

Appendix 1: Methodological Framework (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005)

Through the following stages we will employ a scoping approach to review existing literature, and to examine the extent, range and nature of research activities, to identify research gaps, and to summarise and disseminate research findings:

- 1. Identifying the research question:** starting with wide definitions for study population, interventions or outcomes, to ensure breadth of coverage in the search, and then setting parameters based on the scope and volume of references generated.
 - Levac et al., (2010): maintaining a broad search strategy with clearly defined concepts and their continuous refinement
- 2. Identifying relevant studies:** as comprehensively as possible identifying primary studies (published and unpublished) and reviews suitable for answering the central research question. To achieve this, we adopted a strategy that involved searching for research evidence via different sources.
 - Armstrong et al., (2011): From a practical point of view, decisions have to be made at the outset about the coverage of the review in terms of time span and languages.
- 3. Study selection:** unlike systematic reviews, inclusion and exclusion criteria are developed post hoc, once familiarity with the literature has been gained
 - Daudt et al., (2013); Levac et al., (2010): using multidisciplinary expertise and group consultation within the scoping team to inform and guide the definition of the search criteria and clinical applicability of data for extraction
- 4. Charting the data:** data synthesis and interpretation may adopt a narrative or descriptive approach in place of a more systematic data extraction or analytic method.
 - Armstrong et al., (2011): allowing for post-hoc development of inclusion/exclusion criteria and data synthesis in terms of the value yielded by qualitative or quantitative analysis of results.
- 5. Collating, summarising and reporting the results:** emphasis is not placed on the “weight of evidence” nor on evaluating the quality of evidence, but an analytic or thematic framework to guide the narrative account of existing literature is recommended.
- 6. Consultation exercise:** although this is an optional step, this is recommended as a useful contribution, where “contributors to the consultation provided additional references about potential studies to include in the review as well as valuable insights about issues relating to the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of services that the scoping review alone would not have alerted us to”.
 - Daudt et al., (2013): An additional, parallel element is also described regarding the use of a ‘consultation exercise’ to inform and validate findings from the main scoping review. Whilst consultation might be viewed as an optional component of the scoping study framework, it greatly enhanced our work, a view confirmed by other researchers.