

Protocol

1. Review title

Effective and meaningful engagement of older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies. An integrative literature review.

2. Original language

As above

3. Anticipated or actual start date

1st April 2017

4. Anticipated completion date

31st July 2017

5. Stage of review at time of this submission

Review stage Started

Completed Preliminary searches Yes

Piloting of the study selection process No

Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria No

Data extraction No

Risk of bias (quality) assessment No

Data analysis No

6-14 Demographics

(asks for title, name and organisational affiliation)

Professor Fiona Cowdell, Birmingham City University & Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology,
University of Nottingham

Dr Emily Taylor, Birmingham City University

Mr Michael Sykes, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University

Dr Judith Dyson, University of Hull & Hull York Medical School

Review methods

15. Review question(s) State the question(s) to be addressed / review objectives.

Review question

How can older people most effectively and most meaningfully be engaged in health care intervention design, development or delivery using co-methodologies?

Objectives

- To identify strategies that are effective in engaging older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies
- To identify strategies that are meaningful in engaging older people in health care interventions using co-methodologies

- To inform development of guidance for best practice in engaging older people in future health-related co-methodological working

16. Searches Give details of the sources to be searched, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication period).

Database searching

Databases: CINAHL, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, ASSIA

Search terms: co-design*, codesign*, co-produc*, coproduc*, co-creat*, cocreat*, cometh* or co-meth*, participatory combined with older, elder*, senior*, ageing or aging.

Limiters: English language and published since 2007.

17. URL to search strategy If you have one, give the link to your search strategy here. Alternatively you can e-mail this to PROSPERO and we will store and link to it. I give permission for this file to be made publicly available

18. Condition or domain being studied Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied.

Design, development and delivery of health care interventions

19. Participants/population Give summary criteria for the participants or populations being studied by the review. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion: older people as defined as such by the authors (e.g. older, elder, senior)

Exclusion: children, young people, younger adults, adults in midlife

20. Intervention(s), exposure(s) Give full and clear descriptions of the nature of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed

Inclusion: explicit use of co-methodologies (including co-design, co-production and co-creation) or participatory research, participatory design

Exclusion: literature focusing on engagement, involvement or consultation of service users without specific reference to 'co-' or 'participatory' methodologies

21. Comparator(s)/control Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the main subject/topic of the review will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group).

None

22. Types of study to be included Give details of the study designs to be included in the review. If there are no restrictions on the types of study design eligible for inclusion, this should be stated.

Inclusion: peer-reviewed empirical research of any design and theoretical papers

Exclusion: non-peer-reviewed articles, editorials and discursive (opinion) papers, protocols, theses

23. Context Give summary details of the setting and other relevant characteristics which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

All included studies will be relevant to health care in its broadest sense, for example: primary care, secondary care, the independent sector, community settings. The focus is on healthcare interventions specifically and interventions to improve the environment, housing or circumstances such as social isolation will be excluded.

24. Primary outcome(s) Give the most important outcomes. Give information on timing and effect measures, as appropriate.

a. Effective engagement in co-methodologies – are the aims of using co-methodological processes achieved?

b. Meaningful engagement in co-methodologies – does the engagement of older people have significance or purpose from the perspectives of all involved?

25. Secondary outcomes List any additional outcomes that will be addressed. If there are no secondary outcomes enter None. Give information on timing and effect measures, as appropriate.

None

26 Data extraction (selection and coding) Give the procedure for selecting studies for the review and extracting data, including the number of researchers involved and how discrepancies will be resolved. List the data to be extracted.

- Title review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Abstract review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Full text review by two researchers with discrepancies resolved by discussion and if needed review by a third researcher
- Reference lists of the full texts of the articles retained after screening will be searched for additional relevant articles
- Data extraction divided equally between the four authors
- At each stage we will sample decisions to ensure consistency and agreement between authors

A data extraction spreadsheet will be completed for the empirical studies and a narrative summary will be produced for the theoretical papers.

Data to be extracted from empirical studies:

- Citation details
- Co-methodology used
- Aims: stated aim of study and stated aim of co-methodology
- Theory: co-methodological theory used
- Participants: who involved (all actors – older people, researchers, others) and who led
- Preparation for co-working (e.g. 'co' aspects of set-up, training)
- Co-procedure used, including materials, mode of interaction, where, number of times and duration
- Tailoring of interaction to different participants

- Modification of co-process during use
- Lessons learned from use of co-methodology
- Reviewer assessment of effectiveness at meeting aim of co-methodology – to include consideration of:
 - methodological rigour in terms of how the co-methodology processes and procedures relate to the stated aim for using a co-methodological approach and the claims made on that basis
 - clarity of articulation of what happened in practice including transparency regarding how the co-methods were implemented and adjusted in relationship with all actors involved
 - credibility of the reporting of the nature of interactions and relationships between all actors involved
- Reviewer assessment of meaningfulness of use of co-methodology – to include consideration of:
 - conceptual rigour in terms of the clarity of the co-methodological concept/theoretical perspective
 - authenticity of the representation of the perspectives/experiences of all actors involved in the co-methodological process in regard to its purpose and significance
 - credibility of the reporting of how participants/stakeholders' knowledge/understanding changed as part of the co-methodological process.

27. Risk of bias (quality) assessment State whether and how risk of bias will be assessed, how the quality of individual studies will be assessed, and whether and how this will influence the planned synthesis.

None

28. Strategy for data synthesis Give the planned general approach to be used, for example whether the data to be used will be aggregate or at the level of individual participants, and whether a quantitative or narrative (descriptive) synthesis is planned. Where appropriate a brief outline of analytic approach should be given.

The review will follow the integrative review method, which allows research conducted using a range of methodologies, including non-experimental research, as well as theoretical papers, to be analysed and synthesised (Whittemore and Knafelz 2005). This method integrates conceptual findings rather than aggregating data. The steps we will undertake are:

1. Problem identification
2. Literature search
3. Data evaluation
4. Data analysis
5. Presentation

This systematic approach will be used to summarise the literature reviewed, critically analyse the congruence between the co-design/participation learning and outcomes of different studies, integrate themes across studies, and present new interpretations that develop concepts relating to the principles and best practice in use of co-methodologies.

29. Analysis of subgroups or subsets Give any planned exploration of subgroups or subsets within the review. 'None planned' is a valid response if no subgroup analyses are planned.

None planned

30. Type and method of review Select the type of review and the review method from the drop down list.

Integrative review

31. Language Select the language(s)

English

32. Country

UK

33. Other registration details Give the name of any organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered together with any unique identification number assigned. If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here.

None

34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol Give the citation for the published protocol, if there is one. Give the link to the published protocol, if there is one. This may be to an external site or to a protocol deposited with CRD in pdf format.

35. Dissemination plans Give brief details of plans for communicating essential messages from the review to the appropriate audiences. Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

Peer reviewed publications

University websites

Summary information to independent organisations for older people (for example Age UK)

36. Keywords Give words or phrases that best describe the review. (One word per box, create a new box for each term)

- Integrative review
- Older people
- Co-methodologies
- Participatory design

37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors Give details of earlier versions of the systematic review if an update of an existing review is being registered, including full bibliographic reference if possible.

None

38. Current review status Review status should be updated when the review is completed and when it is published.

Will add later

39. Any additional information Provide any further information the review team consider relevant to the registration of the review.

40. Details of final report/publication(s) This field should be left empty until details of the completed review are available. Give the full citation for the final report or publication of the systematic review. Give the URL where available.