138:697-703. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1267776/>
12. Reitz J.M. Literature review. ODLIS: Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science. Santa Barbara (CA): ABC-CLIO; 2014. Available: http://www.abc-clio.com/ODLIS/odlis_1.aspx
13. Merlin T, Tamblyn D, Ellery B and the INAHTA Quality Assurance Group. What's in a name? - Results of a survey to map the different HTA products of the International Network of Agencies for Health Technology Assessment (INAHTA). International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, 2014; 30(4): 1-8.
14. The National Board of Health, Danish Centre for Evaluation and Health Technology Assessment. Introduction to mini-HTA - a management and decision support tool for the hospital service. Copenhagen, 2005. Available at: <http://www.sst.dk/>
15. Freedman B. Equipoise and the ethics of clinical research. N Eng J Med. 1987;317(3):141-145.
16. Rodrigues HC, van den Berg PP. Randomized controlled trials of maternal-fetal surgery: a challenge to clinical equipoise. Bioethics. 28(8): 405-413.
18. Single A, et al., compilers. HTAi consumer and patient glossary: a beginner's guide to words used in health technology assessment. Version 1. (Edmonton (AB)): Health Technology Assessment international (HTAi); 2009. Available: http://www.htai.org/fileadmin/HTAi_Files/ISG/PatientInvolvement/Glossary/HTAiPatientAndConsumerGlossaryOctober2009_01.pdf
19. Verhagen AP, de Vet HC, de Bie RA, Boers M, van den Brandt PA. The art of quality assessment of RCTs included in systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol. 2001;54(7):651-4.
20. Lundh A, Gotsche PC. Recommendations by Cochrane Review Groups for assessment of the risk of bias in studies. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2008;8:22. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2375895/>
21. Adapted from A Dictionary of Statistical Terms, 5th edition, prepared for the International Statistical Institute by F.H.C. Marriott. Published for the International Statistical Institute by Longman Scientific and Technical, 1990.
22. D.L. Sackett et al., "Evidence-based Medicine: What It Is and What It Isn't" (Editorial), British Medical Journal 312, no. 7023 (1996): 71-72.
23. Klemp M, Frønsdal KB, Facey K. What principles should govern the use of managed entry

- agreements? *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2011 Jan;27(1):77-83.
24. Versi E. "Gold standard" is an appropriate term. *BMJ*. 1992 Jul 18;205(6846):187
 25. Claasen JAHR. The gold standard: not a golden standard. *BMJ*. 2005 May 14;330(7500):1121
 26. Bossuyt PM, Leflang MM. Chapter 6: Developing Criteria for Including Studies. In: *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Diagnostic Test Accuracy*. Version 0.4 updated September 2008. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2008
 27. Glossary of terms relevant for Cochrane Reviews
<http://community-archive.cochrane.org/glossary/5#letterm>
 28. Chaudoir SR, Dugan AG, Barr CHI. Measuring factors affecting implementation of health innovations: a systematic review of structural, organizational, provider, patient, and innovation level measures. *Implementation Science* 2013;8(22). doi:10.1186/1748-5908-8-22.
 29. Rye CB, Kimberly JR. The adoption of innovations by provider organizations in health care. *Medical Care Research and Review* 2007;64(3):235-278.
 33. Deeks JJ. Systematic reviews of evaluations of diagnostic and screening tests. In: Egger M, Davey Smith G, Altman DG, editors. *Systematic reviews in health care: meta-analysis in context*. 2nd ed. London: BMJ Books; 2001. p. 248-82.
 34. Porta M (ed). *A Dictionary of Epidemiology*. Sixth edition. A Handbook for the International Epidemiological Association. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014
 35. Badenoch D, Heneghan C, Nunan D, Spencer EA, editors. *Catalogue of bias*. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford. Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine; 2018. Available: <https://catalogofbias.org/>
 36. Makady A, de Boer A, Hillege H, Klungel O & Goettsch W, 2017. What Is Real-World Data? A Review of Definitions Based on Literature and Stakeholder Interviews. *Value Health* 20(7): 858-865.
 37. A Shiell, C Donaldson, C Mitton, G Currie. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 2002 Volume 56, Issue 2, 85-88
 38. O'Rourke B, Oortwijn W, Schuller T. The new definition of health technology assessment: a milestone in international collaboration. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2020; 1-4. doi: 10.1017/S0266462320000215.
 39. Definition developed and agreed by INAHTA, HTAi, HTA Glossary English Editorial Board, EUnetHTA, ISPOR, RedETSA, HTAsiaLink
 40. <https://journalofbigdata.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40537-019-0217-0>
 41. <https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/complex-interventions-guidance/>
 42. <http://WHO guideline Recommendations on Digital Interventions for Health System Strengthening>
 43. Shaw T, McGregor D, Brunner M, Keep M, Janssen A, Barnet S. *What is eHealth (6)? Development of a conceptual model for eHealth: qualitative study with key informants*. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2017;19(10):e324.
 44. https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB142/B142_20-en.pdf?ua=1
 45. Moshi MR, Toohar R, Merlin T (2020). *Development of a health technology assessment module for evaluating mobile medical applications*. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 36, 252-261. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462320000288>