

JBI SCOPING REVIEW WORKSHOP

Workbook



JBI SCOPING REVIEW WORKSHOP

WORKBOOK

Published by JBI. Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

© JBI 2023

This Publication is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process or placed in computer memory without written permission. All Enquiries should be made to JBI.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
Activity 1: Different Systematic Review Types	5
Activity 2: Reasons for Conducting a Scoping Review.....	7
Activity 3: Question Development.....	8
Activity 4: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria.....	9
Activity 5: Logic grid development	10
Activity 6: analysis and presentation.....	11
Multiple Choice Quiz:	12
Notes	14
Notes	15
Notes	16

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the JBI Scoping Reviews Workshop. This workshop is designed for clinicians, public health professionals, academics, researchers, students and others interested in learning how to conduct a scoping review.

Workshop Objectives

The workshop aims to enable participants to explore the theories and concepts relating to scoping reviews and other types of evidence synthesis. Additionally, we aim to equip participants with the knowledge and tools they need to successfully plan for and undertake a scoping review following the JBI approach.

The objectives are to:

1. Describe different types of evidence synthesis approaches and their relation to evidence-based healthcare;
2. Determine when a scoping review is the most appropriate approach for evidence synthesis;
3. Define and implement the key steps in the conduct of a scoping review;
4. Be able to prepare a scoping review protocol and report that adhere to JBI guidance and PRISMA-ScR.

ACTIVITY 1: DIFFERENT SYSTEMATIC REVIEW TYPES

Refer to table 1 below to determine the most suited review type to answer the following four questions on page 6 of your workbook.

Table 1: Types of Systematic Reviews

Review Type	Aim	Question Format
Effectiveness	To evaluate the effectiveness of a certain treatment/practice in terms of its impact on outcomes.	Population, Intervention, Comparator/s, Outcomes (PICO)
Experiential (Qualitative)	To investigate the experience or meaningfulness of a particular phenomenon.	Population, Phenomena of Interest, Context (PiCo)
Costs/Economic Evaluation	To determine the costs associated with a particular approach/treatment strategy, particularly in terms of cost effectiveness or benefit.	Population, Intervention, Comparator/s, Outcomes, Context (PICOC)
Prevalence and/or Incidence	To determine the prevalence and/or incidence of a certain condition.	Condition, Context, Population (CoCoPop)
Diagnostic Test Accuracy	To determine how well a diagnostic test works in terms of its sensitivity and specificity for a particular diagnosis.	Population, Index Test, Reference Test, Diagnosis of Interest (PIRD)
Etiology and/or Risk	To determine the association between particular exposures/risk factors and outcomes.	Population, Exposure, Outcome (PEO)
Textual Evidence	To review and synthesize current expert opinion, text or policy on a certain phenomena.	Population, Intervention or Phenomena of Interest, Context (PiCo)
Measurement properties	To evaluate the psychometric properties of a certain test, normally to determine the reliability and validity of a particular test or assessment.	Population (P), Type of measurement instrument (I), Construct of interest or the name of the measurement instrument(s) (C), Outcomes (Measurement properties)(O)
Prognostic	To determine the overall prognosis for a condition, the link between specific prognostic factors and an outcome and/or prognostic/prediction models and prognostic tests.	Population, Prognostic Factors (or models of interest), Outcome (PFO)
Methodology	To examine and investigate current research methods and potentially their impact on research quality.	Types of Studies, Types of Data, Types of Methods, Outcomes (SDMO)
Mixed methods	To provide a more complete basis than single method synthesis of reviews.	PICO and/or PiCo
Umbrella/overview	To incorporate all types of syntheses of research evidence including systematic reviews in their various forms and meta-analyses.	PICO and/or PiCo and/or PIRD and/or CoCoPop and/or PEO

Table adapted from: Munn, Z., Stern, C., Aromataris, E. *et al.* What kind of systematic review should I conduct? A proposed typology and guidance for systematic reviewers in the medical and health sciences. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 18, 5 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-017-0468-4>

1. Which interventions are effective for reducing pain in older people with rheumatoid arthritis?

2. What risk factors are associated with stillbirth?

3. What are the experiences of patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers regarding adherence to diabetes treatment?

4. What are the costs and outcomes of telemedicine interventions used in the primary care settings?

ACTIVITY 2: REASONS FOR CONDUCTING A SCOPING REVIEW

JBIR has classified six broad indications for conducting a scoping review. They are:

1. To identify the types of available evidence in a given field
2. To clarify key concepts and definitions
3. To examine how research is conducted on a certain topic
4. To identify key characteristics or factors related to a concept
5. A precursor to a systematic review
6. To identify and analyze knowledge gaps

Match the reason (one or more) with the following four scenarios.

1. A scoping review was commissioned by the EU to chart 25 years of development of mental healthcare for people with severe mental illnesses in central and eastern Europe.

2. Researchers aim to describe and define the concepts of communication, partnership and health promotion in patient-centred care models in aged care settings.

3. Government organisations are looking to fund further knowledge synthesis into COVID-19 treatment interventions, but first want to assess if there is enough evidence.

4. A large health insurance company wants to commission a scoping review to assist in the development of a patient-centred framework, and as a starting point, wants to examine the characteristics of other patient-centred frameworks in the literature.

ACTIVITY 3: QUESTION DEVELOPMENT

Using the PCC framework as a guide and the prompts below, work on developing your scoping review question/s. Please note, not all scoping review questions will contain all elements of the framework. Be prepared to discuss with your group.

Population (P): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who is the target population for your question? Consider gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic class, age etc. 	Click or tap here to enter text.
Concept (C): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The core concept may include details that pertain to elements that would be detailed in a standard systematic review such as the “interventions” and/or “phenomena of interest” Outcomes may also be a component of a scoping review’s “Concept” 	Click or tap here to enter text.
Context (C): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What kind of social context will your review focus on? E.g. cultural factors (geographic, racial, gender) and setting (the clinic, community, hospital, school, aged care facility) 	Click or tap here to enter text.

My scoping review question/s:

Click or tap here to enter text.

ACTIVITY 4: INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA

Work on developing the inclusion/exclusion criteria for your scoping review, remembering they should align with the review question/s and the PCC framework. Be prepared to discuss with your group.

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Participants	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Context	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Concept	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Sources of evidence	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Time frame	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

ACTIVITY 5: LOGIC GRID DEVELOPMENT

Using your review question/s and inclusion/exclusion criteria, develop a logic grid.

Review question/s:		
Population (Who?)	Concept (What?)	Context (Where?)

What databases will you search?

How or will you search gray literature?

ACTIVITY 6: ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

Scan the paper by Davies et al. 2022 provided to you. Answer the questions below and discuss them with group.

- How did the authors analyze and present data?
- What was the approach for analyzing the reasons for patient journey mapping in the literature? Inductive or deductive? How did you understand which approach was applied?
- Do the results address the research questions?

MULTIPLE CHOICE QUIZ:

Which synthesis approach is best suited to produce statements to guide decision-making?

- ☐ Scoping review
- ☐ Systematic review
- ☐ Literature review

In relation to searching for evidence, sensitivity refers to:

- ☐ The ability to identify all relevant studies
- ☐ The ability to exclude all relevant studies
- ☐ The ability to exclude irrelevant studies
- ☐ The ability to identify all irrelevant studies

JBIR recommends following a three-phase process when searching for evidence. It includes:

- ☐ Initial search of all databases/sources to identify relevant terms; review of reference list of included studies; search of google scholar
- ☐ Initial search of a few databases to identify relevant terms; customising and applying terms across at least 5 different databases/sources and review of reference list of all studies assessed at title and abstract stage
- ☐ Initial search of a few databases to identify relevant terms; customising and applying terms across different databases/sources and review of reference list of included studies
- ☐ Initial search of PubMed to identify relevant terms; customising and applying terms across different databases/sources and review of reference list of all studies which have been critically appraised

Ideally, how many people should be involved in extracting the evidence?

- ☐ Only one person is needed once the extraction form has been agreed on by the review team
- ☐ Every member of the review team should always be involved in extraction
- ☐ At least two people should be involved in extraction and this should be done independently
- ☐ Three members of the review team should be involved in extraction and they should undertake each extraction together

JBIR recommends the following regarding the analysis of data included in a scoping review:

- ☐ A thematic synthesis is appropriate
- ☐ A qualitative content analysis is appropriate
- ☐ A JBIR meta-aggregation is appropriate
- ☐ All data should only be presented narratively

Following an inductive approach to analysis means:

- ☐ Using an existing framework/theory for the analysis

- ☐ Using PRISMA-ScR to guide analysis
- ☐ Modifying an existing framework/theory for the analysis
- ☐ Developing your own framework/theory during analysis

A JBI review requires an *apriori* protocol?

- ☐ Yes, in all instances
- ☐ Depends on the topic and if the authors want to publish the review
- ☐ No, not required

Is it acceptable for a scoping review to deviate from the protocol?

- ☐ No, the review should follow exactly what is written in the protocol
- ☐ Yes, it is acceptable however any deviation needs to be clearly detailed in the review
- ☐ Yes, but it depends where you plan to publish your review in regards to if you need to detail the deviations

What kind of evidence might a scoping review include?

- ☐ Quantitative evidence
- ☐ Qualitative evidence
- ☐ Systematic reviews
- ☐ All of the above

Which of the following is an indication for conducting a scoping review?

- ☐ To determine the effectiveness of a drug
- ☐ To examine how research has been conducted in a particular field
- ☐ To uncover the sorts of experiences patients have had regarding a specific care intervention
- ☐ To understand the impact that a particular condition has upon patients' daily lives

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES