

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### **PART 2 - Meta-Narrative Synthesis**

The questions in PART 2 cover potential Items for inclusion in the RAMESES publication standards for Meta-Narrative Synthesis only.

The first four Items are topics for consideration in the Introductory section.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 1: Title - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 1: Title

In the title, identify the document as a Meta-narrative Synthesis or Review.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Explanation:

Our background searching has shown that some meta-narrative reviews are not flagged as such in the title and may also be inconsistently indexed, and hence are more difficult to locate during searching. Most authors currently use the term 'meta-narrative review'. Consistent use of one term is likely to aid indexing and identification. We are interested to find out which term you prefer and why.

### Please choose your preferred term:

- Meta-Narrative Synthesis
- Meta-Narrative Review
- No preference

Reason(s) for choice of term (optional):

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 2: Abstract - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 2: Abstract

As far as possible (taking account of journal-specific formatting and content requirements), the abstract should contain brief details of the study context, review question or objectives; search strategy (including literatures / disciplinary areas searched); selection and appraisal of documents; analysis and synthesis methods; results; and conclusions/implications.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

Apart from the title, an abstract is the only source of information accessible to searchers unless the full paper is obtained. The information in it must allow reviewers and/or users to decide if the review is relevant to their needs.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 3: Rationale for review - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 3: Rationale for review

Explain why the review was done and what it is likely to add to existing understanding of the topic area.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Explanation:

As with all research, a background section explaining what is already known and what the researchers considered the 'knowledge gaps' to be is a helpful orientation. Some meta-narrative reviews are done with the goal of adding to the academic literature (e.g. a thesis); others may be undertaken for a specific purpose (e.g. to inform policy in a particular setting).

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 4: Objectives and focus of review - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 4: Objectives and focus of review

State the purpose of the review and the review question(s). Define and justify the scope of the review.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

A meta-narrative review asks some or all of the following questions:

- [1] Which research (or epistemic) traditions have considered this broad topic area;
- [2] How has each tradition conceptualised the topic (for example including assumptions about the nature of reality, preferred study designs and ways of knowing)?;
- [3] What theoretical approaches and methods did they use?;
- [4] What are the main empirical findings?; and
- [5] What insights can be drawn by combining and comparing findings from different traditions?'

Because a meta-narrative review may generate a potentially infinite number of things that might be explored and explained, and because resources and timescale are invariably finite, the review must be 'contained' by progressively focusing both its breadth (how wide an area?) and depth (how much detail?). This important process may involve discussion and negotiation with (for example) context experts, funders and/or users. It is typical and legitimate for the review question and/or the breadth and depth of the review to evolve as the review progresses. How and why it evolved is usually worth reporting.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Methods section - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

The following questions cover potential Items for inclusion in the Methods section of the RAMESES publication standards.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 5: Protocol - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 5: Protocol

The final protocol (i.e. the account of what was actually done) should be reproduced, at least in summary form, in the document which presents the main findings. If this is not done, the omission should be justified and a reference or link to the protocol given. It may also be appropriate to publish the original protocol (e.g. as set out in the grant proposal or developed in the early stages of the review).

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

The study protocol for a meta-narrative review differs in significant respects from that in a traditional systematic review with meta-analysis. As noted above (Item 4), the research question and scope (and, by implication, all subsequent steps) of a meta-narrative review can (and often should) evolve over the course of the review. However, this does not mean the review can meander uncontained. An accessible summary of what was done, in what order, and why is essential for interpreting the review. Comparing the original protocol with the final account of what was done may provide transparency on how the review's processes has evolved in its bid to build understanding of the topic area.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 6: Rational for using Meta-Narrative approach

Item 6: Rationale for using Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Explain why meta-narrative review was used.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Explanation:

Meta-narrative review (which is rooted in a constructivist philosophy of science) is inspired by the work of Thomas Kuhn, who observed that science progresses in paradigms (see definition below). Meta-narrative review looks historically at how particular research (or epistemic\*) traditions have unfolded over time and shaped the 'normal science' of a topic area.

Some definitions:

- A paradigm is a particular way of viewing the world, including assumptions about how the world works, what are the important questions in a particular topic area, and what study designs and methods are best for adding to the knowledge base.
- A research tradition is a series of linked studies, each building on what has gone before, usually situated within a coherent paradigm, though an interdisciplinary tradition may bridge more than one paradigm.
- Normal science is a paradigm along with the practices and empirical approaches which are taken for granted by scientists within a particular tradition.

Meta-narrative review is therefore best suited to studying topic areas that have been differently conceptualised and studied by different groups over time. The review seeks first to identify and understand all the different research traditions which have a bearing on the topic, and then to synthesise them by means of an over-arching narrative. The goal of meta-narrative review is sense-making of a complex (and perhaps contested) topic area.

\*We would value your opinion on whether a meta-narrative should also look historically at how particular epistemic traditions have unfolded over time:

### Should a meta-narrative also consider epistemic traditions?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Reason(s) for choice of term (optional):

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):



## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Item 7: Evidence of adherence to guiding principles of meta-narrative review...

Item 7: Evidence of adherence to guiding principles of meta-narrative review

Present evidence in your methodology to show how the six guiding principles (pragmatism, pluralism, historicity, contestation, reflexivity and peer review) have been followed.

#### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

Meta-narrative review is based on six guiding principles:

- Principle of pragmatism: what to include is not self-evident. The reviewer must be guided by what will be most useful to the intended audience(s);
- Principle of pluralism: the topic should be illuminated from multiple angles and perspectives, using the established quality criteria appropriate to each. Hence, reviewers should avoid beginning with a single 'preferred' perspective or methodological hierarchy and proceed to judge work in other traditions using these external benchmarks. Research which lacks rigour must be rejected, but the grounds for rejection should be intrinsic to the relevant tradition, not imposed on it;
- Principle of historicity: each research tradition should be described as it unfolded over time, highlighting significant individual scientists, events and discoveries which shaped the tradition;
- Principle of contestation: 'conflicting data' from different research traditions should be examined to generate higher-order insights (e.g. about how different research teams framed the issue differently or made different assumptions about the nature of reality);
- Principle of reflexivity: throughout the review, reviewers must continually reflect, individually and as a team, on the emerging findings;
- Principle of peer review: emerging findings and the draft summary must be presented to an external audience and their feedback used to guide further reflection and analysis.

The published literature on meta-narrative review indicates that some review teams have deliberately adapted the method as first described by Greenhalgh et al. Whilst evolution and/or adaptation of the method is to be welcomed in principle, the description and rationale for any adaptations made should be provided to allow readers to judge their coherence with the underlying principles of meta-narrative review (and hence with its constructivist philosophical basis).

#### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 8: Scoping the literature - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 8: Scoping the literature

Describe and justify the initial process of exploratory scoping of literature.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

One of the main challenges in meta-narrative review is to identify a sufficiently broad range of sources so as to be able to build as comprehensive a map as possible of research undertaken on the topic. This scoping step is used to identify in broad terms the different research traditions, sited in different literatures, which have addressed the topic of interest. Findings from this scoping phase should normally be reported in the Results section.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 9: Searching processes - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 9: Searching processes

State how the search was done and provide details on all the information sources accessed in the review. In particular, state how seminal sources were identified. Where electronic search strategies were used, the information should include (for example) name of database, dates of coverage, limits applied, and date last searched. Contact with relevant content experts should be indicated.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

Searching should be guided by the objectives and focus of the review, and revised iteratively in the light of emerging data. By definition, a meta-narrative review seeks to identify and combine different research traditions, hence different search strategies will need to be developed as appropriate to the different literatures. This stage is likely to involve searching for different kinds of data in different ways.

A single maximally sensitive search is most unlikely to be sufficient. Search methods using forward and backward citation tracking are more likely to help in finding key documents. In particular, potential seminal sources (conceptual, theoretical or empirical studies which have defined the tradition and inspired later work) may be identified from judicious searching of the reference lists of later studies. Once identified, seminal sources should be citation-tracked to identify further sources which drew on these.

Meta-narrative reviews do not approach the literature with a pre-defined 'preferred' study design. Rather, any preferred study design(s) should be identified from quality standards developed within a particular research tradition. 'Methodological filters' (for example, to identify randomised controlled trials) should be used only when these have been designated as a quality feature by the scientists within that tradition.

Searching is necessarily iterative, since the reviewer must move between the seminal source(s) and papers which subsequently cited that source, so as to build a historical picture of how research unfolded in each tradition. The process used for any such additional searches should be clearly documented. A search strategy that does not change as the review progresses may suggest insufficient attention to emerging findings.

Sufficient detail should be given to enable the reader to judge whether searching was sufficiently extensive and directed to locate key sources needed for elucidating all the key research traditions.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 10: Selection and appraisal of documents - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 10: Selection and appraisal of documents

Explain how judgements were made about documents to be included and excluded, and justify these.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

Meta-narrative review is not a technical process. Rather, it is a process of sense-making of the literature, selecting and combining data from primary sources to produce a historical account of how a research tradition unfolded and why, and then (in a second phase) comparing and contrasting findings from these different traditions to build a rich picture of the topic area from multiple angles. This process requires a series of judgements about the unfolding of research in particular traditions, and about the relevance and robustness of particular data within that tradition.

Meta-narrative review takes its quality criteria from the traditions included in the review, and in particular from seminal papers which have been accepted by others within that tradition as authoritative. A meta-narrative review might, for example, include a meta-narrative from clinical epidemiology in which randomised controlled trials and meta-analyses of these are greatly valued; it might also include a meta-narrative from critical sociology in which theory-driven qualitative studies are greatly valued. Studies in these separate traditions should be appraised using the quality criteria which a competent peer-reviewer in that tradition would use.

Description of the selection and appraisal process should be sufficiently detailed to enable a reader to estimate how likely it is that researchers inadvertently excluded data that may have significantly altered the findings of the review.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 11: Data extraction - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 11: Data extraction

Describe and explain which data were extracted from the included documents and justify this selection.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

The type of data that may be collected in meta-narrative review can be very diverse. There are two purposes for data extraction: 1) to assist data analysis and synthesis and 2) to provide transparency of the review process.

In a meta-narrative review the data elements extracted would go to constructing a story of how research on a topic unfolded over time in a particular tradition. This may include:

- upstream (antecedent) traditions from which these emerged; background philosophical assumptions;
- research questions and how they were framed; conceptual and theoretical issues;
- preferred methodologies, study designs and quality criteria;
- key actors (e.g. leading scientists or commentators) and events (e.g. conferences) in the unfolding of the tradition;
- landmark empirical or theoretical studies;
- significant findings and how these shaped subsequent work; and
- key debates and areas of dispute within the tradition, including links with or breaches from other traditions.

Meta-narrative review is used for a wide range of research questions, so it is impossible to be prescriptive about which data should be extracted. However, the link between the research question and the type of data extracted should be clear.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Item 12: Analysis and synthesis processes - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 12: Data collection process

Describe the analysis and synthesis processes in detail. This section should include information on the process by which the account of each meta-narrative (i.e. the story of each unfolding research tradition) was built up and how the separate meta-narratives were compared and contrasted. Document and justify any changes in this process as the study unfolded.

#### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

If exploration of a range of research traditions on the topic is not deemed to be appropriate, the work is probably not a meta-narrative review.

A meta-narrative review should comprise two specific stages, though these will usually overlap as they will necessarily influence one another iteratively.

In the analysis stage, reviewers should seek to identify and map out specific meta-narratives (that is, unfolding stories of research traditions over time), focusing in particular on the concepts, theories, methods and instruments which have characterised the tradition, major findings in that tradition and foci of dissent and disagreement.

The process of building this unfolding storyline is essentially interpretive and hence follows the principles of interpretivist analysis, including immersion in the data by repeated reading and/or analysis of quantitative data; reflexivity and discussion among researchers; consideration of how each new data item fits with an emerging picture of the whole; and checking where appropriate that the story is considered valid by members within the designated research tradition. Both quantitative and qualitative traditions and data will need to be incorporated in the storyline. Explanation and justification for the need to use any analytic methods should be provided.

The synthesis stage involves comparing and contrasting the meta-narratives so as to identify differences between how the different groups have conceptualised the topic (including differences in philosophical position), how they have theorised it, and the methodological approaches and study designs used. Differences in findings between meta-narratives are higher-order data and should be analysed interpretively to produce further insights (e.g. about differences in underlying assumptions or methodological approaches between different research traditions).

Synthesis across traditions may occur at a high level of abstraction (i.e. at the level of concepts and theories) and involve one or more of the following:

- paradigm bridging (seeking commonalities in underlying conceptual and theoretical assumptions),
- paradigm bracketing (highlighting differences in these assumptions),
- interplay (exploring tensions);
- meta-theorising (exploring patterns that span conflicting understandings)

Synthesis may also occur at a more concrete level and summarise empirical findings, using techniques including statistical aggregation, qualitative aggregation, and narrative summary.

A description should be provided of how the all the individuals involved in the review have been involved in the analysis and synthesis processes, and of the nature of any input from external advisors / peer reviewers from the included traditions.

#### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Results section - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

The following questions cover potential Items for inclusion in the Results section of the RAMESES publication standards.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 13: Document flow diagram - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 13: Document flow diagram

Ideally within a flow diagram, provide details on the number of documents assessed for eligibility and included in the review with reasons for exclusion at each stage as well as an indication of their source of origin. A template (which may need further modification to suit the data) is given in Figure X.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

A flow diagram provides an accessible summary of the sequence of steps and gives an indication of the volume of data included and excluded at each step.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):



# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 14: Document characteristics - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 14: Document characteristics

Information on the characteristics of the documents included in the review should be provided.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

Characteristics of documents might include for example (where applicable) full citation, country of origin, study design and main findings. A clear summary of the characteristics of included sources adds to the transparency of the review and may help readers judge the coherence and plausibility of inferences. Reviewers may wish to report data source characteristics within one or more tables.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 15: Main findings - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 15: Main findings

Present the main findings with a specific focus on the key meta-narratives that have a bearing on the topic area, and the commonalities and differences between them.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

The defining feature of a meta-narrative review is illumination of a complex topic area from multiple angles. Each meta-narrative should first be presented as a coherent individual account which conveys the underpinning 'normal science' of the relevant research tradition (concepts, theories, preferred methods) and the key empirical findings in that tradition. Findings and inferences from the synthesis across the different meta-narratives may be presented as an over-arching narrative which retains the integrity of the separate research traditions but draws out what might be learnt from the commonalities and differences between them.

The outputs of paradigm bridging, paradigm bracketing, interplay and meta-theorising should be presented as appropriate to summarise the conceptual and theoretical basis of the meta-narratives. The outputs of statistical aggregation, qualitative aggregation, and narrative summary of disaggregated data should be presented as appropriate to summarise the empirical findings. In each case, data from the primary documents should be presented and sourced to illustrate how inferences have been made and justify these. The more detail is given, the more readers will be able to judge the validity of the inferences.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Discussion section - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

The following questions cover potential Items for inclusion in the Discussion section of the RAMESES publication standards.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 16: Summary of findings - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 16: Summary of findings

Summarise the main findings with attention to the research question, focus of the review, and intended audience.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

In order to place the findings in the context of the wider literature and policy need, it is necessary to summarise briefly what has been found. This section should be succinct and balanced, highlighting the key meta-narratives which emerged from the analysis and the key points of commonality and contestation between them. This should be done with careful attention to the needs of the main users of the review.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Item 17: Strengths, limitations and future research directions - Meta-Narr...

Item 17: Summary of evidence

Discuss both the strengths of the review and its limitations. These should include (but need not be limited to) [a] consideration of all the steps in the review process and [b] comment on the adequacy and trustworthiness of the explanatory insights which emerged. The limitations identified may point to areas where further research is needed.

#### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

Meta-narrative reviews may be constrained by time and resources, by the skill mix and collective experience of the research team and/or by anticipated or unanticipated challenges in the data. These should be made explicit so that readers can interpret the findings in the light of them. A common challenge in meta-narrative reviews is that in order to focus the review, some material is omitted at each successive stage. Some aspects of the topic area therefore end up being reviewed in detail and rich explanatory insights produced for these. Other aspects are neglected (relatively or absolutely). It is thus inevitable that in generating illumination, the review will also cast shadows. These should be highlighted in the discussion so as to indicate areas where other reviews might focus.

Limitations imposed by any modifications made to the review process should also be reported and justified.

#### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

### Item 18: Comparison with existing literature - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 18: Comparison with existing literature

Compare and contrast the review's findings with the existing literature on the topic area.

#### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

Comparing and contrasting the findings from a review with the existing literature may help readers to put these into context. This section might cover questions such as; how does this review compare to other reviews; what does this review add, and which body of work in particular does it add to?; has this review reached the same or different conclusion to previous reviews?; and has it answered a question previously identified as important by leaders in the field?

#### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 19: Conclusion and recommendations - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 19: Conclusion and recommendations

List the main implications that are justified by the findings and place these in the context of other relevant literature. If appropriate, offer recommendations.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### Explanation:

A clear line of reasoning is needed to link implications with the findings presented in the results section. If the review is small and preliminary, or if the strength of evidence behind the inferences is weak or moderate, firm statements about the implications for practice and policy may be inappropriate.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 2

## Item 20: Funding - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

Item 20: Funding

Details should be provided for the funding source (if any) for the review, the role played by the funder (if any) and any conflicts of interests of the reviewers.

### Please rate this Item for:

	1 = Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 = Strongly Agree
Relevance - (Item inclusion)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Content - (Item wording)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Explanation:

The source of funding for a review and/or personal conflicts of interests may influence the research question, methods, data analysis and conclusions. No review is a 'view from nowhere', and readers will be better able to interpret the review if they know why it was done and for which sponsor.

If a review is published, the process for reporting funding and conflicts of interest as set out by the publication concerned should be followed.

### Please comment on item, including wording (optional):