

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Improving conduct and reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data (ICONS-Quant): protocol for a mixed methods study to develop a reporting guideline

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020064
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Oct-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Campbell, Mhairi; University of Glasgow, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Katikireddi, Srinivasa; University of Glasgow, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Sowden, Amanda; University of York, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination McKenzie, Joanne; Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine Thomson, Hilary; University of Glasgow, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit
Keywords:	STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, evidence synthesis, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Improving conduct and reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data (ICONS-Quant):**
4 **protocol for a mixed methods study to develop a reporting guideline**
5
6
7

8 Mhairi Campbell¹ MPhil, Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi¹ FFPH, Amanda Sowden² PhD, Joanne E
9

10 McKenzie³ PhD, Hilary Thomson¹ PhD
11
12
13

14 ¹MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.
15

16 ²Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, UK.
17

18 ³School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
19
20
21
22

23 Corresponding author:

24 Mhairi Campbell
25

26 MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow
27

28 200 Renfield Street, Glasgow, G2 3QB.
29

30 Mhairi.Campbell@glasgow.ac.uk
31

32 0141 353 7601
33
34
35

36 Keywords: systematic review; narrative synthesis; health; evidence synthesis
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

Introduction: Reliable evidence syntheses, based on rigorous systematic reviews, provide essential support for evidence-informed clinical practice and health policy. Systematic reviews should use reproducible and transparent methods to draw conclusions from the available body of evidence.

Narrative synthesis of quantitative data (NS) is a method commonly used in systematic reviews where it may not be appropriate, or possible, to meta-analyse estimates of intervention effects. A common criticism of NS is that it is opaque and subject to author interpretation, casting doubt on the trustworthiness of a review's conclusions. Despite published guidance funded by the UK's Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) on the conduct of NS, recent work suggests that this guidance is rarely used and many review authors appear to be unclear about best practice. To improve the way that NS is conducted and reported, we are developing a reporting guideline for NS of quantitative data.

Methods: We will assess how NS is implemented and reported in Cochrane systematic reviews and the findings will inform the creation of a Delphi consensus exercise by an expert panel. We will use this Delphi survey to develop a checklist for reporting standards for NS. This will be accompanied by supplementary guidance on the conduct and reporting of NS, as well as an online training resource.

Ethics and dissemination: Ethics approval for the Delphi survey will be obtained from the University of Glasgow. Dissemination of the results of this study will be through peer-reviewed publications, national and international conferences.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study will describe reporting practice in recently published (2016-2017) Cochrane systematic reviews of interventions that use NS.
- An online Delphi survey of international experts in NS will be used to develop a consensus based reporting guideline for NS of quantitative data.
- The reporting guideline will be accompanied by online training resources.
- The reporting guideline and the supplementary materials developed to support use of existing guidance will aid the implementation of best practice conduct and reporting of NS.
- The outputs of this project will be incorporated into a resource for authors of Cochrane systematic reviews. Cochrane is a global leader in the production of evidence syntheses of healthcare interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Well conducted systematic reviews are important for informing clinical practice and health policy.[1]

In some reviews, meta-analysis of effect estimates may not be possible or sensible. For example, sufficient data may not allow calculation of standardised effect estimates, the effect metrics arising from different study designs may not be amenable to synthesis (e.g. those arising from interrupted time series and randomised trials), or high levels of statistical heterogeneity may mean that presenting an average effect is misleading. For reviews of quantitative data where statistical synthesis is not possible, narrative synthesis of quantitative data (NS) is often the alternative method of choice. A major concern about NS is that it lacks transparency and therefore introduces bias into the synthesis.[2 3] This is an important criticism, which raises questions about the validity and utility of reviews using NS, and ultimately adding to research waste.[4] NS involves collating study findings into a coherent textual narrative, with descriptions of differences in characteristics of the studies including context and validity, often using tables and graphs to display results.[5 6] Published Guidance for NS funded by the UK's Economics & Social science Research Council (ESRC) describes techniques for promoting transparency between review level data and conclusions; these include graphical and structured tabulation of the data.[5] However, a recent analysis of systematic reviews of public health interventions suggests that this guidance is rarely used.[7]

Relative to developments in meta-analysis or statistical synthesis, and synthesis of qualitative data in the past decade, work to support improved conduct and transparent reporting in NS has been scarce. While a reporting guideline has been developed for systematic reviews and meta-analysis, the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA),[8] the focus of the synthesis items is on meta-analysis of effect estimates, with no items for alternative approaches to synthesis. The Cochrane Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR) provide standards for conducting and reporting Cochrane reviews. They include one general item referring to non-quantitative synthesis or non-statistical synthesis, and do not have any items

1
2
3 specifically for NS.[2] Reporting guidelines have had some impact on improving the reporting for
4 randomised trials and may have similar benefits for improving the reporting of methods and results
5
6
7 from NS.[9]
8
9

10 There is a growing demand for reviews addressing complex questions, and which incorporate diverse
11 sources of data. Cochrane, a global leader in evidence synthesis of health and public health
12 interventions, has recognised this.[10] Following the prioritisation of relevance and breadth of
13 coverage in the Cochrane 2020 strategy,[10] it is likely that the proportion of Cochrane reviews
14 addressing complex questions will increase; this may result in increased use of NS methods. Realising
15 the need for improved implementation and reporting of NS methods, the Cochrane Strategic
16 Methods Fund (SMF) has funded the ICONS-Quant project: Improving CONduct and reporting of
17 Narrative Synthesis of quantitative data. This paper presents the protocol for the work that will be
18 undertaken.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **ICONS-Quant**

34
35
36 The ICONS-Quant project aims to improve the implementation of NS methods through enhancing
37 existing guidance on the conduct of NS and developing a reporting guideline. Provision of reporting
38 guidelines alone will not necessarily lead to improved research conduct; provision of explanatory
39 guidance, dissemination, endorsement, and support for adherence is also necessary.[11] We will
40 produce materials to support the implementation of best practice in the application of NS methods,
41 and improved reporting. While our focus is on Cochrane reviews, the key outputs of the project will
42 be of use for reviews published elsewhere and will be made freely available. We will:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

- 51 • describe current practice in conduct and reporting of NS in Cochrane reviews
 - 52 • achieve expert consensus on reporting standards for NS
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- provide support for those involved in NS through the provision of enhanced guidance on NS conduct and online training resources

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The ICONS-Quant project will be conducted over a period of 24 months from May 2017. Here, we outline the development of a reporting guideline for NS and supporting materials for existing guidance. In line with recommendations for best practice in developing reporting guidelines,[11] we will:

- identify the need for the ICONS-Quant guideline (Work Programme One)
- conduct a Delphi survey and consensus meeting (Work Programme Two)
- enhance existing guidance on NS (Work Programme Three)
- develop learning materials for implementation of NS (Work Programme Four)

Below we outline the Project Advisory Group and the research that will be conducted within each Work Programme. Details of the ICONS-Quant project have been registered with the Enhancing the quality and Transparency of Health Research (EQUATOR) Network, which provides a database of reporting guidelines in development (<http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#74>).

Project Advisory Group

We have established an ICONS-Quant Project Advisory Group (PAG) which will provide governance for the project as well as expert advice. The ICONS PAG includes named project collaborators from Cochrane Review Groups (Effective Practice and Organisation of Care, Consumers and Communication, and Tobacco Addiction), a representative with experience of NS from the Campbell Collaboration Methods Group, and a user representative from the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE).

Work Programme One: assessment of current reporting and conduct of NS in Cochrane reviews

Previously we investigated current practice in the conduct and reporting of NS in systematic reviews of public health interventions.[7] Work Programme One will extend this exercise to assess use of NS methods and their reporting across all Cochrane Review Groups. We will identify Cochrane reviews published between April 2016 and April 2017 that use NS or that synthesise studies using text only, and record how the synthesis has been conducted and reported. We will use the existing data extraction template designed for our previous assessment of NS in public health reviews. This template is based on key sources of best practice for NS,[12-15] including the ESRC guidance on the conduct of NS.[5]. Questions relate to use of theory; investigation of differences across included studies and reported findings; transparency of links between data and text (including data visualisation tools used); assessment of robustness of the synthesis; and adequacy of description of NS methods.[5] Using a similar format to our review of NS in public health reviews,[16] we will tabulate the extracted data. This will allow description of:

- the extent of reporting of narrative synthesis methods: the amount and type of detail included
- the range of approaches and tools used to narratively synthesise data
- how conceptual and methodological heterogeneity is managed
- review authors' reflection on robustness of synthesis

The results of this exercise will be used to inform development of the initial checklist for inclusion in the Delphi survey.

Work Programme Two: Delphi Survey

A Delphi consensus survey will be conducted. This is the standard approach to elicit expert opinion for the purposes of developing consensus based reporting guidelines.[17 18] The results of the

1
2
3 assessment exercise in Work Programme One, in conjunction with key texts on NS,[12-15 19 20]
4 findings from the previous assessment of reporting NS in public health reviews,[16] and input from
5 the ICONS PAG will be used to develop the initial items for Round One of the Delphi survey. An
6 expert panel will then be consulted to inform the development of the Delphi survey. The panel will
7 be identified by the project team and members of the ICONS PAG, and will comprise 15-20 authors
8 and methodologists experienced in or familiar with the purpose and conduct of NS. A video-
9 conference with the expert panel will be used to present findings from Work Programme One and a
10 draft of the proposed Delphi survey. Participants' input will be recorded and used to refine the
11 Delphi survey.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The Delphi online survey will use a questionnaire to achieve consensus on the content and wording
24 of reporting items considered to capture the pertinent details of NS. The on-line platform will be
25 created by the MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, using a web-
26 based platform recently developed for this purpose. The platform facilitates personalised invitations
27 to participate, password protected logins, personalised reminders, and enables data collation for
28 quantitative and qualitative analysis. There will be two rounds of the survey, with a third version
29 conducted if necessary to gain consensus among participants.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Participants will include members of the ICONS PAG, and others experienced in NS. Suitable
40 participants will be identified by the project team, and through recommendations from the ICONS
41 PAG, and through the data extraction exercise described in Work Programme One. We will invite a
42 maximum of 100 individuals to participate and they will be recruited via their workplace email
43 address. We will ask for their professional opinion on the content of a draft reporting guideline. The
44 invitation will outline the aim of the Delphi survey, the process involved, the time commitment, and
45 include a participant information sheet. Individuals who accept the invitation will be asked to take
46 part in each round of the survey. It will be clearly stated that at any stage, a respondent can opt out
47 of the Delphi survey. The survey will ask participants to provide details of their job category; no
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 personal information will be collected. Respondents will be asked to use their email address to log in
4
5 to the survey. This information will be used only to verify the appropriate use of the survey and will
6
7 not be used in the analysis. The Delphi survey will involve implied consent: it will be made clear to
8
9 participants that by responding to the survey, they are consenting to participate in the study. It will
10
11 be explained to respondents that: their responses will not be linked to their identity (de-identified),
12
13 only researchers will have access to the data, and the data will be stored on a password encrypted
14
15 computer and stored and destroyed in accordance with MRC guidelines.
16
17

18 Round One

19
20
21 The Delphi survey will consist of closed and open-ended questions. Round One of the survey will
22
23 provide an introduction to the project and instructions for the survey. The participants will be invited
24
25 to rank each of the proposed guideline items on a four-point Likert Scale (essential, desirable,
26
27 possible, omit). For each item, the participants will be invited to provide comments. A reminder
28
29 email will be sent approximately two weeks after the initial invitation. Round One will close
30
31 approximately four weeks after the first invitations are issued. Responses to Round One of the
32
33 Delphi will be exported verbatim into a Microsoft Excel© spreadsheet and collated. Responses to
34
35 the scale rating will be summarised as counts and percentage frequencies. The free text content will
36
37 be collated and summarised. The results from both the quantitative and qualitative data collation
38
39 will be used to inform the development of Round Two of the Delphi and the content of the final
40
41 guideline checklist. Redrafting of the Delphi survey items will be conducted in discussion with all
42
43 study group members within one month of closure of the round.
44
45
46
47

48 Round Two

49
50
51 All participants from Round One will be invited to take part in Round Two. In Round Two the
52
53 proposed checklist items will be presented in three sections:
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 1. Items that reached high consensus in Round One and that are expected to be included in the final
4 checklist. These items will have an a priori agreement of >70% approval, as recommended by
5 Diamond et al.[21] Participants will not be asked to rate these items again but will be asked to
6 comment on whether they agree with the inclusion of each item in the checklist and to provide
7 comments if they disagree or with suggestions to clarify the wording of the items.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 2. Items that have been significantly altered or are additional as a result of Round One. The
15 participants will be invited to rate these items on the four-point scale and provide comments on
16 each item.
17
18

19
20
21
22 3. Items that were rated as 'omit' in Round One and that are not expected to be included in the final
23 checklist. Participants will not be asked to rate these items; they will be invited to provide their
24 opinion on the removal of these items from the final checklist.
25
26

27
28
29 If there a substantial lack of consensus remaining following Round Two of the Delphi, a third round
30 will be prepared and conducted. Round Three will follow the same format as Round Two, providing
31 the reporting guideline items in three sections: items that are expected to be included in the final
32 guideline; those significantly altered; and items that will be removed from the final checklist.
33
34
35

36 37 38 39 Consensus meeting

40
41
42 An expert panel of individuals experienced in NS methods will be invited to participate in the
43 consensus meeting to finalise the content of the guideline. It is anticipated that this will be held as a
44 face-to-face meeting at the Cochrane colloquium in 2018 in Edinburgh, UK. If this is not possible, an
45 online consensus meeting will be conducted using webinar software. If necessary, an additional
46 virtual meeting will be held to accommodate different time zones of invitees. At the consensus
47 meeting the reporting guideline items developed from the Delphi survey will be discussed, with
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 priority given to establishing consensus on the content and wording of items for which the level of
4
5 consensus is less clear.
6
7

8 **Work Programme Three: Enhancement of existing guidance on NS methods**

9

10
11 We will produce materials to support the current guidance that includes information on the
12 rationale for, as well as implementation of each stage of NS. This will be developed as a supplement
13 to the reporting guideline items. The enhanced guidance will be accessible to novice reviewers and
14 will provide examples of good practice to illustrate how methods of NS may be used. The findings of
15 Work Programmes One and Two, the assessment of current reporting of NS and the Delphi
16 consensus, will be used to inform development of enhanced guidance on NS.[5] Cochrane Review
17 Groups who publish reviews incorporating NS will be identified through the process of work
18 programme one. We anticipate that these will include a range of Cochrane Review Groups and
19 examples will be developed which are relevant to all groups. An overview of methodological tools
20 which can be used to support NS and which have been developed since publication of the ESRC
21 guidance in 2006 will also be incorporated. The PAG will be asked for comments on the draft
22 guidance before it is piloted.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Work Programme Four: Development of learning materials on implementation of NS**

38

39
40 Training materials based on the guidance developed in Work Programmes Two and Three will be
41 produced to promote improved use of NS methods. We have secured support from Cochrane
42 Training to collaborate in Work Programme Four. We will deliver two to three live participatory
43 webinars (to allow for different time-zones) to present the agreed guidance developed in Work
44 Programme Two. One webinar will be recorded and provided on a web page, along with a record of
45 the questions raised in the webinar, and any other frequently asked questions that emerge.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 In addition, an online training module on NS will be developed in collaboration with Cochrane
56
57

1
2
3 Training and a specialist e-learning company. The module will include a mix of didactic and
4 participatory teaching methods involving assessment and interpretation of data and syntheses. We
5 will work with Cochrane colleagues to incorporate the reporting items into the MECIR standards, and
6 offer to update the relevant chapters of the Cochrane Handbook.
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

16
17
18 Ethics approval for the Delphi survey will be obtained from the University of Glasgow College of
19 Social Science Ethics Committee.
20

21
22
23
24 Dissemination of the results of this study will be through peer-reviewed publications, national and
25 international conferences. In addition, the objectives of Work Programmes Three and Four are to
26 distribute and encourage use of the ICONS-Quants guideline through webinars and an online training
27 module.
28
29

30
31
32
33 Authors' contributions: HT conceived the idea of the study. HT, SVK, AS, JMCK and MC designed the
34 study methodology. MC prepared the first draft of this protocol manuscript and all authors critically
35 reviewed and approved the final manuscript.
36
37
38

39
40
41 Funding: This project was supported by funds provided by the Cochrane Strategic Methods Fund.
42 MC, HT and SVK receive funding from the UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12017-13 &
43 MC_UU_12017-15) and Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU13 & SPHSU15). SVK is
44 supported by a NHS Research Scotland Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02). JMCK is supported by
45 a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Australian Public Health Fellowship
46 (1072366).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests. HT and SVK are Cochrane editors. JMCK is a Co-Convenor of the Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The views expressed in this protocol are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Cochrane or its registered entities, committees or working groups.

References

1. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, et al. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet* 2004;364(9445):1615-21 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17317-0
2. Higgins J, Lasserson T, Chandler J, et al. Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews. London: Cochrane, 2016.
3. Valentine JC, Wilson SJ, Rindskopf D, et al. Synthesizing evidence in public policy contexts. *Eval Rev* 2017;41(1):3-26 doi: doi:10.1177/0193841X16674421.
4. Glasziou P, Altman DG, Bossuyt P, et al. Reducing waste from incomplete or unusable reports of biomedical research. *Lancet* 2014;383(9913):267-76 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62228-X
5. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, et al. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews: a product of the ESRC methods programme (Version I) Lancaster, UK: University of Lancaster, 2006.
6. Petticrew M, Rehfuess E, Noyes J, et al. Synthesizing evidence on complex interventions: how meta-analytical, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches can contribute. *J Clinical Epidemiol* 2013;66(11):1230-43 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.06.005.
7. Campbell M, Thomson H, Katikireddi SV, et al. Reporting of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews of public health interventions: a methodological assessment. *Lancet* 2016;388:S34 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32270-X
8. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;339(1):b2535- doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535.
9. Turner L, Shamseer L, Altman DG, et al. Consolidated standards of reporting trials (CONSORT) and the completeness of reporting of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) published in medical journals. *Cochrane Database Sys Rev* 2012(11) doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000030.pub2.
10. Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Strategy to 2020. 2015. <http://community.cochrane.org/organizational-info/resources/strategy-2020>
11. Moher D, Schulz KF, Simera I, et al. Guidance for Developers of Health Research Reporting Guidelines. *PLoS Med* 2010;7(2):e1000217 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000217.
12. Armstrong R, Waters E, Jackson N, et al. Guidelines for systematic reviews of health promotion and public health interventions. Version 2. Australia: Melbourne University, 2007.
13. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews in the social sciences: a practical guide. Malden, MA: Blackwell 2006
14. Popay J, editor. Methods for the development of NICE public health guidance. 3rd ed. London: National Institute for Clinical Excellence, 2012.
15. Pope C, Mays N, Popay J. Synthesising Qualitative and Quantitative Health Evidence: A Guide to Methods. London: Open University Press, 2007.
16. Campbell M, Thomson H, Katikireddi SV, et al. Assessing reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data in public health systematic reviews (Protocol). Glasgow, UK: MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, 2015.

17. Sinha IP, Smyth RL, Williamson PR. Using the Delphi technique to determine which outcomes to measure in clinical trials: recommendations for the future based on a systematic review of existing studies. *PLoS Medicine* 2011;8(1):e1000393 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000393
18. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J Adv Nurs* 2000;32(4):1008-15 doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01567.x.
19. Higgins JP, Green S, editors. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Wiley Online Library, 2011.
20. World Health Organization. *WHO Handbook for guideline development*. World Health Organization, 2014.
21. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67(4):401-09. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.12.002

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Improving conduct and reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data (ICONS-Quant): protocol for a mixed methods study to develop a reporting guideline

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020064.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Campbell, Mhairi; University of Glasgow, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Katikireddi, Srinivasa; University of Glasgow, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Sowden, Amanda; University of York, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination McKenzie, Joanne; Monash University, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine Thomson, Hilary; University of Glasgow, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit
Primary Subject Heading:	Research methods
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, evidence synthesis, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Improving conduct and reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data (ICONS-Quant):**
4 **protocol for a mixed methods study to develop a reporting guideline**
5
6
7

8 Mhairi Campbell¹ MPhil, Srinivasa Vittal Katikireddi¹ FFPH, Amanda Sowden² PhD, Joanne E
9

10 McKenzie³ PhD, Hilary Thomson¹ PhD
11
12
13

14 ¹MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.
15

16 ²Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, UK.
17

18 ³School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
19
20
21
22

23 Corresponding author:

24 Mhairi Campbell
25

26 MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow
27

28 200 Renfield Street, Glasgow, G2 3QB.
29

30 Mhairi.Campbell@glasgow.ac.uk
31

32 0141 353 7601
33
34
35

36 Keywords: systematic review; narrative synthesis; health; evidence synthesis
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

Introduction: Reliable evidence syntheses, based on rigorous systematic reviews, provide essential support for evidence-informed clinical practice and health policy. Systematic reviews should use reproducible and transparent methods to draw conclusions from the available body of evidence. Narrative synthesis of quantitative data (NS) is a method commonly used in systematic reviews where it may not be appropriate, or possible, to meta-analyse estimates of intervention effects. A common criticism of NS is that it is opaque and subject to author interpretation, casting doubt on the trustworthiness of a review's conclusions. Despite published guidance funded by the UK's Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) on the conduct of NS, recent work suggests that this guidance is rarely used and many review authors appear to be unclear about best practice. To improve the way that NS is conducted and reported, we are developing a reporting guideline for NS of quantitative data.

Methods: We will assess how NS is implemented and reported in Cochrane systematic reviews and the findings will inform the creation of a Delphi consensus exercise by an expert panel. We will use this Delphi survey to develop a checklist for reporting standards for NS. This will be accompanied by supplementary guidance on the conduct and reporting of NS, as well as an online training resource.

Ethics and dissemination: Application for ethics approval for the Delphi survey was submitted to the University of Glasgow in November 2017 (reference 400170060). Dissemination of the results of this study will be through peer-reviewed publications, national and international conferences.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study will be the first to develop a consensus based reporting guideline for narrative synthesis of quantitative data in systematic reviews.
- The study follows the recommended methodology for developing reporting standards.
- The online Delphi survey of international experts in NS will be an effective method of gaining reliable consensus from a group of experts.
- The reporting guideline and the supplementary materials developed to support use of existing guidance will aid the implementation of best practice conduct and reporting of NS.

INTRODUCTION

Well conducted systematic reviews are important for informing clinical practice and health policy.[1]

In some reviews, meta-analysis of effect estimates may not be possible or sensible. For example, data may be insufficient to allow calculation of standardised effect estimates, the effect metrics arising from different study designs may not be amenable to synthesis (e.g. those arising from interrupted time series and randomised trials), or high levels of statistical heterogeneity may mean that presenting an average effect is misleading. For reviews of quantitative data where statistical synthesis is not possible, narrative synthesis of quantitative data (NS) is often the alternative method of choice. A major concern about NS is that it lacks transparency and therefore introduces bias into the synthesis.[2 3] This is an important criticism, which raises questions about the validity and utility of reviews using NS, and ultimately increases the risk of adding to research waste.[4] NS involves collating study findings into a coherent textual narrative, with descriptions of differences in characteristics of the studies including context and validity, often using tables and graphs to display results.[5 6] Published Guidance for NS funded by the UK's Economics & Social science Research Council (ESRC) describes techniques for promoting transparency between review level data and conclusions; these include graphical and structured tabulation of the data.[5] However, a recent analysis of systematic reviews of public health interventions suggests that this guidance is rarely used.[7]

Relative to developments in meta-analysis or statistical synthesis, and synthesis of qualitative data in the past decade, work to support improved conduct and transparent reporting in NS has been scarce. While a reporting guideline has been developed for systematic reviews and meta-analysis, the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA),[8] the focus of the synthesis items is on meta-analysis of effect estimates, with no items for alternative approaches to synthesis. The Cochrane Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR) standards for conducting and reporting Cochrane reviews specify one general item referring to non-

1
2
3 quantitative synthesis or non-statistical synthesis, and do not have any items specifically for NS.[2]
4
5 Reporting guidelines have had some impact on improving the reporting for randomised trials and
6
7 may have similar benefits for improving the reporting of methods and results from NS.[9]
8
9

10
11 There is a growing demand for reviews addressing complex questions, and which incorporate diverse
12
13 sources of data. Cochrane, a global leader in evidence synthesis of health and public health
14
15 interventions, has recognised this.[10] Following the prioritisation of relevance and breadth of
16
17 coverage in the Cochrane 2020 strategy,[10] it is likely that the proportion of Cochrane reviews
18
19 addressing complex questions will increase; this may result in increased use of NS methods. Realising
20
21 the need for improved implementation and reporting of NS methods, the Cochrane Strategic
22
23 Methods Fund (SMF) has funded the ICONS-Quant project: Improving CONduct and reporting of
24
25 Narrative Synthesis of quantitative data. This paper presents the protocol for the work that will be
26
27 undertaken.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **ICONS-Quant**

34
35
36 The ICONS-Quant project aims to improve the implementation of NS methods through enhancing
37
38 existing guidance on the conduct of NS and developing a reporting guideline. Provision of reporting
39
40 guidelines alone will not necessarily lead to improved research conduct; provision of explanatory
41
42 guidance, dissemination, endorsement, and support for adherence is also necessary.[11] We will
43
44 produce materials to support the implementation of best practice in the application of NS methods,
45
46 and improved reporting. While our focus is on Cochrane reviews, the key outputs of the project will
47
48 be of use for reviews published elsewhere and will be made freely available. We will:
49
50

- 51
- 52 • describe current practice in conduct and reporting of NS in Cochrane reviews
- 53
- 54 • achieve expert consensus on reporting standards for NS
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

- provide support for those involved in NS through the provision of enhanced guidance on NS conduct and online training resources

We intend ICONS-Quant guideline to be used in combination with the PRISMA guidelines.[8] The PRISMA guidelines provide items relating to the various stages of review conduct, e.g. providing a clear abstract, explaining the literature search strategy, reporting methods to assess risk of bias. The ICONS-Quant reporting guideline will focus on the methods of synthesis, relating most closely to expanding on PRISMA Item 14 'synthesis of results', outlining details that require to be reported to promote transparency in NS.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The ICONS-Quant project will be conducted over a period of 24 months from May 2017. Here, we outline the development of a reporting guideline for NS and supporting materials for existing guidance. In line with recommendations for best practice in developing reporting guidelines,[11] we will:

- identify the need for the ICONS-Quant guideline (Work Programme One)
- conduct a Delphi survey and consensus meeting (Work Programme Two)
- enhance existing guidance on NS (Work Programme Three)
- develop learning materials for implementation of NS (Work Programme Four)

Below we outline the Project Advisory Group and the research that will be conducted within each Work Programme. Details of the ICONS-Quant project have been registered with the Enhancing the quality and Transparency of Health Research (EQUATOR) Network, which provides a database of reporting guidelines in development (<http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#74>).

Project Advisory Group

1
2
3 We have established an ICONS-Quant Project Advisory Group (PAG) which will provide governance
4 for the project as well as expert advice. The ICONS PAG includes named project collaborators from
5 Cochrane Review Groups (Effective Practice and Organisation of Care, Consumers and
6 Communication, and Tobacco Addiction), a representative with experience of NS from the Campbell
7 Collaboration Methods Group, and a user representative from the National Institute for Health and
8 Care Excellence (NICE).
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 16 **Work Programme One: assessment of current reporting and conduct of NS in Cochrane reviews**

17
18
19 Previously we investigated current practice in the conduct and reporting of NS in systematic reviews
20 of public health interventions.[7] Work Programme One will extend this exercise to assess use of NS
21 methods and their reporting across all Cochrane Review Groups. We will identify all Cochrane
22 reviews published between April 2016 and April 2017 and screen them to determine the method of
23 synthesis for the primary outcome. Reviews will be included for further examination if the method
24 for reporting the synthesis of the primary outcomes relies on text. We will identify those that use NS
25 or that synthesise studies using text only, whether or not the authors refer to the use of narrative
26 synthesis or textual methods for synthesis. Reviews will be excluded if they are empty, include only
27 one study, report on diagnostic test accuracy, or are a review of methodology. We will record how
28 the synthesis has been conducted and reported. We will use the existing data extraction template
29 designed for our previous assessment of NS in public health reviews. This template is based on key
30 sources of best practice for NS,[12-15] including the ESRC guidance on the conduct of NS.[5].
31 Questions relate to use of theory; investigation of differences across included studies and reported
32 findings; transparency of links between data and text (including data visualisation tools used);
33 assessment of robustness of the synthesis; and adequacy of description of NS methods.[5] Using a
34 similar format to our review of NS in public health reviews,[16] we will tabulate the extracted data.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 This will allow description of:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- the extent of reporting of narrative synthesis methods: the amount and type of detail included
- the range of approaches and tools used to narratively synthesise data
- how conceptual and methodological heterogeneity is managed
- review authors' reflection on robustness of synthesis

The results of this exercise will be used to inform development of the initial checklist for inclusion in the Delphi survey.

Work Programme Two: Delphi Survey

A Delphi consensus survey will be conducted. This is the standard approach to elicit expert opinion for the purposes of developing consensus based reporting guidelines.[17 18] The results of the assessment exercise in Work Programme One, in conjunction with key texts on NS,[12-15 19 20] findings from the previous assessment of reporting NS in public health reviews,[16] and input from the ICONS PAG will be used to develop the initial items for Round One of the Delphi survey. An expert panel will then be consulted to inform the development of the Delphi survey. The panel will be identified by the project team and members of the ICONS PAG, and will comprise 15-20 authors and methodologists experienced in or familiar with the purpose and conduct of NS. A video-conference with the expert panel will be used to present findings from Work Programme One and a draft of the proposed Delphi survey. Participants' input will be recorded and used to refine the Delphi survey.

The Delphi online survey will use a questionnaire to achieve consensus on the content and wording of reporting items considered to capture the pertinent details of NS. The on-line platform will be created by the MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, using a web-based platform recently developed for this purpose. The platform facilitates personalised invitations to participate, password protected logins, personalised reminders, and enables data collation for

1
2
3 quantitative and qualitative analysis. There will be two rounds of the survey, with a third version
4
5 conducted if necessary to gain consensus among participants.
6
7

8 Participants will include members of the ICONS PAG, and others experienced in NS. Suitable
9
10 participants will be identified by the project team, and through recommendations from the ICONS
11
12 PAG, and through the data extraction exercise described in Work Programme One. The data
13
14 extraction exercise will help articulate identified gaps in reporting of methods and findings of
15
16 narrative synthesis where transparency is particular lacking. The identified gaps will be used when
17
18 drafting reporting item questions for the Delphi consensus exercise, to improve transparency in NS.
19
20 We will invite a maximum of 100 individuals to participate and they will be recruited via their
21
22 workplace email address. We will ask for their professional opinion on the content of a draft
23
24 reporting guideline. The invitation will outline the aim of the Delphi survey, the process involved, the
25
26 time commitment, and include a participant information sheet. Individuals who accept the invitation
27
28 will be asked to take part in each round of the survey. It will be clearly stated that at any stage, a
29
30 respondent can opt out of the Delphi survey. The survey will ask participants to provide details of
31
32 their job category; no personal information will be collected. Respondents will be asked to use their
33
34 email address to log in to the survey. This information will be used only to verify the appropriate use
35
36 of the survey and will not be used in the analysis. The Delphi survey will involve implied consent: it
37
38 will be made clear to participants that by responding to the survey, they are consenting to
39
40 participate in the study. It will be explained to respondents that: their responses will not be linked to
41
42 their identity (de-identified), only researchers will have access to the data, and the data will be
43
44 stored on a password encrypted computer and stored and destroyed in accordance with MRC
45
46 guidelines.
47
48
49

50
51 Round One
52
53
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 The Delphi survey will consist of closed and open-ended questions. Round One of the survey will
4 provide an introduction to the project and instructions for the survey. The participants will be invited
5 to rank each of the proposed guideline items on a four-point Likert Scale (essential, desirable,
6 possible, omit, used in previous Delphi surveys for developing reporting guidelines[21,22]). For each
7 item, the participants will be invited to provide comments. A reminder email will be sent
8 approximately two weeks after the initial invitation. Round One will close approximately four weeks
9 after the first invitations are issued. Responses to Round One of the Delphi will be exported verbatim
10 into a Microsoft Excel© spreadsheet and collated. Responses to the scale rating will be summarised
11 as counts and percentage frequencies. The free text content will be collated and summarised. The
12 results from both the quantitative and qualitative data collation will be used to inform the
13 development of Round Two of the Delphi and the content of the final guideline checklist. Redrafting
14 of the Delphi survey items will be conducted in discussion with all study group members within one
15 month of closure of the round.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Round Two

32
33
34 All participants from Round One will be invited to take part in Round Two. In Round Two the
35 proposed checklist items will be presented in three sections:
36
37

38
39
40 1. Items that reached high consensus in Round One and that are expected to be included in the final
41 checklist. These items will have an a priori agreement of >70% approval, as recommended by
42 Diamond et al.[23] Participants will not be asked to rate these items again but will be asked to
43 comment on whether they agree with the inclusion of each item in the checklist and to provide
44 comments if they disagree or with suggestions to clarify the wording of the items.
45
46
47
48

49
50
51 2. Items that have been significantly altered or are additional as a result of Round One. The
52 participants will be invited to rate these items on the four-point scale and provide comments on
53 each item.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 3. Items that were rated as 'omit' in Round One and that are not expected to be included in the final
4 checklist. Participants will not be asked to rate these items; they will be invited to provide their
5 opinion on the removal of these items from the final checklist.
6
7
8
9

10 If there a substantial lack of consensus remaining following Round Two of the Delphi, a third round
11 will be prepared and conducted. Round Three will follow the same format as Round Two, providing
12 the reporting guideline items in three sections: items that are expected to be included in the final
13 guideline; those significantly altered; and items that will be removed from the final checklist.
14
15
16
17
18

19 Consensus meeting

20
21
22
23 An expert panel of individuals experienced in NS methods will be invited to participate in the
24 consensus meeting to finalise the content of the guideline. It is anticipated that this will be held as a
25 face-to-face meeting at the Cochrane colloquium in 2018 in Edinburgh, UK. If this is not possible, an
26 online consensus meeting will be conducted using webinar software. If necessary, an additional
27 virtual meeting will be held to accommodate different time zones of invitees. At the consensus
28 meeting the reporting guideline items developed from the Delphi survey will be discussed, with
29 priority given to establishing consensus on the content and wording of items for which the level of
30 consensus is less clear.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Work Programme Three: Enhancement of existing guidance on NS methods**

41
42
43
44 We will produce materials to support the current guidance that includes information on the
45 rationale for, as well as implementation of each stage of NS. This will be developed as a supplement
46 to the reporting guideline items. The enhanced guidance will be accessible to novice reviewers and
47 will provide examples of good practice to illustrate how methods of NS may be used. The findings of
48 Work Programmes One and Two, the assessment of current reporting of NS and the Delphi
49 consensus, will be used to inform development of enhanced guidance on NS.[5] Cochrane Review
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Groups who publish reviews incorporating NS will be identified through the process of work
4 programme one. We anticipate that these will include a range of Cochrane Review Groups and
5 examples will be developed which are relevant to all groups. An overview of methodological tools
6 which can be used to support NS and which have been developed since publication of the ESRC
7 guidance in 2006 will also be incorporated. The PAG will be asked for comments on the draft
8 guidance before it is piloted.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Work Programme Four: Development of learning materials on implementation of NS**

17
18
19 Training materials based on the guidance developed in Work Programmes Two and Three will be
20 produced to promote improved use of NS methods. We have secured support from Cochrane
21 Training to collaborate in Work Programme Four. We will deliver two to three live participatory
22 webinars (to allow for different time-zones) to present the agreed guidance developed in Work
23 Programme Two. One webinar will be recorded and provided on a web page, along with a record of
24 the questions raised in the webinar, and any other frequently asked questions that emerge.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 In addition, an online training module on NS will be developed in collaboration with Cochrane
35 Training and a specialist e-learning company. The module will include a mix of didactic and
36 participatory teaching methods involving assessment and interpretation of data and syntheses. We
37 will work with Cochrane colleagues to incorporate the reporting items into the MECIR standards, and
38 offer to update the relevant chapters of the Cochrane Handbook.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

50
51
52 An application for ethics approval for the Delphi survey was submitted to the University of Glasgow
53 College of Social Sciences Ethics Committee in November 2017 (reference number 400170060).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dissemination of the results of this study will be through peer-reviewed publications, national and
4 international conferences. In addition, the objectives of Work Programmes Three and Four are to
5 distribute and encourage use of the ICONS-Quants guideline through webinars and an online training
6 module.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Authors' contributions: HT conceived the idea of the study. HT, SVK, AS, JMck and MC designed the
13 study methodology. MC prepared the first draft of this protocol manuscript and all authors critically
14 reviewed and approved the final manuscript.
15
16
17

18
19
20 Funding: This project was supported by funds provided by the Cochrane Strategic Methods Fund.
21 MC, HT and SVK receive funding from the UK Medical Research Council (MC_UU_12017-13 &
22 MC_UU_12017-15) and Scottish Government Chief Scientist Office (SPHSU13 & SPHSU15). SVK is
23 supported by a NHS Research Scotland Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02). JMck is supported by
24 a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Australian Public Health Fellowship
25 (1072366).
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests. HT and SVK are Cochrane editors.
34 JMck is a Co-Convenor of the Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. The views expressed in this
35 protocol are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Cochrane or its registered entities,
36 committees or working groups.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 References

- 46 1. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, et al. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet*
47 2004;364(9445):1615-21 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17317-0
- 48 2. Higgins J, Lasserson T, Chandler J, et al. Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention
49 Reviews. London: Cochrane, 2016.
- 50 3. Valentine JC, Wilson SJ, Rindskopf D, et al. Synthesizing evidence in public policy contexts. *Eval Rev*
51 2017;41(1):3-26 doi: doi:10.1177/0193841X16674421.
- 52 4. Glasziou P, Altman DG, Bossuyt P, et al. Reducing waste from incomplete or unusable reports of
53 biomedical research. *Lancet* 2014;383(9913):267-76 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62228-X
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, et al. Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews: a product of the ESRC methods programme (Version I) Lancaster, UK: University of Lancaster, 2006.
6. Petticrew M, Rehfuess E, Noyes J, et al. Synthesizing evidence on complex interventions: how meta-analytical, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches can contribute. *J Clinical Epidemiol* 2013;66(11):1230-43 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.06.005.
7. Campbell M, Thomson H, Katikireddi SV, et al. Reporting of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews of public health interventions: a methodological assessment. *Lancet* 2016;388:S34 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32270-X
8. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;339(1):b2535- doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2535.
9. Turner L, Shamseer L, Altman DG, et al. Consolidated standards of reporting trials (CONSORT) and the completeness of reporting of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) published in medical journals. *Cochrane Database Sys Rev* 2012(11) doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000030.pub2.
10. Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane Strategy to 2020. 2015. <http://community.cochrane.org/organizational-info/resources/strategy-2020>
11. Moher D, Schulz KF, Simera I, et al. Guidance for Developers of Health Research Reporting Guidelines. *PLoS Med* 2010;7(2):e1000217 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000217.
12. Armstrong R, Waters E, Jackson N, et al. Guidelines for systematic reviews of health promotion and public health interventions. Version 2. Australia: Melbourne University, 2007.
13. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews in the social sciences: a practical guide. Malden, MA: Blackwell 2006
14. Popay J, editor. Methods for the development of NICE public health guidance. 3rd ed. London: National Institute for Clinical Excellence, 2012.
15. Pope C, Mays N, Popay J. Synthesising Qualitative and Quantitative Health Evidence: A Guide to Methods. London: Open University Press, 2007.
16. Campbell M, Thomson H, Katikireddi SV, et al. Assessing reporting of narrative synthesis of quantitative data in public health systematic reviews (Protocol). Glasgow, UK: MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, 2015.
17. Sinha IP, Smyth RL, Williamson PR. Using the Delphi technique to determine which outcomes to measure in clinical trials: recommendations for the future based on a systematic review of existing studies. *PLoS Medicine* 2011;8(1):e1000393 doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000393
18. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J Adv Nurs* 2000;32(4):1008-15 doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01567.x.
19. Higgins JP, Green S, editors. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Wiley Online Library, 2011.
20. World Health Organization. WHO Handbook for guideline development. World Health Organization, 2014.
21. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide *BMJ* 2014;348
22. Armstrong R, Campbell M, Craig P, et al. Reporting guidelines for population health and policy interventions: TIDieR-PHP. *Lancet* 2015;386:S19
23. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67(4):401-09. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.12.002