

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 3

### **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.

Our previous formulations of the following two items from the Methods section of the RAMESES publication standards did not achieve consensus in Round 2. We would appreciate further attention to our revised efforts.

For each Item we have provided you with our new suggested wording as well as the results of the ratings and original wording from Round 2.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 3

## Item 5: Changes in the review process

Item 5: Changes in the review process

Any changes made to the review process that was initially planned should be briefly described and justified.

-----  
ORIGINAL TEXT IN ROUND 2

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).

RATINGS FROM ROUND 2

Relevance

Response rate (%): 31/33 (94)

Mode: 7

Median: 7

Inter-quartile range: 6 to 7

Content:

Response rate (%): 31/33 (94)

Mode: 7

Median: 6

Inter-quartile range: 6 to 7  
-----

### 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 can (and often should) evolve over the course of the review. For example changes to the research question or scope is likely to have an impact on many of the review's subsequent processes. However, this does not mean the review can meander uncontained. At the very least, an accessible summary of what was planned and how and why this differed from what was done should be provided as this may assist interpretation.

-----  
ORIGINAL TEXT IN ROUND 2

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 3

### 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 reviews often look 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.
- An epistemic tradition is the unfolding of the underpinning set of philosophical assumptions which drive the development of theory and method; scholarship may progress via debate around these assumptions even in the absence of new empirical studies.
- 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. The review seeks first to identify and understand as many as possible of the potentially important 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.

---

### ORIGINAL TEXT IN ROUND 2

[NB: Main change has been the addition of a definition of epistemic tradition.]

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.

---

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

## RAMESES Delphi - Round 3

### Results section - Meta-Narrative Synthesis

The following question covers a potential Item for inclusion in the Results section of the RAMESES publication standards.

Please click on the NEXT button below to proceed.

# RAMESES Delphi - Round 3

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

Item 13: Document flow diagram

Perhaps 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. Example templates (which are likely to need modification to suit the data) are provided in SOURCES X.

-----  
**ORIGINAL TEXT IN ROUND 2**

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.

**RATINGS FROM ROUND 2**

**Relevance**

Response rate (%): 21/33 (94)

Mode: 7

Median: 7

Inter-quartile range: 5 to 7

**Content:**

Response rate (%): 31/33 (82)

Mode: 7

Median: 6

Inter-quartile range: 4.5 to 7

-----

**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):**