



Intervention Now To Eliminate Repeat Unintended Pregnancy in Teenagers (INTERUPT): A systematic review protocol for intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, qualitative and realist synthesis of implementation factors and user engagement.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004733
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Jan-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Whitaker, Rhiannon; Bangor University, North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health Hendry, Maragret; Bangor University, North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research Booth, Andrew; Sheffield University, School of Health and Related Research Carter, Ben; Cardiff University, Institute of Primary Care and Public Health Charles, Joanna; Bangor University, Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation Craine, Noel; National Public Health Service for Wales, Edwards, Rhiannon; Bangor University, Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation Lyons, Marion; National Public Health Service for Wales, Noyes, Jane; Bangor University, Centre for Health Related Research Pasterfield, Diana; Bangor University, North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research Rycroft-Malone, Jo; Bangor University, School of Healthcare Sciences Williams, Nefyn; Bangor University, North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Sexual health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	REPRODUCTIVE MEDICINE, Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intervention Now To Eliminate Repeat Unintended Pregnancy in Teenagers (INTERUPT): A systematic review of intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, qualitative and realist synthesis of implementation factors and user engagement.

Corresponding author:

Rh. Whitaker
Associate Director (Scientific)
North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
Y Wern
Normal Site
Holyhead Road
Bangor University
Bangor
Gwynedd
UK
LL57 2PZ

Email: r.whitaker@bangor.ac.uk

Tel: 01248 382597

Co-authors:

M. Hendry
North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
Bangor University
Wrexham
UK

A. Booth
School of Health and Related Research
University of Sheffield
Sheffield
UK

B. Carter
Institute of Primary Care and Public Health
Cardiff University School of Medicine
Cardiff
UK

J. Charles
Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
Bangor University
Bangor
UK

N. Craine
National Public Health Service for Wales
Wales

1 R.T. Edwards
2 Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
3 Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
4 Bangor University
5 Bangor
6 UK
7

8 M.Lyons
9 National Public Health Service for Wales
10 Wales
11

12 J.Noyes
13 Centre for Health Related Research
14 School of Healthcare Sciences
15 Bangor University
16 Bangor
17 UK
18

19 D.Pasterfield
20 North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
21 Bangor University
22 Wrexham
23 UK
24

25 J.Rycroft-Malone
26 Centre for Health Related Research
27 School of Healthcare Sciences
28 Fron Heulog
29 Bangor University
30 Bangor
31 UK
32

33 N. Williams
34 North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
35 Bangor University
36 Bangor
37 UK
38

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords (up to 5 keywords or phrases suitable for use in an index (recommended to use MeSH terms))

Pregnancy in adolescence. Prevention. Public Health. Sexual health interventions. Teenage conceptions

Word count: excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables) 4855

Abstract**Background**

The United Kingdom has the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe, a fifth are repeat pregnancies. Unintended conceptions can do emotional, psychological and educational harm to teenage girls, often with enduring implications for their life chances. Babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and increased risk of poverty, educational under-achievement and unemployment later in life, with associated societal costs.

Methods

We will conduct a streamed, mixed-methods systematic review to find and evaluate interventions designed to reduce repeat unintended teen pregnancies.

Our aims are to identify:

- Who is at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies?
- Which interventions are effective, cost-effective, how they work, in what setting, and for whom?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to intervention uptake?

Traditional electronic database searches will be augmented by targeted searches for evidence “clusters” and guided by an advisory group of experts and stakeholders.

To address the topic’s inherent complexities we will use a highly structured, innovative and iterative approach combining methodological techniques tailored to each stream of evidence. Quantitative data will be synthesised with reference to Cochrane guidelines for public health interventions. Qualitative evidence addressing facilitators and barriers to the uptake of interventions, experience, and acceptability of interventions will be synthesised thematically. We will apply the principles of realist synthesis to uncover theories and mechanisms underpinning interventions. We will conduct an integration and overarching narrative of findings authenticated by client group feedback.

Ethics and dissemination

We will publish the complete review in “Health Technologies Assessment” and sections in more specialist peer reviewed journals. It will be presented at national and international conferences in the fields of public health, reproductive medicine and review methodology. Findings will be fed back to service users and practitioners via workshops run by the partner collaborators.

Protocol Registration PROSPERO CRD42012003168

INTRODUCTION

Background

Despite data from the United Kingdom that are consistent with a gradual decline in teenage conception rates, the UK continues to have the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe.^{1,2} Teenage pregnancies are a target within the *England Teenage Pregnancy Strategy* and their equivalents within the devolved governments of the UK.³⁻⁶ Teenage pregnancies have considerable impacts on the individual wellbeing of teenage parents and their children. Inherent within the national strategy responses, and a range of other national policy documents addressing this issue, is the recognition that babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and a significantly increased risk of living in poverty, achieving less at school and being unemployed later in life⁷ with substantial costs to society.

Repeat pregnancies represent a considerable proportion of the overall rate; one fifth of births amongst under 18s are repeat pregnancies⁸ and are thus a crucial potential focus for intervention. Around three quarters of teenage pregnancies are unplanned with up to one half resulting in abortion.³ Within the UK teenage pregnancy is strongly associated with social disadvantage. The social predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy are varied and have been previously usefully grouped into predictors operating at individual, couple, family, community and social level.⁹ These predictors share much common ground with those of first teenage pregnancy.

Aims of the review

The overall aims are to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions for preventing repeat unintended pregnancies amongst adolescents, and to investigate the barriers and facilitators for their implementation and uptake. Whilst these overall aims are broad, the focus will be on the *implementation* of interventions; specific research objectives are to determine:


- What factors characterise subgroups who are at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies (i.e. what are the predictors of repeat unintended pregnancy)?
- Which (elements of) interventions appear to be effective, how do they work, in what setting, and for whom (conversely, why are they ineffective, why don't they work)?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to the acceptability, uptake, and implementation of interventions?
- What is the relative cost-effectiveness of interventions?

METHODS

Overall plan of research

Initial scoping searches informed a tailored, 4-phase approach to the review (**Figure 1**). For the overall framework of the mixed method review we will draw upon the structured, phased, EPPI-Centre approach,¹⁰ and use their reviews of young people, pregnancy and social exclusion, and the barriers to and facilitators of children's healthy eating as methodological exemplars.^{10,11} After conducting extensive literature searches, screening the evidence against explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria and appraising study quality, a mapping exercise is undertaken to organise and describe the evidence so as to give a clear picture of the body of research. From this, the scope of the review can be refined in order to focus in depth on the most important areas of the topic in question. Our research will be guided by an expert panel whom we will engage with via a regular agenda item on the quarterly meeting of the Teenage Conceptions Task and Finish group, and we will present our findings for feedback and discussion to a group of young people who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood.

Figure 1 Overview of review methods



PHASE 1: IDENTIFYING THE LITERATURE, QUALITY APPRAISAL AND MAPPING THE EVIDENCE.

Search strategies

Principal searches

We will search the following electronic databases for published literature using strategies that combine thesaurus terms and keywords relating to pregnancy, termination of pregnancy or parenthood with adolescence and text word synonyms for repeat or subsequent: Medline & Medline in Process, PsycInfo, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health Literature), The Cochrane Library (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, the Health Technology Assessment Database, NHS Economic Evaluation Database), EMBASE (The Excerpta Medica database), BNI (British Nursing Index), ERIC (Educational Resource Index and Abstracts), SocAbs (Sociological Abstracts), ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Abstract & Indexes), BiblioMap (The EPPI-Centre register of health promotion and public health research), and the Social Sciences Citation Index. We will use a search strategy developed and piloted in Medline (Appendix 1) and subsequently modified for use in the remaining databases (full details available from the authors).

Supplementary searches

Further modified versions of the same strategy will be used to search the following databases for “grey” literature: OpenGrey, Scopus, Scirus, Social Care Online, National Research Register, NIHR portfolio database, and Index to theses. Similarly, to capture economics studies, we will search RePEc (Research Papers in Economics) and EconLit. We will apply an alternative search strategy specifically designed to capture the type of descriptive titles that are common in qualitative studies to selected databases: SocAbs, ASSIA, BNI and the Social Sciences Citation Index. This strategy will combine additional synonyms for “pregnancy”, “adolescence” and “repeat” with a brief qualitative filter comprising three broad free-text terms, “qualitative”, “findings” and “interview\$” that has been shown to be as effective as a more complex one.^{12 13}

Since the issues surrounding implementation of interventions are a primary focus of this review, qualitative and process evaluation evidence associated with trials is highly relevant – particularly to better understanding the facilitators and barriers to implementation.¹⁴ Therefore a key feature of our search strategy will be to identify “evidence clusters” related to key randomised controlled trials; we will use search engines such as Google and Google Scholar, conduct citation searches and contact Principal Investigators to ascertain whether a qualitative/ views study or process evaluation was conducted, as this data is sometimes published separately or not published at all.

We will be further guided by our expert panel, some of whom have frequent contact with young women who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood; they will inform the direction of our searches by identifying interventions which they may have experienced and giving us feedback. This will help identify areas where evidence is lacking and supplementary searches may be necessary. Additional sources will include the bibliographies of included papers. If necessary we will also hand-search key journals such as the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, the Journal of Adolescent Health, Contraception, the Journal of Adolescence and Health Care, the Journal of Paediatric and Adolescent Gynaecology, Adolescence, Maternal and Child Health Journal

1
2
3 and the Journal of Reproductive Medicine, and make personal contact with professional networks
4 such as the Family Planning Association, reproductive health nursing networks, General
5 Practitioners' fora etc. to identify Department of Health and third sector policy documents and
6 evaluations. Finally we will circulate a list of included studies to key stakeholders and researchers in
7 the field and ask them if they are aware of any important omissions.
8
9

10
11 A number of systematic reviews related to teenage pregnancy have been published in the last two
12 decades. The earliest we found in our scoping search was dated 1997.¹⁵ Therefore we will limit our
13 searches to 1995 onwards but we will conduct a separate search excluding the terms for second or
14 subsequent pregnancies but including a filter for systematic reviews as a means of capturing
15 relevant data from earlier studies.
16

17
18 References will be managed by using bibliographic reference management software (Endnote). Two
19 reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts to identify potentially relevant documents,
20 which will be retrieved and assessed according to the inclusion criteria below. Disagreements will be
21 resolved by discussion or, if necessary, by a third reviewer.
22
23

24 **Study eligibility**

25 **Study type:** Our search strategy will capture published studies of any design including trials of
26 interventions, effectiveness studies; interrupted time series studies (ITS), cost-effectiveness studies,
27 process evaluations, surveys and qualitative studies of participants' views and experiences of
28 interventions. We will also consider relevant grey literature of any type, such as unpublished
29 reports, service evaluations and theses.
30
31

32
33 **Population:** The population of interest is young women, who are aged up to and including 19 years
34 and have had at least one unintended pregnancy, whether the outcome was termination,
35 miscarriage or delivery. Where study populations are mixed, we will include all studies whose
36 reported population comprised at least 75% young women in our target age group.¹⁶
37
38

39
40 **Intervention:** We will include studies of any intervention designed to reduce repeat unintended
41 pregnancies (also referred to as "birth-spacing" or "pregnancy-spacing") in these young women,
42 delivered in any educational, healthcare or community setting. Interventions may have single or
43 multiple components, and could be delivered to individuals or communities. We will also include
44 studies designed to identify risk factors or subgroups at increased risk of repeat unintended
45 pregnancy, where there may be no actual intervention.
46
47

48
49 We will include studies that identify barriers and facilitators to the implementation and uptake of
50 interventions, and explore the views of intervention recipients or providers or health professionals,
51 particularly with regard to whether the intervention was implemented and worked in the way
52 intended. We will look for studies that help us identify programme theories and logic – and we will
53 look for, and develop, candidate theories as to why some young women have more than one
54 unplanned pregnancy, and which could begin to explain the relative success or failure of particular
55 interventions.
56
57
58
59
60

Comparator: Comparators could be no intervention, standard practice, or another intervention. Comparators are likely to be location-specific and standard care in one setting may be seen as an intervention in another setting.

Outcomes

We will report on the primary and secondary outcomes below. Outcomes will be addressed by a range of evidence types and analytical techniques (see Figure 1).

Primary outcomes:

- Identification of at risk groups
- Identification of barriers and facilitators of interventions relating to:
 - acceptability
 - uptake
 - feasibility of implementation
- Views and experiences of young women, families and professionals
 - Conceptualisation of repeat teenage pregnancy rates as an issue
 - Effectiveness of interventions
 - Uptake of interventions
 - Change in repeat pregnancy rates

Other outcomes:

- Identification of, access to and uptake of reproductive services and social care
- Feasibility of widespread adoption of interventions in health and social care
- Cost of interventions
- Effectiveness of interventions:
 - Change in validated quality of life indices
 - Change in rate of abortion
- Cost-effectiveness of interventions

Study exclusion criteria

We will include published studies from any country as, although there may be different cultural and social attitudes towards teenage pregnancy, they may have a bearing on minority populations within the UK. If any major studies (e.g. randomised controlled trials) are found in non-English language publications we will attempt translation. We will limit our searches for unpublished material to the UK to enhance the direct applicability of the results to the NHS and UK public health bodies. We will not exclude studies on the basis of quality, but will incorporate judgements about study quality when interpreting the evidence.

Quality appraisal

RCTs and quasi-RCTs will be assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias (RoB);¹² we will categorise and report the overall risk of bias of each of the included trials:

- Low risk of bias (plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter the results) if all criteria were met;
- Unclear risk of bias (plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results) if one or more criteria were assessed as unclear; or

- High risk of bias (plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results) if one or more criteria were not met

The Cochrane RoB tool will be supplemented by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for mixed studies reviews.¹⁷ This tool has the advantage of incorporating the appraisal of several different study designs (qualitative, RCT, non-RCT, observational, mixed methods) using a single tool with a coherent range of quality criteria. Piloting suggests the MMAT is an efficient and reliable tool, however it does not cover economic evaluations so we will also use the Drummond checklist¹⁸ and the Phillips checklist¹⁹ recommended for economic studies and economic models respectively.²⁰ Where the evidence comprises, for example, policy documents or reports of locally implemented initiatives, it is unlikely that we will be able to formally assess quality. We will therefore take a broad view of the evidence as being most relevant for the context and be guided by the advisory group as to its merit.

Certainty of evidence

We will use GRADE, as the accepted approach to assessing the certainty of findings of reviews of effectiveness²¹ but, since GRADE is not suitable for appraising the certainty of qualitative evidence, will also use a recently developed method, CerQual (certainty of the quality of evidence).²² The CerQual approach is based on the methodological limitations of individual studies contributing to the review finding, in this case indicated by the MMAT tool, combined with the coherence of each review finding. Coherence is assessed by the extent to which a clear pattern is identifiable across the individual study data, and is strengthened where findings are consistent across multiple contexts or where variation across individual studies is explained, especially where studies contributing to the finding are drawn from a wide range of settings. CerQual is similar to GRADE in that both approaches aim to assess the *certainty* of (or confidence in) the evidence and both rate this certainty for each finding across studies rather than for each individual study. GRADE also bases its assessment on a combination of the quality of the evidence and other factors, including consistency across studies.

Mapping the evidence

We will undertake a mapping exercise following EPPI-Centre methods.¹⁰ We will assign codes to records using lists that we will develop of pre-defined keywords to aid the sorting and grouping of documents for mapping and synthesis. Keywords will be related to, for example: the study design or type of record (intervention study, process evaluation, qualitative study, report etc.), the country and health, educational or community setting in which the study took place, the topic or focus of the study/report, the population focus of the study/report and study design. From the coding exercise we will develop a descriptive map of the literature and identify gaps in the research. The map will also provide a context for interpreting the results of the synthesis and a basis for refining the scope of the review i.e. it will aid the advisory group in identifying areas for in-depth focus and, possibly, areas where additional searches need to be conducted. The advisory group will meet with the review group late in phase 1 to discuss the results of the mapping exercise and to ratify or recommend refinements to that work which would be needed prior to the completion of Phase 2 where the evidence will be selected and prioritised for in depth review.

PHASE 2: SELECTING AND PRIORITISING THE EVIDENCE FOR IN DEPTH REVIEW AND DATA-EXTRACTION

Study selection

The review team, with advice from the advisory group obtained during the mapping exercise, will prioritise the evidence for in-depth review. Beginning with evidence relating to primary outcomes, and within each grouped set of data we will prioritise the best quality evidence of most relevance to address the research questions. We will be particularly interested in “evidence clusters”, i.e. trials of interventions accompanied by qualitative studies, process evaluations, reports etc.; “sibling” studies, i.e. trials of interventions paired with qualitative studies using the same participants, and “orphan” studies where effectiveness studies and views studies relate to similar interventions and populations (and so can inform each other) although the actual participants are different. These studies have the potential to indicate the effectiveness of an intervention as well as its acceptability to users and barriers to implementation and uptake. We will apply the CART framework, where evidence is judged on the criteria of Completeness, Accuracy, Relevance and Timeliness.²³ Thus we will prioritise the evidence according to relevance and stop when data-saturation is reached.

Study selection for the Cochrane Review

We have registered the title with the Cochrane Fertility Regulation review group, and will develop a separate Cochrane protocol to be published in the Cochrane library. The main difference between the Cochrane protocol and this HTA protocol is that we will adapt the inclusion and exclusion criteria to exclude unpublished evidence and PhD theses from the Cochrane review. The intention is to follow the same design and methods across the two reviews. This variation in inclusion criteria between the Cochrane and HTA reviews offers an opportunity to undertake a sensitivity analysis to see what contribution unpublished evidence makes to overall outcomes and interpretation of evidence. The Cochrane Collaboration is also calling for exemplar reviews of complex interventions where complexity is considered important. The Cochrane version of the HTA review has the potential to be classified as an ‘innovative’ review in the Cochrane library and would be one of the first to demonstrate the value of an additional realist synthesis in understanding complexity at multiple levels of context, intervention and implementation.

Data Extraction

We will create a bespoke set of data-extraction forms to collect data from each study: study characteristics (design, sample type, sample size etc.); description of intervention or risk factors; contextual factors in the study setting; outcomes including costs of implementing intervention; programme theories or mechanisms described by the authors in the rationale behind the intervention or postulated in the explanation of the results. We will draw on the components of Greenhalgh et al’s framework²⁴ to map facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation, including characteristics of the intervention (e.g. risk, complexity, acceptability), the contextual elements that influence whether it might be used or not (e.g. resources, organisation of services, leadership), and what implementation processes are required to implement the intervention (e.g. change agents, project management support, communication). Data extraction will be undertaken by two reviewers independently; disagreements will be resolved by discussion.

Study summaries

We will present the findings of the data extraction exercise in a table of study characteristics. This will include: the study details; setting; population; quality score; methods; etc. We will present socio-demographic characteristics known to be important from an equity perspective. For this

process, the PROGRESS (Place, Race, Occupation, Gender, Religion, Education, Socio-economic status (SES), Social status) framework will be utilised.²⁵

PHASE 3: EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS BY TYPE OF EVIDENCE

Data to be considered in this review will be extremely diverse, and data synthesis complex. The choice of synthesis method depends on the questions addressed and the type of data included; in this review there are many questions, and diverse data. **Figure 1** illustrates the method of synthesis proposed for each evidence type.

Quantitative synthesis

Measures of intervention effect: We will present quantitative continuous outcomes on the original scale as reported in each individual study. These may be standardised, if they use different scales, by dividing the estimated mean difference by its standard deviation (SD). Dichotomous outcome data will be fitted with a random effects model using the Mantel Haenzel test and presented as risk ratio (RR). ITS studies will be analysed by using the rate change (α), and slope (β) parameters as the intervention effect. Time to event data will be analysed using hazard ratios as the intervention effect. All outcomes data will be reported as their effect size with associated 95% confidence intervals.

Unit of assessment: We anticipate that many of the studies will be clustered by community, service, or geographical area. Where possible cluster RCTs (or quasi-RCTs) that do not account for the correlated nature of the data will be reanalysed by inflating the study standard. If this is not possible we will report only the point estimate, and adjust the 'other risk of bias' to account for the likely impact of not accounting for the clustering.

Multiple time-points per outcome in non-ITS study designs: If RCT, quasi-RCT or cohort studies are found reporting repeated incidence of repeat pregnancy over time, these outcomes will be defined and summarised at both short and long term time. We will follow the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group (EPOC) and non-randomised studies methods group guidance on incorporating these diverse types of evidence in the review.

Assessment of heterogeneity: We will assess both clinical and statistical heterogeneity. Clinical heterogeneity will be assessed by examining the characteristics of the studies, the similarity between the types of participants, and the interventions, whilst statistical heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic. We will report heterogeneity as important if it is at least moderate to substantial by $I^2 > 30\%$ and will not pool data if the statistical heterogeneity is severe $I^2 > 90\%$; If there is statistical heterogeneity between 60 to 90% and this can be explained by clinical reasoning and a coherent argument can be made for combining the studies, they will be entered into a meta-analysis. After exploring the heterogeneity where a coherent scientific argument is not found the included study causing the heterogeneity will be excluded and the analysis repeated as a sensitivity analysis. Where the heterogeneity cannot be adequately explained, the data will not be pooled in a meta-analysis. In this case, or when only single outcomes are reported, we will present study findings in tables and explore the relationships within and between studies in a narrative summary.²⁶

1
2
3 **Assessment of reporting biases:** Where there are an adequate number of studies (nominally at least
4 10) an assessment of reporting bias will be carried out by testing for funnel plot asymmetry.²⁷
5 Funnel plots will only be presented where there is some evidence of asymmetry in the plots.
6 Possible sources of asymmetry will then be explored with an additional sensitivity analysis and the
7 studies at greatest risk of bias will be removed and the most likely unbiased intervention effect will
8 be summarised in the meta-analyses.
9

10
11 **Dealing with missing data:** Where we have missing, or unclear data or information, we will contact
12 the investigators of the primary research. Following this correspondence data may be re-analysed
13 according to a treatment by allocation principle whenever possible.²⁸ If loss to follow up data is not
14 fully reported and authors have conducted a per-protocol analysis we will inspect the degree of
15 imbalance in the dropout between the groups to determine the potential impact of bias. In the
16 absence of a treatment by allocation population, we will use an available case population. Where
17 possible an intention to treat analysis will be carried out. In cases where non-ITT analyses are
18 reported we may report the missing data using a best-worst and worst-best scenario analysis if an
19 adequate number of studies were included in a meta-analysis (nominally three).²⁸ Where there are
20 missing variances, these will be imputed using methods that will be highlighted explicitly in the
21 methods section and the assumptions fully described.
22
23

24
25 **Subgroup analysis:** Subgroups included and highlighted within the primary research as important
26 confounders will be used to identify risk factors. If there are adequate studies we will investigate
27 the following subgroup of studies, or subgroups within studies to try to identify differences in
28 intervention effectiveness: age of mother; deprivation index of area; length of follow up; history of
29 substance misuse; looked after children (or care leavers).
30
31
32

33 34 **Qualitative studies**

35 For qualitative studies or qualitative elements in mixed-method studies we will develop an a priori
36 coding framework specifically designed to address questions and issues of interest and conduct
37 thematic syntheses using the Framework method developed by Ritchie & Spencer.²⁹ We will use
38 Greehalgh et al's framework to support the synthesis of findings about the facilitators and barriers
39 to intervention implementation.²⁴
40
41
42

43 **Surveys, process evaluations and other types of data**

44 Data from surveys, process evaluations and other sources e.g. reports may be either semi-qualitative
45 or quantitative or both. Data may be extracted to present evidence of acceptability or uptake of
46 interventions and synthesised in a narrative summary or aggregated using thematic analysis.
47
48

49 **Realist synthesis**

50 We will select subsets of evidence and apply the principles of realist synthesis.³⁰⁻³² We will identify
51 explicit or implicit *theories* by which it is postulated how an intervention has an underlying causal
52 *mechanism* that works in a defined social *context* to result in a particular outcome. Such theories
53 may also be used to explain the failure of an intervention to work. Additional theories will be
54 identified from the wider literature (e.g. policy documents), the advisory group members, or
55 personal contact with other experts in the field. Data synthesis will involve individual reflection and
56 team discussion and will question the integrity of each theory, adjudicate between competing
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 theories, consider the same theory in different settings, and compare the stated theory with actual
4 practice.³³ Coded data from the studies will then be used to confirm, refute or refine the candidate
5 theories. Thus we will attempt to explain what interventions work, for whom, and in what
6 circumstances.
7

9 **Investigation of risk factors using meta-regression**

10 A key aim of the review will be to search, identify and summarise the population of young girls that
11 are at greatest risk of repeat pregnancy (for example considering income, social deprivation,
12 ethnicity, degree of rurality, substance misuse, currently in care or care leavers, those from a
13 vulnerable or in at risk communities) . We anticipate that these factors will be considered and
14 summarised as important confounding variables within RCTs, quasi-RCTs, CBAs for studies
15 investigating an intervention to reduce repeat pregnancies. We will also identify non-interventional
16 studies that present epidemiological data (e.g. cohort studies, cross sectional studies and policy
17 documents) of effect modifiers associated with an increased risk of repeat pregnancy. Data will be
18 extracted and summarised and if possible presented in a meta-regression of summarising the
19 standardised effect sizes, with their associated 95% confidence intervals.
20
21
22
23

25 **Cost-effectiveness**

26 We will provide a narrative review of economic evaluations of interventions specifically designed to
27 address the issue in question. We will stratify any economic studies found by the public health lever
28 mechanism used e.g. government, statutory or legal, public information, school based group or
29 targeted intervention, NHS initiated, charity initiated. We will be particularly interested in
30 perspective of analysis, type of economic evaluation (e.g. cost analysis, cost-benefit analysis, cost-
31 effectiveness analysis, cost-utility analysis). We will document the way that these studies have
32 attempted to overcome the particular methodological challenges of this type of complex,
33 preventative, behaviour change based intervention.³⁴⁻³⁷ Where possible, we will conduct meta-
34 analysis of the economic evidence (if there is sufficient homogeneity to allow it).
35
36
37
38

39 **PHASE 4: OVERARCHING SYNTHESSES**

41 **Reporting the studies**

42 Results will be presented with reference to the PRISMA reporting guidelines for systematic
43 reviews,³⁸ the MOOSE guidelines for Meta-analyses of observational studies³⁹ and the RAMESES
44 publication standards for realist syntheses.⁴⁰ We will summarise the evidence for each outcome in a
45 summary of findings table.
46
47
48

49 **Overarching narrative synthesis and interpretation of findings**

50 We will conduct an overarching narrative synthesis, juxtaposing the qualitative and quantitative data
51 on service user views and implementation issues and comparing programme theories with
52 effectiveness.⁴¹ To aid this process we will develop a methodological and conceptual matrix or logic
53 model to integrate our findings.^{42 43} The processes involved in this review are essentially iterative;
54 thus we anticipate that the mapping exercise and the work on relevant programme theory will
55 contribute towards a framework for the meta-synthesis.
56
57
58
59
60

Discussing the evidence

Within the discussion we will consider the following areas:

- Summary of findings, strength and certainty of evidence
- Strengths and limitations of the review
- Implications for UK policy and practice, including intervention implementation
- Implications for further research

During the draft stage of the final report a consultation process, defined and facilitated by the frontline organisations engaged with our team, will be undertaken with service users via their representatives in the voluntary sector. This aim of this process is to share our emerging findings, and seek comments and feedback, which will also feed into the discussion section of the report.

DISCUSSION

Systematic reviews of complex interventions are challenging;⁴⁴ interventions in the field of teenage pregnancy prevention are diverse in terms of content, context and implementation factors. To encompass this diversity, the methods for this review are ambitious and innovative, drawing on a number of methodological sources and with a degree of flexibility built in to the design. To ensure the validity and reliability of findings based upon novel research methods our review includes:

- An overall framework to provide structure to the review
- A high degree of methodological expertise in the review team
- An expert advisory group including access to stakeholders in the field
- Feedback from clients/service users to authenticate findings

These factors will ensure that we deliver a high quality review with a high degree of relevance in its findings that will be of interest to policy makers and those who design and commission services, as well as making a valuable contribution to the debate on methods for conducting systematic reviews of complex interventions, where understanding complexity is considered important.

Review registration

PROSPERO Registration Number: CRD42012003168

Cochrane Registration number: i=fertility/0068

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

RhW and NC initiated the study. MH devised the study structure and all authors contributed to its design. RhW, MH and BC drafted the manuscript. AB, MH, DP and JC contributed to the search strategies, BC the quantitative analysis, JN the qualitative analysis and mixed methods synthesis, JRM the realist synthesis, ML, NC and NW the health care perspective, and RTE and JC the health economics. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Technologies Assessment project number 11/141/05. Professor Rhiannon Tudor Edwards and Dr Joanna Charles are funded by Public Health Wales.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Dr Huw Roberts for his invaluable contribution to the study management team and Dr Richa Sinha for her contribution to the development of the search strategies.

References

1. Office for National Statistics. UK National Statistics Publication Hub: Conception and fertility rates, 2011.
2. UNICEF. Child poverty and perspective: an overview of child well being in rich countries. Innocenti Report Card 7. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, 2007.
3. Department of Health. Teenage pregnancy strategy: beyond 2010, 2010.
4. Welsh Assembly Government. Sexual Health And Wellbeing Action Plan For Wales, 2010-2015. , 2010.
5. Northern Ireland Department of Health SSaPS. Sexual Health Promotion Strategy & Action Plan 2008 - 2013. , 2008.
6. The Scottish Executive. Respect and Responsibility: Strategy and Action Plan for Improving Sexual Health. , 2005.
7. Rachael Parker et al. Teenage Pregnancy Strategy Evaluation: Final report synthesis, 2005.
8. The Teenage Pregnancy Independent Advisory Group (TPIAG). Teenage pregnancy: You can make a real difference to teenage pregnancy, (undated).
9. Rowlands S. Social Predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy and focused strategies. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2010;24:605-16.
10. Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre. EPPI-Centre methods for conducting systematic reviews: University of London, 2007.
11. Thomas J, Sutcliffe K, Harden A, Oliver S, Rees R, Brunton G, et al. Children and healthy eating: a systematic review of barriers and facilitators. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, institute of Education, University of London, 2003.
12. Flemming K, Briggs M. Electronic searching to locate qualitative research: evaluation of three strategies. *Journal of advanced nursing* 2006;57(1):95-100.
13. Shaw R, Booth A, Sutton A, Miller T, Smith J, Young B, et al. Finding qualitative research: an evaluation of search strategies. *BMC Medical research methodology* 2004;4(5).
14. O'Cathain A, Thomas K, Drabble S, Rudolph A, Hewison J. What can qualitative research do for randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review. *BMJ Open*, 2013:e002889.
15. NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination: University of York. Preventing and reducing the adverse effects of unintended teenage pregnancies. *Effective health care: Bulletin on the effectiveness of health service interventions for decision makers* 1997;3(1).
16. Oranganje C, Meremikwu M, Eko H, Esu E, Meremikwu A, Ehir iJ. Interventions for preventing unintended pregnancies among adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009(4).
17. Pace R, Pluye P, Bartlett G, Macaulay A, Salsberg J, Jagosh J, et al. Testing the reliability and efficiency of the pilot Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for systematic mixed studies review. *International journal of nursing studies* 2012;49:47-53.
18. Drummond M, Jefferson T, The BMJ Economic Evaluation Working Party. Guidelines for authors and peer reviewers of economic submissions to the BMJ. *BMJ* 1996;313:275-83.

19. Philips Z, Ginnelly L, Sculpher M, Claxton K, Golder S, Riemsma R, et al. Review of guidelines for good practice in decision-analytic modelling in health technology assessment. *Health Technology Assessment* 2004;8(36).
20. Shemilt I, Mugford M, Byford S, Drummond M, Eisenstein E, Knapp M, et al. Chapter 15: Incorporating economics evidence. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
21. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE Guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64(4):380-82.
22. Glenton C, Colvin C, Carlsen B, Swartz A, Lewin S, Noyes J, et al. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of lay health worker programmes to improve access to maternal and child health: qualitative evidence synthesis (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013(2).
23. Tennison B. Understanding data, information, and knowledge. In: Pencheon D, Guest C, Melzer D, Muir Gray JA, editors. *Oxford Handbook of Public Health Practice*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
24. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, MacFarlane F, Bate P, O K. Diffusions of innovation in service organisations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Millbank Quarterly* 2004;82(4):581-629.
25. Ueffing E, Tugwell P, Welch V, Petticrew M, Kristjansson E, for the Campbell and Cochrane Equity Methods Group. Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors. Version 2012-10-02, 2009.
26. Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Section 9.5, Chapter 9: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
27. Sterne J, Egger M, Moher D. Section 10.4.3.1, Chapter 10: Addressing reporting biases In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention. Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
28. Higgins J, Deeks J, Altman D. Section 16.2, Chapter 16: Special topics in statistics. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). In: Higgins JPT, Green S, editors: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
29. Ritchie L, Spencer J. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman A, Burgess R, editors. *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Routledge, 1994:173-94.
30. Pawson R. *Evidence-based policy: a realist perspective*. London: Sage, 2006.
31. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, DeCorby K, Hutchinson A. Chapter 25. Realist synthesis. In: Gerrish K, Lacey A, editors. *The research process in nursing. 6th edition*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
32. Greenhalgh T, Kristjansson E, Robinson V. Realist review to understand the efficacy of school feeding programmes *BMJ* 2007;335:858-61.
33. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson A, DeCorby K, Bucknall T, Kent B, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research *Implementation Science* 2012;7:33.
34. Kelly M, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, Powell J. (2005). Economic appraisal of public health interventions. London: Health Development Agency, 2005.
35. Medical Research Council. Guidance on the development, evaluation and implementation of complex interventions to improve health, 2008.
36. Vos T, Carter R, Barendregt J, Mihalopoulos C, Veerman L, Magnus A, et al. Assessing Cost-Effectiveness in Prevention ACE-Prevention. Retrieved from 2010.
37. Payne K, McAllister M, Davies L. Valuing the economic benefits of complex interventions: When maximising health is not sufficient. *Health Econ*. 2011;22(3):258-71.
38. Moher D, Liberat iA, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, Group -TP. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535.

- 1
2
3 39. Stroup D, Berlin J, Morton S, Olkin I, Williamson G, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational
4 studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in
5 Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12.
- 6 40. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards:
7 realist syntheses. *BMC Medicine* 2013.
- 8 41. Noyes J, Popay J, Pearson A, Hannes K, Booth A. Chapter 20: Qualitative research and Cochrane
9 reviews. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
10 *Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
- 11 42. Oliver S, Harden A, Rees R, Shepherd J, Brunton G, Garcia L, et al. An emerging framework for
12 including different types of evidence in systematic reviews for public policy. *Evaluation*
13 2005;11:428-46.
- 14 43. Thomas J, Harden A, Oakly A, Oliver S, Sutcliffe S, Rees R, et al. Integrating qualitative research
15 with trials in systematic reviews: an example form public health. *BMJ* 2004;328(1010-12).
- 16 44. Shepperd S, Lewin S, Straus S, Clarke M, Eccles M, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Can we systematically
17 review studies that evaluate complex interventions? *PLoS Medicine* 2009;6(8):e1000086.
- 18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Intervention Now To Eliminate Repeat Unintended Pregnancy in Teenagers (INTERUPT): A systematic review protocol for intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, qualitative and realist synthesis of implementation factors and user engagement.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004733.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Mar-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Whitaker, Rhiannon; Bangor University, North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health Hendry, Maragret; Bangor University, North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research Booth, Andrew; Sheffield University, School of Health and Related Research Carter, Ben; Cardiff University, Institute of Primary Care and Public Health Charles, Joanna; Bangor University, Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation Craine, Noel; National Public Health Service for Wales, Edwards, Rhiannon; Bangor University, Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation Lyons, Marion; National Public Health Service for Wales, Noyes, Jane; Bangor University, Centre for Health Related Research Pasterfield, Diana; Bangor University, North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research Rycroft-Malone, Jo; Bangor University, School of Healthcare Sciences Williams, Nefyn; Bangor University, North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Sexual health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	REPRODUCTIVE MEDICINE, Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intervention Now To Eliminate Repeat Unintended Pregnancy in Teenagers (INTERUPT): A systematic review of intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, qualitative and realist synthesis of implementation factors and user engagement.

Corresponding author:

Rh. Whitaker
Associate Director (Scientific)
North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
Y Wern
Normal Site
Holyhead Road
Bangor University
Bangor
Gwynedd
UK
LL57 2PZ

Email: r.whitaker@bangor.ac.uk

Tel: 01248 382597

Co-authors:

M. Hendry
North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
Bangor University
Wrexham
UK

A. Booth
School of Health and Related Research
University of Sheffield
Sheffield
UK

B. Carter
Institute of Primary Care and Public Health
Cardiff University School of Medicine
Cardiff
UK

J. Charles
Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
Bangor University
Bangor
UK

N. Craine
Public Health Wales/Iechyd Cyhoeddus Cymru
Microbiology Department/Adran Microbioleg
Ysbyty Gwynedd

1 Bangor
2 Gwynedd
3 LL57 2PW
4

5 R.T. Edwards
6 Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
7 Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
8 Bangor University
9 Bangor
10 UK
11

12 M.Lyons
13 Director of Health Protection, Public Health Wales,
14 Health Protection Team, Health Protection Division,
15 Temple of Peace,
16 Cathays Park,
17 Cardiff, CF10 3NW
18
19

20 J.Noyes
21 Centre for Health Related Research
22 School of Healthcare Sciences
23 Bangor University
24 Bangor
25 UK
26
27

28 D.Pasterfield
29 North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
30 Bangor University
31 Wrexham
32 UK
33
34

35 J.Rycroft-Malone
36 Centre for Health Related Research
37 School of Healthcare Sciences
38 Fron Heulog
39 Bangor University
40 Bangor
41 UK
42

43 N. Williams
44 North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
45 Bangor University
46 Bangor
47 UK
48

49
50
51 Keywords (up to 5 keywords or phrases suitable for use in an index (recommended to use MeSH
52 terms)
53

54 Pregnancy in adolescence. Prevention. Public Health. Sexual health interventions. Teenage
55 conceptions
56

57 Word count: excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables) 4962
58
59
60

Abstract**Background**

The United Kingdom has the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe, a fifth are repeat pregnancies. Unintended conceptions can do emotional, psychological and educational harm to teenage girls, often with enduring implications for their life chances. Babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and increased risk of poverty, educational under-achievement and unemployment later in life, with associated societal costs.

Methods

We will conduct a streamed, mixed-methods systematic review to find and evaluate interventions designed to reduce repeat unintended teen pregnancies.

Our aims are to identify:

- Who is at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies?
- Which interventions are effective, cost-effective, how they work, in what setting, and for whom?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to intervention uptake?

Traditional electronic database searches will be augmented by targeted searches for evidence “clusters” and guided by an advisory group of experts and stakeholders.

To address the topic’s inherent complexities we will use a highly structured, innovative and iterative approach combining methodological techniques tailored to each stream of evidence. Quantitative data will be synthesised with reference to Cochrane guidelines for public health interventions. Qualitative evidence addressing facilitators and barriers to the uptake of interventions, experience, and acceptability of interventions will be synthesised thematically. We will apply the principles of realist synthesis to uncover theories and mechanisms underpinning interventions. We will conduct an integration and overarching narrative of findings authenticated by client group feedback.

Ethics and dissemination

We will publish the complete review in “Health Technologies Assessment” and sections in more specialist peer reviewed journals. It will be presented at national and international conferences in the fields of public health, reproductive medicine and review methodology. Findings will be fed back to service users and practitioners via workshops run by the partner collaborators.

Protocol Registration PROSPERO CRD42012003168

INTRODUCTION

Background

Despite data from the United Kingdom that are consistent with a gradual decline in teenage conception rates, the UK continues to have the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe.^{1,2} Teenage pregnancies are a target within the *England Teenage Pregnancy Strategy* and their equivalents within the devolved governments of the UK.³⁻⁶ Teenage pregnancies have considerable impacts on the individual wellbeing of teenage parents and their children. Inherent within the national strategy responses, and a range of other national policy documents addressing this issue, is the recognition that babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and a significantly increased risk of living in poverty, achieving less at school and being unemployed later in life⁷ with substantial costs to society.

Repeat pregnancies represent a considerable proportion of the overall rate; one fifth of births amongst under 18s are repeat pregnancies⁸ and are thus a crucial potential focus for intervention. Around three quarters of teenage pregnancies are unplanned with up to one half resulting in abortion.³ Within the UK teenage pregnancy is strongly associated with social disadvantage. The social predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy are varied and have been previously usefully grouped into predictors operating at individual, couple, family, community and social level.⁹ These predictors share much common ground with those of first teenage pregnancy.

Aims of the review

The overall aims are to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions for preventing repeat unintended pregnancies amongst adolescents, and to investigate the barriers and facilitators for their implementation and uptake. Whilst these overall aims are broad, the focus will be on the *implementation* of interventions; specific research objectives are to determine:

- What factors characterise subgroups who are at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies (i.e. what are the predictors of repeat unintended pregnancy)?
- Which (elements of) interventions appear to be effective, how do they work, in what setting, and for whom (conversely, why are they ineffective, why don't they work)?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to the acceptability, uptake, and implementation of interventions?
- What is the relative cost-effectiveness of interventions?

METHODS

Overall plan of research

Initial scoping searches informed a tailored, 4-phase approach to the review (**Figure 1**). For the overall framework of the mixed method review we will draw upon the structured, phased, EPPI-Centre approach,¹⁰ and use their reviews of young people, pregnancy and social exclusion, and the barriers to and facilitators of children's healthy eating as methodological exemplars.^{10,11} After conducting extensive literature searches, screening the evidence against explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria and appraising study quality, a mapping exercise is undertaken to organise and describe the evidence so as to give a clear picture of the body of research. From this, the scope of the review can be refined in order to focus in depth on the most important areas of the topic in question. Our research will be guided by an expert panel whom we will engage with via a regular agenda item on the quarterly meeting of the Public Health Wales's Addressing Teenage Conceptions in Wales; Task and Finish group, and we will present our findings for feedback and discussion to a group of young mothers who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood and are in contact with the Flying Start

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

programme. The Task and finish group draws its membership from public health practitioners, policy makers, GP and specialist doctors, midwives, academics and third sector representatives from across Wales with a professional interest in reducing teen conception rates

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004733 on 10 April 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 19, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For peer review only

For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

PHASE 1: IDENTIFYING THE LITERATURE, QUALITY APPRAISAL AND MAPPING THE EVIDENCE.

Search strategies

Principal searches

We will search the following electronic databases for published literature using strategies that combine thesaurus terms and keywords relating to pregnancy, termination of pregnancy or parenthood with adolescence and text word synonyms for repeat or subsequent: Medline & Medline in Process, PsycInfo, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health Literature), The Cochrane Library (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, the Health Technology Assessment Database, NHS Economic Evaluation Database), EMBASE (The Excerpta Medica database), BNI (British Nursing Index), ERIC (Educational Resource Index and Abstracts), SocAbs (Sociological Abstracts), ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Abstract & Indexes), BiblioMap (The EPPI-Centre register of health promotion and public health research), and the Social Sciences Citation Index. We will use a search strategy developed and piloted in Medline (Appendix 1) and subsequently modified for use in the remaining databases (full details available from the authors).

Supplementary searches

Further modified versions of the same strategy will be used to search the following databases for “grey” literature: OpenGrey, Scopus, Scirus, Social Care Online, National Research Register, NIHR portfolio database, and Index to theses. Similarly, to capture economics studies, we will search RePEc (Research Papers in Economics) and EconLit. We will apply an alternative search strategy specifically designed to capture the type of descriptive titles that are common in qualitative studies to selected databases: SocAbs, ASSIA, BNI and the Social Sciences Citation Index. This strategy will combine additional synonyms for “pregnancy”, “adolescence” and “repeat” with a brief qualitative filter comprising three broad free-text terms, “qualitative”, “findings” and “interview\$” that has been shown to be as effective as a more complex one.^{12 13}

Since the issues surrounding implementation of interventions are a primary focus of this review, qualitative and process evaluation evidence associated with trials is highly relevant – particularly to better understanding the facilitators and barriers to implementation.¹⁴ Therefore a key feature of our search strategy will be to identify “evidence clusters” related to key randomised controlled trials; we will use search engines such as Google and Google Scholar, conduct citation searches and contact Principal Investigators to ascertain whether a qualitative/ views study or process evaluation was conducted, as this data is sometimes published separately or not published at all.

We will be further guided by our expert panel, some of whom have frequent contact with young women who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood; they will inform the direction of our searches by identifying interventions which they may have experienced and giving us feedback. This will help identify areas where evidence is lacking and supplementary searches may be necessary. Additional sources will include the bibliographies of included papers. If necessary we will also hand-search key journals such as the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, the Journal of Adolescent Health, Contraception, the Journal of Adolescence and Health Care, the Journal of Paediatric and Adolescent Gynaecology, Adolescence, Maternal and Child Health Journal

1
2
3 and the Journal of Reproductive Medicine, and make personal contact with professional networks
4 such as the Family Planning Association, reproductive health nursing networks, General
5 Practitioners' fora etc. to identify Department of Health and third sector policy documents and
6 evaluations. Finally we will circulate a list of included studies to key stakeholders and researchers in
7 the field and ask them if they are aware of any important omissions.
8
9

10
11 A number of systematic reviews related to teenage pregnancy have been published in the last two
12 decades. The earliest we found in our scoping search was dated 1997.¹⁵ Therefore we will limit our
13 searches to 1995 onwards but we will conduct a separate search excluding the terms for second or
14 subsequent pregnancies but including a filter for systematic reviews as a means of capturing
15 relevant data from earlier studies.
16

17
18 References will be managed by using bibliographic reference management software (Endnote). Two
19 reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts to identify potentially relevant documents,
20 which will be retrieved and assessed according to the inclusion criteria below. Disagreements will be
21 resolved by discussion or, if necessary, by a third reviewer.
22
23

24 **Study eligibility**

25 **Study type:** Our search strategy will capture published studies of any design including trials of
26 interventions, effectiveness studies; interrupted time series studies (ITS), cost-effectiveness studies,
27 process evaluations, surveys and qualitative studies of participants' views and experiences of
28 interventions. We will also consider relevant grey literature of any type, such as unpublished
29 reports, service evaluations and theses.
30
31

32
33 **Population:** The population of interest is young women, who are aged up to and including 19 years
34 and have had at least one unintended pregnancy, whether the outcome was termination,
35 miscarriage or delivery. Where study populations are mixed, we will include all studies whose
36 reported population comprised at least 75% young women in our target age group.¹⁶
37
38

39
40 **Intervention:** We will include studies of any intervention designed to reduce repeat unintended
41 pregnancies (also referred to as "birth-spacing" or "pregnancy-spacing") in these young women,
42 delivered in any educational, healthcare or community setting. Interventions may have single or
43 multiple components, and could be delivered to individuals or communities. We will also include
44 studies designed to identify risk factors or subgroups at increased risk of repeat unintended
45 pregnancy, where there may be no actual intervention.
46
47

48
49 We will include studies that identify barriers and facilitators to the implementation and uptake of
50 interventions, and explore the views of intervention recipients or providers or health professionals,
51 particularly with regard to whether the intervention was implemented and worked in the way
52 intended. We will look for studies that help us identify programme theories and logic – and we will
53 look for, and develop, candidate theories as to why some young women have more than one
54 unplanned pregnancy, and which could begin to explain the relative success or failure of particular
55 interventions.
56
57
58
59
60

Comparator: Comparators could be no intervention, standard practice, or another intervention. Comparators are likely to be location-specific and standard care in one setting may be seen as an intervention in another setting.

Outcomes and other phenomena of interest

We will report on the primary and secondary outcomes and other phenomena of interest below. Outcomes will be addressed by a range of evidence types and analytical techniques (see Figure 1).

Primary outcomes and other phenomena of interest:

- Identification of at risk groups
- Identification of barriers and facilitators of interventions relating to:
 - acceptability
 - uptake
 - feasibility of implementation
- Views and experiences of young women, families and professionals
 - Conceptualisation of repeat teenage pregnancy rates as an issue
 - Effectiveness of interventions
 - Uptake of interventions
 - Change in repeat pregnancy rates

Other outcomes and other phenomena of interest:

- Identification of, access to and uptake of reproductive services and social care
- Feasibility of widespread adoption of interventions in health and social care
- Cost of interventions
- Effectiveness of interventions:
 - Change in validated quality of life indices
 - Change in rate of abortion
- Cost-effectiveness of interventions

Study exclusion criteria

We will include published studies from any country as, although there may be different cultural and social attitudes towards teenage pregnancy, they may have a bearing on minority populations within the UK. If any major studies (e.g. randomised controlled trials or national cohort studies) are found in non-English language publications we will attempt translation. Smaller qualitative studies or process evaluations published in other languages may be missed but those studies exclusions are unlikely to bias any synthesis of evidence. We will limit our searches for unpublished material to the UK to enhance the direct applicability of the results to the NHS and UK public health bodies. We will not exclude studies on the basis of quality, but will incorporate judgements about study quality when interpreting the evidence.

Quality appraisal

RCTs and quasi-RCTs will be assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias (RoB);¹² we will categorise and report the overall risk of bias of each of the included trials:

- Low risk of bias (plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter the results) if all criteria were met;

- Unclear risk of bias (plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results) if one or more criteria were assessed as unclear; or
- High risk of bias (plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results) if one or more criteria were not met

The Cochrane RoB tool will be supplemented by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for mixed studies reviews.¹⁷ This tool has the advantage of incorporating the appraisal of several different study designs (qualitative, RCT, non-RCT, observational, mixed methods) using a single tool with a coherent range of quality criteria. Piloting suggests the MMAT is an efficient and reliable tool, however it does not cover economic evaluations so we will also use the Drummond checklist¹⁸ and the Phillips checklist¹⁹ recommended for economic studies and economic models respectively.²⁰ Where the evidence comprises, for example, policy documents or reports of locally implemented initiatives, it is unlikely that we will be able to formally assess quality. We will therefore take a broad view of the evidence as being most relevant for the context and be guided by the advisory group as to its merit.

Certainty of evidence

We will use GRADE, as the accepted approach to assessing the certainty of findings of reviews of effectiveness²¹ but, since GRADE is not suitable for appraising the certainty of qualitative evidence, will also use a recently developed method, CerQual (certainty of the quality of evidence).²² The CerQual approach is based on the methodological limitations of individual studies contributing to the review finding, in this case indicated by the MMAT tool, combined with the coherence of each review finding. Coherence is assessed by the extent to which a clear pattern is identifiable across the individual study data, and is strengthened where findings are consistent across multiple contexts or where variation across individual studies is explained, especially where studies contributing to the finding are drawn from a wide range of settings. CerQual is similar to GRADE in that both approaches aim to assess the *certainty* of (or confidence in) the evidence and both rate this certainty for each finding across studies rather than for each individual study. GRADE also bases its assessment on a combination of the quality of the evidence and other factors, including consistency across studies.

Mapping the evidence

We will undertake a mapping exercise following EPPI-Centre methods.¹⁰ We will assign codes to records using lists that we will develop of pre-defined keywords to aid the sorting and grouping of documents for mapping and synthesis. Keywords will be related to, for example: the study design or type of record (intervention study, process evaluation, qualitative study, report etc.), the country and health, educational or community setting in which the study took place, the topic or focus of the study/report, the population focus of the study/report and study design. From the coding exercise we will develop a descriptive map of the literature and identify gaps in the research. The map will also provide a context for interpreting the results of the synthesis and a basis for refining the scope of the review i.e. it will aid the advisory group in identifying areas for in-depth focus and, possibly, areas where additional searches need to be conducted. The advisory group will meet with the review group late in phase 1 to discuss the results of the mapping exercise and to ratify or recommend refinements to that work which would be needed prior to the completion of Phase 2 where the evidence will be selected and prioritised for in depth review.

PHASE 2: SELECTING AND PRIORITISING THE EVIDENCE FOR IN DEPTH REVIEW AND DATA-EXTRACTION

Study selection

The review team, with advice from the advisory group obtained during the mapping exercise, will prioritise the evidence for in-depth review. Beginning with evidence relating to primary outcomes, and within each grouped set of data we will prioritise the best quality evidence of most relevance to address the research questions. We will be particularly interested in “evidence clusters”, i.e. trials of interventions accompanied by qualitative studies, process evaluations, reports etc.; “sibling” studies, i.e. trials of interventions paired with qualitative studies using the same participants, and “orphan” studies where effectiveness studies and views studies relate to similar interventions and populations (and so can inform each other) although the actual participants are different. These studies have the potential to indicate the effectiveness of an intervention as well as its acceptability to users and barriers to implementation and uptake. We will apply the CART framework, where evidence is judged on the criteria of Completeness, Accuracy, Relevance and Timeliness.²³ Thus we will prioritise the evidence according to relevance and stop when data-saturation is reached.

Study selection for the Cochrane Review

We have registered the title with the Cochrane Fertility Regulation review group, and will develop a separate Cochrane protocol to be published in the Cochrane library. The main difference between the Cochrane protocol and this HTA protocol is that we will adapt the inclusion and exclusion criteria to exclude unpublished evidence and PhD theses from the Cochrane review. The intention is to follow the same design and methods across the two reviews. This variation in inclusion criteria between the Cochrane and HTA reviews offers an opportunity to undertake a sensitivity analysis to see what contribution unpublished evidence makes to overall outcomes and interpretation of evidence. The Cochrane Collaboration is also calling for exemplar reviews of complex interventions where complexity is considered important. The Cochrane version of the HTA review has the potential to be classified as an ‘innovative’ review in the Cochrane library and would be one of the first to demonstrate the value of an additional realist synthesis in understanding complexity at multiple levels of context, intervention and implementation.

Data Extraction

We will create a bespoke set of data-extraction forms to collect data from each study: study characteristics (design, sample type, sample size etc.); description of intervention or risk factors; contextual factors in the study setting; outcomes including costs of implementing intervention; programme theories or mechanisms described by the authors in the rationale behind the intervention or postulated in the explanation of the results. We will draw on the components of Greenhalgh et al’s framework²⁴ to map facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation, including characteristics of the intervention (e.g. risk, complexity, acceptability), the contextual elements that influence whether it might be used or not (e.g. resources, organisation of services, leadership), and what implementation processes are required to implement the intervention (e.g. change agents, project management support, communication). Data extraction will be undertaken by two reviewers independently; disagreements will be resolved by discussion.

Study summaries

We will present the findings of the data extraction exercise in a table of study characteristics. This will include: the study details; setting; population; quality score; methods; etc. We will present socio-demographic characteristics known to be important from an equity perspective. For this process, the PROGRESS (Place, Race, Occupation, Gender, Religion, Education, Socio-economic status (SES), Social capital) framework will be utilised.²⁵

PHASE 3: EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS BY TYPE OF EVIDENCE

Data to be considered in this review will be extremely diverse, and data synthesis complex. The choice of synthesis method depends on the questions addressed and the type of data included; in this review there are many questions, and diverse data. **Figure 1** illustrates the method of synthesis proposed for each evidence type.

Quantitative synthesis

Measures of intervention effect: We will present quantitative continuous outcomes on the original scale as reported in each individual study. These may be standardised, if they use different scales, by dividing the estimated mean difference by its standard deviation (SD). Dichotomous outcome data will be fitted with a random effects model using the Mantel Haenzel test and presented as risk ratio (RR). ITS studies will be analysed by using the rate change (α), and slope (β) parameters as the intervention effect. Time to event data will be analysed using hazard ratios as the intervention effect. All outcomes data will be reported as their effect size with associated 95% confidence intervals.

Unit of assessment: We anticipate that many of the studies will be clustered by community, service, or geographical area. Where possible cluster RCTs (or quasi-RCTs) that do not account for the correlated nature of the data will be reanalysed by inflating the study standard. If this is not possible we will report only the point estimate, and adjust the 'other risk of bias' to account for the likely impact of not accounting for the clustering.

Multiple time-points per outcome in non-ITS study designs: If RCT, quasi-RCT or cohort studies are found reporting repeated incidence of repeat pregnancy over time, these outcomes will be defined and summarised at both short and long term time. We will follow the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group (EPOC) and non-randomised studies methods group guidance on incorporating these diverse types of evidence in the review.

Assessment of heterogeneity: We will assess both heterogeneity of the populations, context and interventions (clinical) and statistical heterogeneity. Clinical heterogeneity will be assessed by examining the characteristics of the studies, the similarity between the types of participants, and the interventions, whilst statistical heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic. We will report heterogeneity as important if it is at least moderate to substantial by $I^2 > 30\%$ and will not pool data if the statistical heterogeneity is severe $I^2 > 90\%$; If there is statistical heterogeneity between 60 to 90% and this can be explained by clinical reasoning and a coherent argument can be made for combining the studies, they will be entered into a meta-analysis. After exploring the heterogeneity where a coherent scientific argument is not found the included study causing the heterogeneity will be excluded and the analysis repeated as a sensitivity analysis. Where the heterogeneity cannot be

adequately explained, the data will not be pooled in a meta-analysis. In this case, or when only single outcomes are reported, we will present study findings in tables and explore the relationships within and between studies in a narrative summary.²⁶

Assessment of reporting biases: Where there are an adequate number of studies (nominally at least 10) an assessment of reporting bias will be carried out by testing for funnel plot asymmetry.²⁷ Funnel plots will only be presented where there is some evidence of asymmetry in the plots. Possible sources of asymmetry will then be explored with an additional sensitivity analysis and the studies at greatest risk of bias will be removed and the most likely unbiased intervention effect will be summarised in the meta-analyses.

Dealing with missing data: Where we have missing, or unclear data or information, we will contact the investigators of the primary research. Following this correspondence data may be re-analysed according to a treatment by allocation principle whenever possible.²⁸ If loss to follow up data is not fully reported and authors have conducted a per-protocol analysis we will inspect the degree of imbalance in the dropout between the groups to determine the potential impact of bias. In the absence of a treatment by allocation population, we will use an available case population. Where possible an intention to treat analysis will be carried out. In cases where non-ITT analyses are reported we may report the missing data using a best-worst and worst-best scenario analysis if an adequate number of studies were included in a meta-analysis (nominally three).²⁸ Where there are missing variances, these will be imputed using methods that will be highlighted explicitly in the methods section and the assumptions fully described.

Subgroup analysis: Subgroups included and highlighted within the primary research as important confounders will be used to identify risk factors. If there are adequate studies we will investigate the following subgroup of studies, or subgroups within studies to try to identify differences in intervention effectiveness: age of mother; deprivation index of area; length of follow up; history of substance misuse; looked after children (or care leavers).

Qualitative studies

For qualitative studies or qualitative elements in mixed-method studies we will develop an a priori coding framework specifically designed to address questions and issues of interest and conduct thematic syntheses using the Framework method developed by Ritchie & Spencer.²⁹ We will use Greehalgh et al's framework to support the synthesis of findings about the facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation.²⁴

Surveys, process evaluations and other types of data

Data from surveys, process evaluations and other sources e.g. reports may be either semi-qualitative or quantitative or both. Data may be extracted to present evidence of acceptability or uptake of interventions and synthesised in a narrative summary or aggregated using thematic analysis.

Realist synthesis

We will select subsets of evidence and apply the principles of realist synthesis.³⁰⁻³² We will identify explicit or implicit *theories* by which it is postulated how an intervention has an underlying causal *mechanism* that works in a defined social *context* to result in a particular outcome. Such theories

1
2
3 may also be used to explain the failure of an intervention to work. Additional theories will be
4 identified from the wider literature (e.g. policy documents), the advisory group members, or
5 personal contact with other experts in the field. Data synthesis will involve individual reflection and
6 team discussion and will question the integrity of each theory, adjudicate between competing
7 theories, consider the same theory in different settings, and compare the stated theory with actual
8 practice.³³ Coded data from the studies will then be used to confirm, refute or refine the candidate
9 theories. Thus we will attempt to explain what interventions work, for whom, and in what
10 circumstances.
11
12

14 **Investigation of risk factors using meta-regression**

15 A key aim of the review will be to search, identify and summarise the population of young girls that
16 are at greatest risk of repeat pregnancy (for example considering income, social deprivation,
17 ethnicity, degree of rurality, substance misuse, currently in care or care leavers, those from a
18 vulnerable or in at risk communities). We anticipate that these factors will be considered and
19 summarised as important confounding variables within RCTs, quasi-RCTs, CBAs for studies
20 investigating an intervention to reduce repeat pregnancies. We will also identify non-interventional
21 studies that present epidemiological data (e.g. cohort studies, cross sectional studies and policy
22 documents) of effect modifiers associated with an increased risk of repeat pregnancy. Data will be
23 extracted and summarised and if possible presented in a meta-regression of summarising the
24 standardised effect sizes, with their associated 95% confidence intervals.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Cost-effectiveness**

31 We will provide a narrative review of economic evaluations of interventions specifically designed to
32 address the issue in question. We will stratify any economic studies found by the public health lever
33 mechanism used e.g. government, statutory or legal, public information, school based group or
34 targeted intervention, NHS initiated, charity initiated. We will be particularly interested in
35 perspective of analysis, type of economic evaluation (e.g. cost analysis, cost-benefit analysis, cost-
36 effectiveness analysis, cost-utility analysis). We will document the way that these studies have
37 attempted to overcome the particular methodological challenges of this type of complex,
38 preventative, behaviour change based intervention.³⁴⁻³⁷ Where possible, we will conduct meta-
39 analysis of the economic evidence (if there is sufficient homogeneity to allow it).
40
41
42
43

44 **PHASE 4: OVERARCHING SYNTHESSES**

46 **Reporting the studies**

47 Results will be presented with reference to the PRISMA reporting guidelines for systematic
48 reviews,³⁸ the MOOSE guidelines for Meta-analyses of observational studies³⁹ and the RAMESES
49 publication standards for realist syntheses.⁴⁰ We will summarise the evidence for each outcome in a
50 summary of findings table.
51
52

54 **Overarching narrative synthesis and interpretation of findings**

55 We will conduct an overarching narrative synthesis, juxtaposing the qualitative and quantitative data
56 on service user views and implementation issues and comparing programme theories with
57 effectiveness.⁴¹ To aid this process we will develop a methodological and conceptual matrix or logic
58
59
60

1
2
3 model to integrate our findings.^{42 43} The processes involved in this review are essentially iterative;
4 thus we anticipate that the mapping exercise and the work on relevant programme theory will
5 contribute towards a framework for the meta-synthesis.
6
7

8 **Discussing the evidence**

9 Within the discussion we will consider the following areas:
10

- 11 • Summary of findings, strength and certainty of evidence
 - 12 • Strengths and limitations of the review
 - 13 • Implications for UK policy and practice, including intervention implementation
 - 14 • Implications for further research
- 15
16
17

18 During the draft stage of the final report a consultation process, defined and facilitated by the
19 frontline organisations engaged with our team, will be undertaken with service users via their
20 representatives in the voluntary sector. This aim of this process is to share our emerging findings,
21 and seek comments and feedback, which will also feed into the discussion section of the report.
22
23

24 **DISCUSSION**

25 Systematic reviews of complex interventions are challenging,⁴⁴ interventions in the field of teenage
26 pregnancy prevention are diverse in terms of content, context and implementation factors. To
27 encompass this diversity, the methods for this review are ambitious and innovative, drawing on a
28 number of methodological sources and with a degree of flexibility built in to the design. To ensure
29 the validity and reliability of findings based upon novel research methods our review includes:
30

- 31 • An overall framework to provide structure to the review
 - 32 • A high degree of methodological expertise in the review team
 - 33 • An expert advisory group including access to stakeholders in the field
 - 34 • Feedback from clients/service users to authenticate findings
- 35
36

37 These factors will ensure that we deliver a high quality review with a high degree of relevance in its
38 findings that will be of interest to policy makers and those who design and commission services, as
39 well as making a valuable contribution to the debate on methods for conducting systematic reviews
40 of complex interventions, where understanding complexity is considered important.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Dr Huw Roberts for his invaluable contribution to the study management team and Dr Richa Sinha for her contribution to the development of the search strategies.

Authors' contributions

RhW and NC initiated the study. MH devised the study structure and all authors contributed to its design. RhW, MH and BC drafted the manuscript. AB, MH, DP and JC contributed to the search strategies, BC the quantitative analysis, JN the qualitative analysis and mixed methods synthesis, JRM the realist synthesis, ML, NC and NW the health care perspective, and RTE and JC the health economics. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Technologies Assessment project number 11/141/05. Professor Rhiannon Tudor Edwards and Dr Joanna Charles are funded by Public Health Wales.

Review registration

PROSPERO Registration Number: CRD42012003168

Cochrane Registration number: i=fertility/0068

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Office for National Statistics. UK National Statistics Publication Hub: Conception and fertility rates, 2011.
2. UNICEF. Child poverty and perspective: an overview of child well being in rich countries. Innocenti Report Card 7. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, 2007.
3. Department of Health. Teenage pregnancy strategy: beyond 2010, 2010.
4. Welsh Assembly Government. Sexual Health And Wellbeing Action Plan For Wales, 2010-2015. , 2010.
5. Northern Ireland Department of Health SSaPS. Sexual Health Promotion Strategy & Action Plan 2008 - 2013. , 2008.
6. The Scottish Executive. Respect and Responsibility: Strategy and Action Plan for Improving Sexual Health. , 2005.
7. Rachael Parker et al. Teenage Pregnancy Strategy Evaluation: Final report synthesis, 2005.
8. The Teenage Pregnancy Independent Advisory Group (TPIAG). Teenage pregnancy: You can make a real difference to teenage pregnancy, (undated).
9. Rowlands S. Social Predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy and focused strategies. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2010;24:605-16.
10. Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre. EPPI-Centre methods for conducting systematic reviews: University of London, 2007.
11. Thomas J, Sutcliffe K, Harden A, et al. Children and healthy eating: a systematic review of barriers and facilitators. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, institute of Education, University of London, 2003.
12. Flemming K, Briggs M. Electronic searching to locate qualitative research: evaluation of three strategies. *Journal of advanced nursing* 2006;57(1):95-100.
13. Shaw R, Booth A, Sutton A, et al. Finding qualitative research: an evaluation of search strategies. *BMC Medical research methodology* 2004;4(5).
14. O'Cathain A, Thomas K, Drabble S, et al. What can qualitative research do for randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review. *BMJ Open*, 2013:e002889.
15. NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination: University of York. Preventing and reducing the adverse effects of unintended teenage pregnancies. *Effective health care: Bulletin on the effectiveness of health service interventions for decision makers* 1997;3(1).
16. Oranganje C, Meremikwu M, Eko H, et al. Interventions for preventing unintended pregnancies among adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009(4).
17. Pace R, Pluye P, Bartlett G, et al. Testing the reliability and efficiency of the pilot Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for systematic mixed studies review. *International journal of nursing studies* 2012;49:47-53.
18. Drummond M, Jefferson T, The BMJ Economic Evaluation Working Party. Guidelines for authors and peer reviewers of economic submissions to the BMJ. *BMJ* 1996;313:275-83.
19. Philips Z, Ginnelly L, Sculpher M, et al. Review of guidelines for good practice in decision-analytic modelling in health technology assessment. *Health Technology Assessment* 2004;8(36).
20. Shemilt I, Mugford M, Byford S, et al. Chapter 15: Incorporating economics evidence. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
21. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, et al. GRADE Guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64(4):380-82.
22. Glenton C, Colvin C, Carlsen B, et al. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of lay health worker programmes to improve access to maternal and child health: qualitative evidence synthesis (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013(2).

23. Tennison B. Understanding data, information, and knowledge. In: Pencheon D, Guest C, Melzer D, Muir Gray JA, editors. *Oxford Handbook of Public Health Practice*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
24. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, MacFarlane F, et al. Diffusions of innovation in service organisations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Millbank Quarterly* 2004;82(4):581-629.
25. Ueffing E, Tugwell P, Welch V, et al. for the Campbell and Cochrane Equity Methods Group. Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors. Version 2012-10-02, 2009.
26. Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Section 9.5, Chapter 9: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
27. Sterne J, Egger M, Moher D. Section 10.4.3.1, Chapter 10: Addressing reporting biases In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention. Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
28. Higgins J, Deeks J, Altman D. Section 16.2, Chapter 16: Special topics in statistics. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). In: Higgins JPT, Green S, editors: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
29. Ritchie L, Spencer J. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman A, Burgess R, editors. *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Routledge, 1994:173-94.
30. Pawson R. *Evidence-based policy: a realist perspective*. London: Sage, 2006.
31. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, DeCorby K, et al. Chapter 25. Realist synthesis. In: Gerrish K, Lacey A, editors. *The research process in nursing. 6th edition*. . Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
32. Greenhalgh T, Kristjansson E, Robinson V. Realist review to understand the efficacy of school feeding programmes *BMJ* 2007;335:858-61.
33. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson A, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research *Implementation Science* 2012;7:33.
34. Kelly M, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, et al. (2005). Economic appraisal of public health interventions. London: Health Development Agency, 2005.
35. Medical Research Council. Guidance on the development, evaluation and implementation of complex interventions to improve health, 2008.
36. Vos T, Carter R, Barendregt J, et al. Assessing Cost-Effectiveness in Prevention ACE-Prevention. Retrieved from 2010.
37. Payne K, McAllister M, Davies L. Valuing the economic benefits of complex interventions: When maximising health is not sufficient. *Health Econ*. 201;22(3):258-71.
38. Moher D, Liberat iA, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535.
39. Stroup D, Berlin J, Morton S, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12.
40. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses. *BMC Medicine* 2013.
41. Noyes J, Popay J, Pearson A, et al. Chapter 20: Qualitative research and Cochrane reviews. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
42. Oliver S, Harden A, Rees R, et al. An emerging framework for including different types of evidence in systematic reviews for public policy. *Evaluation* 2005;11:428-46.
43. Thomas J, Harden A, Oakly A, et al. Integrating qualitative research with trials in systematic reviews: an example form public health. *BMJ* 2004;328(1010-12).
44. Shepperd S, Lewin S, Straus S, et al. Can we systematically review studies that evaluate complex interventions? *PLoS Medicine* 2009;6(8):e1000086.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004733 on 10 April 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 19, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intervention Now To Eliminate Repeat Unintended Pregnancy in Teenagers (INTERUPT): A systematic review of intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, qualitative and realist synthesis of implementation factors and user engagement.

Corresponding author:

Rh. Whitaker
Associate Director (Scientific)
North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
Y Wern
Normal Site
Holyhead Road
Bangor University
Bangor
Gwynedd
UK
LL57 2PZ

Email: r.whitaker@bangor.ac.uk

Tel: 01248 382597

Co-authors:

M. Hendry
North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
Bangor University
Wrexham
UK

A. Booth
School of Health and Related Research
University of Sheffield
Sheffield
UK

B. Carter
Institute of Primary Care and Public Health
Cardiff University School of Medicine
Cardiff
UK

J. Charles
Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
Bangor University
Bangor
UK

N. Craine
[Public Health Wales/Iechyd Cyhoeddus Cymru](#)
[Microbiology Department/Adran Microbioleg](#)
[Ysbyty Gwynedd](#)

1 [Bangor](#)
2 [Gwynedd](#)
3 [LL57 2PW](#)
4 [National Public Health Service for Wales](#)
5 [Wales](#)

7 R.T. Edwards
8 Centre for Health Economics & Medicines Evaluation
9 Institute of Medical and Social Care Research
10 Bangor University
11 Bangor
12 UK

15 M.Lyons
16 [Director of Health Protection, Public Health Wales,](#)
17 [Health Protection Team, Health Protection Division,](#)
18 [Temple of Peace,](#)
19 [Cathays Park,](#)
20 [Cardiff, CF10 3NW](#)
21 [National Public Health Service for Wales](#)
22 [Wales](#)

25 J.Noyes
26 Centre for Health Related Research
27 School of Healthcare Sciences
28 Bangor University
29 Bangor
30 UK

32 D.Pasterfield
33 North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research
34 Bangor University
35 Wrexham
36 UK

39 J.Rycroft-Malone
40 Centre for Health Related Research
41 School of Healthcare Sciences
42 Fron Heulog
43 Bangor University
44 Bangor
45 UK

47 N. Williams
48 North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health
49 Bangor University
50 Bangor
51 UK

55 Keywords (up to 5 keywords or phrases suitable for use in an index (recommended to use MeSH
56 terms)

58 Pregnancy in adolescence. Prevention. Public Health. Sexual health interventions. Teenage
59 conceptions
60

Word count: excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables) [48554962](#)

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract**Background**

The United Kingdom has the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe, a fifth are repeat pregnancies. Unintended conceptions can do emotional, psychological and educational harm to teenage girls, often with enduring implications for their life chances. Babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and increased risk of poverty, educational under-achievement and unemployment later in life, with associated societal costs.

Methods

We will conduct a streamed, mixed-methods systematic review to find and evaluate interventions designed to reduce repeat unintended teen pregnancies.

Our aims are to identify:

- Who is at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies?
- Which interventions are effective, cost-effective, how they work, in what setting, and for whom?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to intervention uptake?

Traditional electronic database searches will be augmented by targeted searches for evidence “clusters” and guided by an advisory group of experts and stakeholders.

To address the topic’s inherent complexities we will use a highly structured, innovative and iterative approach combining methodological techniques tailored to each stream of evidence. Quantitative data will be synthesised with reference to Cochrane guidelines for public health interventions. Qualitative evidence addressing facilitators and barriers to the uptake of interventions, experience, and acceptability of interventions will be synthesised thematically. We will apply the principles of realist synthesis to uncover theories and mechanisms underpinning interventions. We will conduct an integration and overarching narrative of findings authenticated by client group feedback.

Ethics and dissemination

We will publish the complete review in “Health Technologies Assessment” and sections in more specialist peer reviewed journals. It will be presented at national and international conferences in the fields of public health, reproductive medicine and review methodology. Findings will be fed back to service users and practitioners via workshops run by the partner collaborators.

Protocol Registration PROSPERO CRD42012003168

INTRODUCTION

Background

Despite data from the United Kingdom that are consistent with a gradual decline in teenage conception rates, the UK continues to have the highest rate of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe.^{1,2} Teenage pregnancies are a target within the *England Teenage Pregnancy Strategy* and their equivalents within the devolved governments of the UK.³⁻⁶ Teenage pregnancies have considerable impacts on the individual wellbeing of teenage parents and their children. Inherent within the national strategy responses, and a range of other national policy documents addressing this issue, is the recognition that babies of teenage mothers have increased mortality in their first year and a significantly increased risk of living in poverty, achieving less at school and being unemployed later in life⁷ with substantial costs to society.

Repeat pregnancies represent a considerable proportion of the overall rate; one fifth of births amongst under 18s are repeat pregnancies⁸ and are thus a crucial potential focus for intervention. Around three quarters of teenage pregnancies are unplanned with up to one half resulting in abortion.³ Within the UK teenage pregnancy is strongly associated with social disadvantage. The social predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy are varied and have been previously usefully grouped into predictors operating at individual, couple, family, community and social level.⁹ These predictors share much common ground with those of first teenage pregnancy.

Aims of the review

The overall aims are to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions for preventing repeat unintended pregnancies amongst adolescents, and to investigate the barriers and facilitators for their implementation and uptake. Whilst these overall aims are broad, the focus will be on the *implementation* of interventions; specific research objectives are to determine:

- What factors characterise subgroups who are at greater risk of repeat unintended pregnancies (i.e. what are the predictors of repeat unintended pregnancy)?
- Which (elements of) interventions appear to be effective, how do they work, in what setting, and for whom (conversely, why are they ineffective, why don't they work)?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to the acceptability, uptake, and implementation of interventions?
- What is the relative cost-effectiveness of interventions?

METHODS

Overall plan of research


Initial scoping searches informed a tailored, 4-phase approach to the review (**Figure 1**). For the overall framework of the mixed method review we will draw upon the structured, phased, EPPI-Centre approach,¹⁰ and use their reviews of young people, pregnancy and social exclusion, and the barriers to and facilitators of children's healthy eating as methodological exemplars.^{10,11} After conducting extensive literature searches, screening the evidence against explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria and appraising study quality, a mapping exercise is undertaken to organise and describe the evidence so as to give a clear picture of the body of research. From this, the scope of the review can be refined in order to focus in depth on the most important areas of the topic in question. Our research will be guided by an expert panel whom we will engage with via a regular agenda item on the quarterly meeting of the [Public Health Wales's Addressing Teenage Conceptions in Wales](#); Task and Finish group, and we will present our findings for feedback and discussion to a group of young people

1 mothers who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood and are in contact with
2 the Flying Start programme.

3 The Task and finish group draws its membership from public health practitioners, policy makers, GP
4 and specialist doctors, midwives, academics and third sector representatives from across Wales with a
5 professional interest in reducing teen conception rates.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Figure 1 Overview of review methods



PHASE 1: IDENTIFYING THE LITERATURE, QUALITY APPRAISAL AND MAPPING THE EVIDENCE.

Search strategies

Principal searches

We will search the following electronic databases for published literature using strategies that combine thesaurus terms and keywords relating to pregnancy, termination of pregnancy or parenthood with adolescence and text word synonyms for repeat or subsequent: Medline & Medline in Process, PsycInfo, CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health Literature), The Cochrane Library (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects, the Health Technology Assessment Database, NHS Economic Evaluation Database), EMBASE (The Excerpta Medica database), BNI (British Nursing Index), ERIC (Educational Resource Index and Abstracts), SocAbs (Sociological Abstracts), ASSIA (Applied Social Sciences Abstract & Indexes), BiblioMap (The EPPI-Centre register of health promotion and public health research), and the Social Sciences Citation Index. We will use a search strategy developed and piloted in Medline (Appendix 1) and subsequently modified for use in the remaining databases (full details available from the authors).

Supplementary searches

Further modified versions of the same strategy will be used to search the following databases for “grey” literature: OpenGrey, Scopus, Scirus, Social Care Online, National Research Register, NIHR portfolio database, and Index to theses. Similarly, to capture economics studies, we will search RePEc (Research Papers in Economics) and EconLit. We will apply an alternative search strategy specifically designed to capture the type of descriptive titles that are common in qualitative studies to selected databases: SocAbs, ASSIA, BNI and the Social Sciences Citation Index. This strategy will combine additional synonyms for “pregnancy”, “adolescence” and “repeat” with a brief qualitative filter comprising three broad free-text terms, “qualitative”, “findings” and “interview\$” that has been shown to be as effective as a more complex one.^{12 13}

Since the issues surrounding implementation of interventions are a primary focus of this review, qualitative and process evaluation evidence associated with trials is highly relevant – particularly to better understanding the facilitators and barriers to implementation.¹⁴ Therefore a key feature of our search strategy will be to identify “evidence clusters” related to key randomised controlled trials; we will use search engines such as Google and Google Scholar, conduct citation searches and contact Principal Investigators to ascertain whether a qualitative/ views study or process evaluation was conducted, as this data is sometimes published separately or not published at all.

We will be further guided by our expert panel, some of whom have frequent contact with young women who have experience of teenage pregnancy and early parenthood; they will inform the direction of our searches by identifying interventions which they may have experienced and giving us feedback. This will help identify areas where evidence is lacking and supplementary searches may be necessary. Additional sources will include the bibliographies of included papers. If necessary we will also hand-search key journals such as the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, the Journal of Adolescent Health, Contraception, the Journal of Adolescence and Health Care, the Journal of Paediatric and Adolescent Gynaecology, Adolescence, Maternal and Child Health Journal

1
2
3 and the Journal of Reproductive Medicine, and make personal contact with professional networks
4 such as the Family Planning Association, reproductive health nursing networks, General
5 Practitioners' fora etc. to identify Department of Health and third sector policy documents and
6 evaluations. Finally we will circulate a list of included studies to key stakeholders and researchers in
7 the field and ask them if they are aware of any important omissions.
8
9

10
11 A number of systematic reviews related to teenage pregnancy have been published in the last two
12 decades. The earliest we found in our scoping search was dated 1997.¹⁵ Therefore we will limit our
13 searches to 1995 onwards but we will conduct a separate search excluding the terms for second or
14 subsequent pregnancies but including a filter for systematic reviews as a means of capturing
15 relevant data from earlier studies.
16

17
18 References will be managed by using bibliographic reference management software (Endnote). Two
19 reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts to identify potentially relevant documents,
20 which will be retrieved and assessed according to the inclusion criteria below. Disagreements will be
21 resolved by discussion or, if necessary, by a third reviewer.
22
23

24 **Study eligibility**

25 **Study type:** Our search strategy will capture published studies of any design including trials of
26 interventions, effectiveness studies; interrupted time series studies (ITS), cost-effectiveness studies,
27 process evaluations, surveys and qualitative studies of participants' views and experiences of
28 interventions. We will also consider relevant grey literature of any type, such as unpublished
29 reports, service evaluations and theses.
30
31

32
33 **Population:** The population of interest is young women, who are aged up to and including 19 years
34 and have had at least one unintended pregnancy, whether the outcome was termination,
35 miscarriage or delivery. Where study populations are mixed, we will include all studies whose
36 reported population comprised at least 75% young women in our target age group.¹⁶
37
38

39
40 **Intervention:** We will include studies of any intervention designed to reduce repeat unintended
41 pregnancies (also referred to as "birth-spacing" or "pregnancy-spacing") in these young women,
42 delivered in any educational, healthcare or community setting. Interventions may have single or
43 multiple components, and could be delivered to individuals or communities. We will also include
44 studies designed to identify risk factors or subgroups at increased risk of repeat unintended
45 pregnancy, where there may be no actual intervention.
46
47

48
49 We will include studies that identify barriers and facilitators to the implementation and uptake of
50 interventions, and explore the views of intervention recipients or providers or health professionals,
51 particularly with regard to whether the intervention was implemented and worked in the way
52 intended. We will look for studies that help us identify programme theories and logic – and we will
53 look for, and develop, candidate theories as to why some young women have more than one
54 unplanned pregnancy, and which could begin to explain the relative success or failure of particular
55 interventions.
56
57
58
59
60

Comparator: Comparators could be no intervention, standard practice, or another intervention. Comparators are likely to be location-specific and standard care in one setting may be seen as an intervention in another setting.

Outcomes and other phenomena of interest

We will report on the primary and secondary outcomes [and other phenomena of interest](#) below. Outcomes will be addressed by a range of evidence types and analytical techniques (see Figure 1).

Primary outcomes and other phenomena of interest:

- Identification of at risk groups
- Identification of barriers and facilitators of interventions relating to:
 - acceptability
 - uptake
 - feasibility of implementation
- Views and experiences of young women, families and professionals
 - Conceptualisation of repeat teenage pregnancy rates as an issue
 - Effectiveness of interventions
 - Uptake of interventions
 - Change in repeat pregnancy rates

Other outcomes and other phenomena of interest:

- Identification of, access to and uptake of reproductive services and social care
- Feasibility of widespread adoption of interventions in health and social care
- Cost of interventions
- Effectiveness of interventions:
 - Change in validated quality of life indices
 - Change in rate of abortion
- Cost-effectiveness of interventions

Study exclusion criteria

We will include published studies from any country as, although there may be different cultural and social attitudes towards teenage pregnancy, they may have a bearing on minority populations within the UK. If any major studies (e.g. randomised controlled trials [or national cohort studies](#)) are found in non-English language publications we will attempt translation. [Smaller qualitative studies or process evaluations published in other languages may be missed but those studies exclusions are unlikely to bias any synthesis of evidence.](#) We will limit our searches for unpublished material to the UK to enhance the direct applicability of the results to the NHS and UK public health bodies. We will not exclude studies on the basis of quality, but will incorporate judgements about study quality when interpreting the evidence.

Quality appraisal

RCTs and quasi-RCTs will be assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias (RoB);¹² we will categorise and report the overall risk of bias of each of the included trials:

- Low risk of bias (plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter the results) if all criteria were met;

- Unclear risk of bias (plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results) if one or more criteria were assessed as unclear; or
- High risk of bias (plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results) if one or more criteria were not met

The Cochrane RoB tool will be supplemented by the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for mixed studies reviews.¹⁷ This tool has the advantage of incorporating the appraisal of several different study designs (qualitative, RCT, non-RCT, observational, mixed methods) using a single tool with a coherent range of quality criteria. Piloting suggests the MMAT is an efficient and reliable tool, however it does not cover economic evaluations so we will also use the Drummond checklist¹⁸ and the Phillips checklist¹⁹ recommended for economic studies and economic models respectively.²⁰ Where the evidence comprises, for example, policy documents or reports of locally implemented initiatives, it is unlikely that we will be able to formally assess quality. We will therefore take a broad view of the evidence as being most relevant for the context and be guided by the advisory group as to its merit.

Certainty of evidence

We will use GRADE, as the accepted approach to assessing the certainty of findings of reviews of effectiveness²¹ but, since GRADE is not suitable for appraising the certainty of qualitative evidence, will also use a recently developed method, CerQual (certainty of the quality of evidence).²² The CerQual approach is based on the methodological limitations of individual studies contributing to the review finding, in this case indicated by the MMAT tool, combined with the coherence of each review finding. Coherence is assessed by the extent to which a clear pattern is identifiable across the individual study data, and is strengthened where findings are consistent across multiple contexts or where variation across individual studies is explained, especially where studies contributing to the finding are drawn from a wide range of settings. CerQual is similar to GRADE in that both approaches aim to assess the *certainty* of (or confidence in) the evidence and both rate this certainty for each finding across studies rather than for each individual study. GRADE also bases its assessment on a combination of the quality of the evidence and other factors, including consistency across studies.

Mapping the evidence

We will undertake a mapping exercise following EPPI-Centre methods.¹⁰ We will assign codes to records using lists that we will develop of pre-defined keywords to aid the sorting and grouping of documents for mapping and synthesis. Keywords will be related to, for example: the study design or type of record (intervention study, process evaluation, qualitative study, report etc.), the country and health, educational or community setting in which the study took place, the topic or focus of the study/report, the population focus of the study/report and study design. From the coding exercise we will develop a descriptive map of the literature and identify gaps in the research. The map will also provide a context for interpreting the results of the synthesis and a basis for refining the scope of the review i.e. it will aid the advisory group in identifying areas for in-depth focus and, possibly, areas where additional searches need to be conducted. The advisory group will meet with the review group late in phase 1 to discuss the results of the mapping exercise and to ratify or recommend refinements to that work which would be needed prior to the completion of Phase 2 where the evidence will be selected and prioritised for in depth review.

PHASE 2: SELECTING AND PRIORITISING THE EVIDENCE FOR IN DEPTH REVIEW AND DATA-EXTRACTION

Study selection

The review team, with advice from the advisory group obtained during the mapping exercise, will prioritise the evidence for in-depth review. Beginning with evidence relating to primary outcomes, and within each grouped set of data we will prioritise the best quality evidence of most relevance to address the research questions. We will be particularly interested in “evidence clusters”, i.e. trials of interventions accompanied by qualitative studies, process evaluations, reports etc.; “sibling” studies, i.e. trials of interventions paired with qualitative studies using the same participants, and “orphan” studies where effectiveness studies and views studies relate to similar interventions and populations (and so can inform each other) although the actual participants are different. These studies have the potential to indicate the effectiveness of an intervention as well as its acceptability to users and barriers to implementation and uptake. We will apply the CART framework, where evidence is judged on the criteria of Completeness, Accuracy, Relevance and Timeliness.²³ Thus we will prioritise the evidence according to relevance and stop when data-saturation is reached.

Study selection for the Cochrane Review

We have registered the title with the Cochrane Fertility Regulation review group, and will develop a separate Cochrane protocol to be published in the Cochrane library. The main difference between the Cochrane protocol and this HTA protocol is that we will adapt the inclusion and exclusion criteria to exclude unpublished evidence and PhD theses from the Cochrane review. The intention is to follow the same design and methods across the two reviews. This variation in inclusion criteria between the Cochrane and HTA reviews offers an opportunity to undertake a sensitivity analysis to see what contribution unpublished evidence makes to overall outcomes and interpretation of evidence. The Cochrane Collaboration is also calling for exemplar reviews of complex interventions where complexity is considered important. The Cochrane version of the HTA review has the potential to be classified as an ‘innovative’ review in the Cochrane library and would be one of the first to demonstrate the value of an additional realist synthesis in understanding complexity at multiple levels of context, intervention and implementation.

Data Extraction

We will create a bespoke set of data-extraction forms to collect data from each study: study characteristics (design, sample type, sample size etc.); description of intervention or risk factors; contextual factors in the study setting; outcomes including costs of implementing intervention; programme theories or mechanisms described by the authors in the rationale behind the intervention or postulated in the explanation of the results. We will draw on the components of Greenhalgh et al’s framework²⁴ to map facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation, including characteristics of the intervention (e.g. risk, complexity, acceptability), the contextual elements that influence whether it might be used or not (e.g. resources, organisation of services, leadership), and what implementation processes are required to implement the intervention (e.g. change agents, project management support, communication). Data extraction will be undertaken by two reviewers independently; disagreements will be resolved by discussion.

Study summaries

We will present the findings of the data extraction exercise in a table of study characteristics. This will include: the study details; setting; population; quality score; methods; etc. We will present socio-demographic characteristics known to be important from an equity perspective. For this process, the PROGRESS (Place, Race, Occupation, Gender, Religion, Education, Socio-economic status (SES), Social [statuscapital](#)) framework will be utilised.²⁵

PHASE 3: EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS BY TYPE OF EVIDENCE

Data to be considered in this review will be extremely diverse, and data synthesis complex. The choice of synthesis method depends on the questions addressed and the type of data included; in this review there are many questions, and diverse data. **Figure 1** illustrates the method of synthesis proposed for each evidence type.

Quantitative synthesis

Measures of intervention effect: We will present quantitative continuous outcomes on the original scale as reported in each individual study. These may be standardised, if they use different scales, by dividing the estimated mean difference by its standard deviation (SD). Dichotomous outcome data will be fitted with a random effects model using the Mantel Haenzel test and presented as risk ratio (RR). ITS studies will be analysed by using the rate change (α), and slope (β) parameters as the intervention effect. Time to event data will be analysed using hazard ratios as the intervention effect. All outcomes data will be reported as their effect size with associated 95% confidence intervals.

Unit of assessment: We anticipate that many of the studies will be clustered by community, service, or geographical area. Where possible cluster RCTs (or quasi-RCTs) that do not account for the correlated nature of the data will be reanalysed by inflating the study standard. If this is not possible we will report only the point estimate, and adjust the 'other risk of bias' to account for the likely impact of not accounting for the clustering.

Multiple time-points per outcome in non-ITS study designs: If RCT, quasi-RCT or cohort studies are found reporting repeated incidence of repeat pregnancy over time, these outcomes will be defined and summarised at both short and long term time. We will follow the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group (EPOC) and non-randomised studies methods group guidance on incorporating these diverse types of evidence in the review.

Assessment of heterogeneity: We will assess both [heterogeneity of the populations, context and interventions \(clinical\)](#) and statistical heterogeneity. Clinical heterogeneity will be assessed by examining the characteristics of the studies, the similarity between the types of participants, and the interventions, whilst statistical heterogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 statistic. We will report heterogeneity as important if it is at least moderate to substantial by $I^2 > 30\%$ and will not pool data if the statistical heterogeneity is severe $I^2 > 90\%$; If there is statistical heterogeneity between 60 to 90% and this can be explained by clinical reasoning and a coherent argument can be made for combining the studies, they will be entered into a meta-analysis. After exploring the heterogeneity where a coherent scientific argument is not found the included study causing the heterogeneity will be excluded and the analysis repeated as a sensitivity analysis. Where the heterogeneity cannot be

adequately explained, the data will not be pooled in a meta-analysis. In this case, or when only single outcomes are reported, we will present study findings in tables and explore the relationships within and between studies in a narrative summary.²⁶

Assessment of reporting biases: Where there are an adequate number of studies (nominally at least 10) an assessment of reporting bias will be carried out by testing for funnel plot asymmetry.²⁷ Funnel plots will only be presented where there is some evidence of asymmetry in the plots. Possible sources of asymmetry will then be explored with an additional sensitivity analysis and the studies at greatest risk of bias will be removed and the most likely unbiased intervention effect will be summarised in the meta-analyses.

Dealing with missing data: Where we have missing, or unclear data or information, we will contact the investigators of the primary research. Following this correspondence data may be re-analysed according to a treatment by allocation principle whenever possible.²⁸ If loss to follow up data is not fully reported and authors have conducted a per-protocol analysis we will inspect the degree of imbalance in the dropout between the groups to determine the potential impact of bias. In the absence of a treatment by allocation population, we will use an available case population. Where possible an intention to treat analysis will be carried out. In cases where non-ITT analyses are reported we may report the missing data using a best-worst and worst-best scenario analysis if an adequate number of studies were included in a meta-analysis (nominally three).²⁸ Where there are missing variances, these will be imputed using methods that will be highlighted explicitly in the methods section and the assumptions fully described.

Subgroup analysis: Subgroups included and highlighted within the primary research as important confounders will be used to identify risk factors. If there are adequate studies we will investigate the following subgroup of studies, or subgroups within studies to try to identify differences in intervention effectiveness: age of mother; deprivation index of area; length of follow up; history of substance misuse; looked after children (or care leavers).

Qualitative studies

For qualitative studies or qualitative elements in mixed-method studies we will develop an a priori coding framework specifically designed to address questions and issues of interest and conduct thematic syntheses using the Framework method developed by Ritchie & Spencer.²⁹ We will use Greehalgh et al's framework to support the synthesis of findings about the facilitators and barriers to intervention implementation.²⁴

Surveys, process evaluations and other types of data

Data from surveys, process evaluations and other sources e.g. reports may be either semi-qualitative or quantitative or both. Data may be extracted to present evidence of acceptability or uptake of interventions and synthesised in a narrative summary or aggregated using thematic analysis.

Realist synthesis

We will select subsets of evidence and apply the principles of realist synthesis.³⁰⁻³² We will identify explicit or implicit *theories* by which it is postulated how an intervention has an underlying causal *mechanism* that works in a defined social *context* to result in a particular outcome. Such theories

1
2
3 may also be used to explain the failure of an intervention to work. Additional theories will be
4 identified from the wider literature (e.g. policy documents), the advisory group members, or
5 personal contact with other experts in the field. Data synthesis will involve individual reflection and
6 team discussion and will question the integrity of each theory, adjudicate between competing
7 theories, consider the same theory in different settings, and compare the stated theory with actual
8 practice.³³ Coded data from the studies will then be used to confirm, refute or refine the candidate
9 theories. Thus we will attempt to explain what interventions work, for whom, and in what
10 circumstances.
11
12

14 **Investigation of risk factors using meta-regression**

15 A key aim of the review will be to search, identify and summarise the population of young girls that
16 are at greatest risk of repeat pregnancy (for example considering income, social deprivation,
17 ethnicity, degree of rurality, substance misuse, currently in care or care leavers, those from a
18 vulnerable or in at risk communities) . We anticipate that these factors will be considered and
19 summarised as important confounding variables within RCTs, quasi-RCTs, CBAs for studies
20 investigating an intervention to reduce repeat pregnancies. We will also identify non-interventional
21 studies that present epidemiological data (e.g. cohort studies, cross sectional studies and policy
22 documents) of effect modifiers associated with an increased risk of repeat pregnancy. Data will be
23 extracted and summarised and if possible presented in a meta-regression of summarising the
24 standardised effect sizes, with their associated 95% confidence intervals.
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Cost-effectiveness**

31 We will provide a narrative review of economic evaluations of interventions specifically designed to
32 address the issue in question. We will stratify any economic studies found by the public health lever
33 mechanism used e.g. government, statutory or legal, public information, school based group or
34 targeted intervention, NHS initiated, charity initiated. We will be particularly interested in
35 perspective of analysis, type of economic evaluation (e.g. cost analysis, cost-benefit analysis, cost-
36 effectiveness analysis, cost-utility analysis). We will document the way that these studies have
37 attempted to overcome the particular methodological challenges of this type of complex,
38 preventative, behaviour change based intervention.³⁴⁻³⁷ Where possible, we will conduct meta-
39 analysis of the economic evidence (if there is sufficient homogeneity to allow it).
40
41
42
43

44 **PHASE 4: OVERARCHING SYNTHESSES**

46 **Reporting the studies**

47 Results will be presented with reference to the PRISMA reporting guidelines for systematic
48 reviews,³⁸ the MOOSE guidelines for Meta-analyses of observational studies³⁹ and the RAMESES
49 publication standards for realist syntheses.⁴⁰ We will summarise the evidence for each outcome in a
50 summary of findings table.
51
52

54 **Overarching narrative synthesis and interpretation of findings**

55 We will conduct an overarching narrative synthesis, juxtaposing the qualitative and quantitative data
56 on service user views and implementation issues and comparing programme theories with
57 effectiveness.⁴¹ To aid this process we will develop a methodological and conceptual matrix or logic
58
59
60

1
2
3 model to integrate our findings.^{42 43} The processes involved in this review are essentially iterative;
4 thus we anticipate that the mapping exercise and the work on relevant programme theory will
5 contribute towards a framework for the meta-synthesis.
6
7

8 **Discussing the evidence**

9 Within the discussion we will consider the following areas:
10

- 11 • Summary of findings, strength and certainty of evidence
 - 12 • Strengths and limitations of the review
 - 13 • Implications for UK policy and practice, including intervention implementation
 - 14 • Implications for further research
- 15
16
17

18 During the draft stage of the final report a consultation process, defined and facilitated by the
19 frontline organisations engaged with our team, will be undertaken with service users via their
20 representatives in the voluntary sector. This aim of this process is to share our emerging findings,
21 and seek comments and feedback, which will also feed into the discussion section of the report.
22
23

24 **DISCUSSION**

25 Systematic reviews of complex interventions are challenging,⁴⁴ interventions in the field of teenage
26 pregnancy prevention are diverse in terms of content, context and implementation factors. To
27 encompass this diversity, the methods for this review are ambitious and innovative, drawing on a
28 number of methodological sources and with a degree of flexibility built in to the design. To ensure
29 the validity and reliability of findings based upon novel research methods our review includes:
30

- 31 • An overall framework to provide structure to the review
 - 32 • A high degree of methodological expertise in the review team
 - 33 • An expert advisory group including access to stakeholders in the field
 - 34 • Feedback from clients/service users to authenticate findings
- 35
36

37 These factors will ensure that we deliver a high quality review with a high degree of relevance in its
38 findings that will be of interest to policy makers and those who design and commission services, as
39 well as making a valuable contribution to the debate on methods for conducting systematic reviews
40 of complex interventions, where understanding complexity is considered important.
41
42

43 **Review registration**

44 PROSPERO Registration Number: CRD42012003168
45

46 Cochrane Registration number: i=fertility/0068
47
48

49 **Competing interests**

50 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
51
52

53 **Authors' contributions**

54 RhW and NC initiated the study. MH devised the study structure and all authors contributed to its
55 design. RhW, MH and BC drafted the manuscript. AB, MH, DP and JC contributed to the search
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 strategies, BC the quantitative analysis, JN the qualitative analysis and mixed methods synthesis,
4 JRM the realist synthesis, ML, NC and NW the health care perspective, and RTE and JC the health
5 economics. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
6
7

8 Funding

9
10 This work is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Technologies Assessment
11 project number 11/141/05. Professor Rhiannon Tudor Edwards and Dr Joanna Charles are funded
12 by Public Health Wales.
13

14 Acknowledgements

15
16 The authors wish to thank Dr Huw Roberts for his invaluable contribution to the study management
17 team and Dr Richa Sinha for her contribution to the development of the search strategies.
18
19


20 References

- 21
22
23 1. Office for National Statistics. UK National Statistics Publication Hub: Conception and fertility rates,
24 2011.
25 2. UNICEF. Child poverty and perspective: an overview of child well being in rich countries. Innocenti
26 Report Card 7. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, 2007.
27 3. Department of Health. Teenage pregnancy strategy: beyond 2010, 2010.
28 4. Welsh Assembly Government. Sexual Health And Wellbeing Action Plan For Wales, 2010-2015. ,
29 2010.
30 5. Northern Ireland Department of Health SSaPS. Sexual Health Promotion Strategy & Action Plan
31 2008 - 2013. , 2008.
32 6. The Scottish Executive. Respect and Responsibility: Strategy and Action Plan for Improving Sexual
33 Health. , 2005.
34 7. Rachael Parker et al. Teenage Pregnancy Strategy Evaluation: Final report synthesis, 2005.
35 8. The Teenage Pregnancy Independent Advisory Group (TPIAG). Teenage pregnancy: You can make
36 a real difference to teenage pregnancy, (undated).
37 9. Rowlands S. Social Predictors of repeat adolescent pregnancy and focused strategies. *Best Practice*
38 *& Research Clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 2010;24:605-16.
39 10. ~~Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre. EPPI-Centre methods for~~
40 ~~conducting systematic reviews: University of London, 2007. Gough D, Oliver S, Thomas J.~~
41 ~~(2012) Introduction to systematic reviews. London: Sage.~~
42
43 11. Thomas J, Sutcliffe K, Harden A, Oliver S, Rees R, Brunton G, et al. Children and healthy eating: a
44 systematic review of barriers and facilitators. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research
45 Unit, institute of Education, University of London, 2003.
46 12. Flemming K, Briggs M. Electronic searching to locate qualitative research: evaluation of three
47 strategies. *Journal of advanced nursing* 2006;57(1):95-100.
48 13. Shaw R, Booth A, Sutton A, Miller T, Smith J, Young B, et al. Finding qualitative research: an
49 evaluation of search strategies. *BMC Medical research methodology* 2004;4(5).
50 14. O'Cathain A, Thomas K, Drabble S, Rudolph A, Hewison J. What can qualitative research do for
51 randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review. *BMJ Open*, 2013:e002889.
52 15. NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination: University of York. Preventing and reducing the
53 adverse effects of unintended teenage pregnancies. *Effective health care: Bulletin on the*
54 *effectiveness of health service interventions for decision makers* 1997;3(1).
55
56
57
58
59
60

16. Oringanje C, Meremikwu M, Eko H, Esu E, Meremikwu A, Ehir ij. Interventions for preventing unintended pregnancies among adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009(4).
17. Pace R, Pluye P, Bartlett G, Macaulay A, Salsberg J, Jagosh J, et al. Testing the reliability and efficiency of the pilot Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for systematic mixed studies review. *International journal of nursing studies* 2012;49:47-53.
18. Drummond M, Jefferson T, The BMJ Economic Evaluation Working Party. Guidelines for authors and peer reviewers of economic submissions to the BMJ. *BMJ* 1996;313:275-83.
19. Philips Z, Ginnelly L, Sculpher M, Claxton K, Golder S, Riemsma R, et al. Review of guidelines for good practice in decision-analytic modelling in health technology assessment. *Health Technology Assessment* 2004;8(36).
20. Shemilt I, Mugford M, Byford S, Drummond M, Eisenstein E, Knapp M, et al. Chapter 15: Incorporating economics evidence. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
21. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE Guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64(4):380-82.
22. Glenton C, Colvin C, Carlsen B, Swartz A, Lewin S, Noyes J, et al. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of lay health worker programmes to improve access to maternal and child health: qualitative evidence synthesis (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013(2).
23. Tennison B. Understanding data, information, and knowledge. In: Pencheon D, Guest C, Melzer D, Muir Gray JA, editors. *Oxford Handbook of Public Health Practice*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 2006.
24. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, MacFarlane F, Bate P, O K. Diffusions of innovation in service organisations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Millbank Quarterly* 2004;82(4):581-629.
25. Ueffing E, Tugwell P, Welch V, Petticrew M, Kristjansson E, for the Campbell and Cochrane Equity Methods Group. Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors. Version 2012-10-02, 2009.
26. Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Section 9.5, Chapter 9: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
27. Sterne J, Egger M, Moher D. Section 10.4.3.1, Chapter 10: Addressing reporting biases In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Intervention. Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
28. Higgins J, Deeks J, Altman D. Section 16.2, Chapter 16: Special topics in statistics. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*. In: Higgins JPT, Green S, editors: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
29. Ritchie L, Spencer J. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman A, Burgess R, editors. *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Routledge, 1994:173-94.
30. Pawson R. *Evidence-based policy: a realist perspective*. London: Sage, 2006.
31. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, DeCorby K, Hutchinson A. Chapter 25. Realist synthesis. In: Gerrish K, Lacey A, editors. *The research process in nursing. 6th edition*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
32. Greenhalgh T, Kristjansson E, Robinson V. Realist review to understand the efficacy of school feeding programmes *BMJ* 2007;335:858-61.
33. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson A, DeCorby K, Bucknall T, Kent B, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research *Implementation Science* 2012;7:33.
34. Kelly M, McDaid D, Ludbrook A, Powell J. (2005). Economic appraisal of public health interventions. London: Health Development Agency, 2005.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 35. Medical Research Council. Guidance on the development, evaluation and implementation of
- 5 complex interventions to improve health, 2008.
- 6 36. Vos T, Carter R, Barendregt J, Mihalopoulos C, Veerman L, Magnus A, et al. Assessing Cost-
- 7 Effectiveness in Prevention ACE–Prevention. Retrieved from 2010.
- 8 37. Payne K, McAllister M, Davies L. Valuing the economic benefits of complex interventions: When
- 9 maximising health is not sufficient. *Health Econ.* 201;22(3):258-71.
- 10 38. Moher D, Liberat iA, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, Group -TP. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
- 11 Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535.
- 12 39. Stroup D, Berlin J, Morton S, Olkin I, Williamson G, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational
- 13 studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in
- 14 Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12.
- 15 40. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards:
- 16 realist syntheses. *BMC Medicine* 2013.
- 17 41. Noyes J, Popay J, Pearson A, Hannes K, Booth A. Chapter 20: Qualitative research and Cochrane
- 18 reviews. In: Higgins J, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
- 19 *Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011)*: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
- 20 42. Oliver S, Harden A, Rees R, Shepherd J, Brunton G, Garcia L, et al. An emerging framework for
- 21 including different types of evidence in systematic reviews for public policy. *Evaluation*
- 22 2005;11:428-46.
- 23 43. Thomas J, Harden A, Oakly A, Oliver S, Sutcliffe S, Rees R, et al. Integrating qualitative research
- 24 with trials in systematic reviews: an example form public health. *BMJ* 2004;328(1010-12).
- 25 44. Shepperd S, Lewin S, Straus S, Clarke M, Eccles M, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Can we systematically
- 26 review studies that evaluate complex interventions? *PLoS Medicine* 2009;6(8):e1000086.
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

Figure 1 Overview of review methods



90x63mm (300 x 300 DPI)

view only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60