

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Record Nr. | UNINA9910789370203321 |
| Titolo | Review of NASA's Evidence reports on human health risks : 2013 letter report // Carol E. H. Scott-Corner [and three others], editors ; committee to review NASA's evidence reports on human health risks board on health sciences policy |
| Pubbl/distr/stampa | Washington, District of Columbia : , : National Academies Press, , 2014 ©2014 |
| ISBN | 0-309-29655-2 0-309-29653-6 |
| Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (62 p.) |
| Disciplina | 616.980214 |
| Soggetti | Space medicine - Standards - United States Evidence-based medicine - United States - Methodology |
| Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| Note generali | Description based upon print version of record. |
| Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references. |
| Nota di contenuto | ""Front Matter""; ""Reviewers""; ""Contents""; ""Review of NASA's evidence reports on human health risks: 2013 letter report.""; ""References""; ""Appendix A: Meeting Agendas""; ""Appendix B: Committee Biosketches"" |
| Sommario/riassunto | "Review of NASA's Evidence Reports on Human Health Risks: 2013 Letter Report is the first in a series of five reports from the Institute of Medicine that will independently review more than 30 evidence reports that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has compiled on human health risks for long-duration and exploration space flights. This report builds on the 2008 IOM report Review of NASA's Human Research Program Evidence Books: A Letter Report, which provided an initial and brief review of the evidence reports. This letter report reviews three evidence reports and examines the quality of the evidence, analysis, and overall construction of each report; identifies existing gaps in report content; and provides suggestions for additional sources of expert input. The report analyzes each evidence report's overall quality, which included readability; internal consistency; the source and breadth of cited evidence; identification of existing |

knowledge and research gaps; authorship expertise; and, if applicable, response to recommendations from the 2008 IOM letter report."--
Publisher's description.
