

Citation

Kerry Micklewright, Morag Farquhar. Occupational therapy interventions for informal carers and implications for carer support: a systematic review. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020203026 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020203026

Review question

- 1) What involvement do occupational therapists have in interventions targeting adult informal carers?
- 2) What is the nature/breadth of these interventions?
- 3) What do we know about the efficacy of these interventions?

Searches

Multiple databases will be searched for the review, including: CINAHL, OTSeeker, MEDLINE (Ovid), PsycINFO, Scopus, EMBASE and the Cochrane Library. The dates used for these searches will be January 1999-December 2019 to ensure that literature retrieved from searches will be comprehensive yet contemporary.

The researchers will complete scoping searches of grey literature databases, specifically OpenGrey, Proquest and Ethos, to determine if inclusion of grey literature is indicated for this review.

The reference lists of eligible papers will be searched. The reviewers will screen the articles citing eligible papers for further literature. Key authors will be contacted for suggestions regarding further eligible papers. The British Journal of Occupational Therapy (BJOT) will also be hand-searched for the period January 1999 – December 2019.

Types of study to be included

Inclusion criteria: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods studies published between 1999-2019.

Exclusion criteria: editorials, opinion pieces, case studies, non-empirical material.

Condition or domain being studied

This review aims to capture insights into the role occupational therapy is playing in supporting adult informal carers in the UK. The review will focus primarily on interventions led or delivered by occupational therapists, though studies that include a distinct intervention by an occupational therapist within a wider group of professionals will also be considered as long as the contribution of the therapist is clearly defined and directly involving carers.

Participants/population

Adult informal carers for adult patients (18+ years of age).

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Interventions delivered by occupational therapists to improve outcomes for/wellbeing of informal carers.

Comparator(s)/control

Standard care (where comparator present).

Context

Additional inclusion criteria:

- Interventions for unpaid/informal carers only
- Papers that relate to interventions that target carers specifically (or if for patient-carer dyads, independently evaluate the effect of the intervention on the carer)

- English language papers only
- Papers including interventions where outcomes were measured (quantitative) or identified (qualitative)
- Papers/studies that relate to adult carers supporting adult patients

Main outcome(s)

Any outcome measure used to demonstrate the efficacy/effect of the intervention including measures of quality of life, health (physical or psychological, e.g. measures of anxiety, depression, physical disability), carer-specific outcomes (e.g. carer strain or burden), process or outcome data related to the delivery of the intervention or the experience of the occupational therapist delivering it (e.g. staffing implications, views of the therapist in relation to delivering the intervention). Both quantitative and qualitative data will be included.

Measures of effect

Not applicable.

Additional outcome(s)

None.

Measures of effect

Not applicable.

Data extraction (selection and coding)

The study selection process will be based on one used by the reviewers to successfully complete a previous systematic review as follows:

- 1) First reviewer to complete the database searches.
- 2) The first reviewer will then remove duplicates from the references retrieved through database searches in EndNote.
- 3) The first reviewer will then screen articles by title and abstract using the eligibility criteria previously described.
- 4) If eligibility is uncertain following this step, the full article text will be read. The full paper will be screened against the eligibility criteria.
- 5) If eligibility remains unclear the paper will be discussed between both reviewers to make a final decision.
- 6) The number of papers excluded at each stage – and the reasons for excluding them – will be recorded.
- 6) The second reviewer will verify the accuracy of screening by reviewing a random sample of 10% of the papers deemed eligible (or a minimum of 10 papers) against the a priori inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- 7) Should any further potentially eligible papers be identified through searching reference lists, citations, handsearching or via the recommendation of key authors, paper references will be retrieved. These new papers will be screened as above.

Data from eligible papers will be extracted using digital data extraction forms. Data storage and handling will comply with the University of East Anglia's policies on data security. If further data relating to a specific paper is required, the corresponding author will be contacted. Any new data received will be managed in the same way as that directly extracted from the literature.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Risk of bias will be assessed for each study using suitable quality appraisal tools. Due to the potential variety in study methodologies within the papers retrieved a range of quality appraisal tools is likely to be used (e.g. CASP, Downs & Black Checklist for Measuring Quality, Appraisal tool for Cross-Sectional Studies - AXIS). If an eligible paper is retrieved that uses a methodology not covered by these tools, an appropriate appraisal tool will be sought. The second reviewer will complete a reliability check of the critical appraisal process

completed by the first reviewer. They will examine 10% papers that have undergone critical appraisal using an appropriate tool and feedback to the first reviewer regarding any suggested changes.

Critical appraisal will not be used to exclude studies from the review as it aims to be as comprehensive as possible. However, the appraisal of individual papers will be used to determine their credibility as evidence. The reviewers will also appraise the overall quality of the evidence, including any trends in methodological weakness and potential bias.

Strategy for data synthesis

Textual narrative synthesis will be used, as this method of synthesis has been demonstrated to be an effective way of combining qualitative and quantitative papers to produce a summary of research literature. The reviewers will utilize a convergent integrated approach to synthesizing quantitative and qualitative evidence, 'qualitizing' quantitative data into textual descriptions to enable integration with qualitative data. Data relating to the characteristics of eligible studies will be tabulated to provide context (for example, how participants were recruited and the year the paper was published).

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Not applicable.

Contact details for further information

Kerry Micklewright
K.Micklewright@uea.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

University of East Anglia
<https://www.uea.ac.uk/>

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Miss Kerry Micklewright. University of East Anglia
Professor Morag Farquhar. University of East Anglia

Type and method of review

Narrative synthesis, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

06 August 2020

Anticipated completion date

31 July 2021

Funding sources/sponsors

This work was supported by the Royal College of Occupational Therapists Research Foundation via a Systematic Review Grant.

Conflicts of interest

None known

Language

English

Country

England

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Caregivers; Humans; Occupational Therapy; Quality of Life

Date of registration in PROSPERO

03 September 2020

Date of first submission

13 August 2020

Stage of review at time of this submission [1 change]

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	Yes
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	Yes
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	Yes	Yes
Data extraction	Yes	Yes
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	Yes	Yes
Data analysis	Yes	Yes

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

03 September 2020

09 June 2021