

14	(qualitative adj2 review*).ab,ti.	3403
15	(systematic adj2 (review or scoping)).ab,ti.	151245
16	2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9	338294
17	10 or 11	376532
18	12 or 13 or 14 or 15	153725
19	1 and 16 and 17	8721
20	18 and 19	703
21	limit 20 to yr="2011 -Current"	557

Table 6. Inclusion criteria

	Strand 1	Strand 2
Setting	No restriction	UK only [or for reviews, scope includes UK]
Language	English	
Time period	Ten years preceding date of searches (choice informed by launch of Administrative Data Taskforce in 2011, reflecting increasing interest in use of administrative secondary data for research & policy purposes)	
Publication type	Systematic reviews Scoping reviews	Peer reviewed primary research
	Identified as such in title and/or abstract, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly specified research question/aim Inclusion/exclusion criteria Search strategy including more than one database 	Grey literature reporting primary research
Must include material relevant to each of the following elements of scope:		

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial), English (U.S.)

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

<p>Definitions - 1</p>	<p>Public health practice – organised efforts undertaken with the intention of improving the health and wellbeing of individuals, communities, or populations and/or reducing inequalities in health; usually but not exclusively by staff working in health services, government, and the third sector.</p> <p>Healthy public policy – activities of government at local, or national level that may affect health and wellbeing and/or reduce inequalities, including (but not limited to) investment, regulation, legislation, incentivisation, and including policy areas other than healthcare and social care.</p>	
<p>Definitions - 2</p>	<p>Evidence – information used in the process of decision-making, which might be based on numerical or textual data, practice guidelines, expert opinion, tacit knowledge and lived experience, narratives/stories, and meta-data (data about data).</p>	<p>Secondary data – use, re-use, or novel combination of existing datasets, including those generated through service delivery rather than for the purposes of research (administrative/routine data).</p>
<p>Definitions - 3</p>	<p>Focus on <i>process</i> of how evidence (2) is used in public health practice and healthy public policy (1).</p>	
<p>Definitions - 4</p>	<p>Barriers or facilitators – factors that hinder or support an activity.</p>	
<p>Exclusion criteria</p>	<p>Primary research; not systematic or scoping reviews.</p> <p>Protocols for systematic or scoping review.</p> <p>Research question relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Validity of specific research methods, evaluated according to ability to produce high-quality research (note that studies evaluating suitability of specific research methods – e.g. systematic reviews – according to their usefulness as evidence in decision-making WOULD be 	<p>Study or article types other than primary research – e.g. editorials, commentaries, essays. Abstract must describe research methods.</p> <p>Research question relates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> decision-making about diagnosis or clinical care of individual patients in a healthcare setting. decision-making about research strategy/funding alone i.e. decision-making about what research should be done and how. estimating effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of a specific public health or clinical intervention.

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Formatted ...

Second, we will code for and synthesise key themes for strands 1 and 2 separately but identifying overlaps where relevant. We will aim to present these results in visual and/or tabular formats that can be used to inform discussions at the first workshop and development of a systems map.

Stakeholder input

The project advisory group – which includes stakeholders from practice, policy, and the public – will be asked to provide feedback on the protocol and emerging results from the review, in order to inform the synthesis and development of outputs.

Reporting

Reporting of review results in the final study report and any subsequent publications will draw on PRISMA-ScR reporting guidelines for scoping reviews.

References

1. Campbell, M., McKenzie, J. E., Sowden, A., Katikireddi, S. V., Brennan, S. E., Ellis, S., Hartmann-Boyce, J., Ryan, R., Shepperd, S., Thomas, J., Welch, V., & Thomson, H. (2020). Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ*, 368, l6890. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l6890>

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial), Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body CS (Arial), No underline, Font color: Auto, (Asian) Chinese (PRC), (Other) English (U.K.)