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# Abstract

(Maximum - 250 words for Protocols/500 words for Scoping Reviews)

**Objective:** State an overarching review objective structured using the key components of the inclusion criteria (approximately one or two sentences). e.g. The objective of this scoping review is to understand the extent and type of evidence in relation to (insert field).

**Introduction:** Briefly describe the rationale for the review considering what is already known on the topic (approximately two to three sentences).

**Inclusion criteria:** Summarize the inclusion criteria using the participants, concept, and context (PCC framework) and highlight any relevant exclusions in paragraph format. Present the information in one to three sentences – NOT under individual subheadings.

**Methods:** List the key information sources searched/to be searched (those from which the majority of evidence sources were/will be located), the date (month/year) the search was conducted (for reviews only) and any search limits (e.g. language). Briefly describe the approach to study selection, data extraction, analysis of the evidence and presentation of the results. Briefly describe any notable deviations to the methodological approach taken (for reviews only).

**Results (For Reviews ONLY):** The bulk of the abstract should be reserved to convey the main results of the review in relation to the objective/question. Report the number and type of included evidence as well as any pertinent study characteristics.

**Conclusions (For Reviews ONLY):** Provide a conclusion based on a general interpretation of the review findings in line with the review’s objective/s and any limitations of the review. Briefly convey key implications of the findings for practice and research (if any).

# Introduction

*Guidance for authors: Describe the rationale for the review considering what is already known on the topic, including information that supports and justifies the selection of inclusion criteria. Key terms should be defined, and operational definitions narratively explained. Furthermore, provide some indication that there is evidence available that will meet your inclusion criteria. A rationale as to why a scoping review was the most appropriate method should also be provided. (Approximately 1000 words).*

Edit set text as appropriate:

A preliminary search of MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and *JBI Evidence Synthesis* was conducted and no current or underway systematic reviews or scoping reviews on the topic were identified.

*Guidance for authors: If there are any existing systematic reviews/scoping reviews, it should be specified how the proposed review will differ.*

*Guidance for authors: Conclude with an overarching review objective, that captures and aligns with the core elements/PCC framework of the inclusion criteria (e.g. The objective of this scoping review is to assess the extent of the literature (insert area/field).*

# Review question

*Guidance for authors: Clearly state the review question or questions using the PCC framework (i.e. additional or sub-questions) that the review seeks to answer. The review question/s should clearly relate to the objective/s.*

# Keywords

*Guidance for authors: List a maximum of five keywords in alphabetical order, separated by a semi-colon and a space. Ideally these words should be different to those that appear in the title and abstract.*These are for the purposes of meta-data and indexing, and not related to the search strategy.

# Eligibility criteria

### Participants

*Guidance for authors: Describe/define participants that will be included. Specific exclusion criteria based on any participant characteristics should also be stated.*

### Concept

*Guidance for authors: Describe and/or define the concept. Specific exclusion criteria based on any concept should also be stated.*

### Context

*Guidance for authors: Describe the context. Consider cultural/sub-cultural factors, geographic location, specific racial or gender-based interests or details about the specific setting. Specific exclusion criteria based on any context should also be stated.*

### Types of Sources

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

This scoping review will consider both experimental and quasi-experimental study designs including randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, before and after studies and interrupted time-series studies. In addition, analytical observational studies including prospective and retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies and analytical cross-sectional studies will be considered for inclusion. This review will also consider descriptive observational study designs including case series, individual case reports and descriptive cross-sectional studies for inclusion.

Qualitative studies will also be considered that focus on qualitative data including, but not limited to, designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, qualitative description, action research and feminist research.

In addition, systematic reviews that meet the inclusion criteria will also be considered, depending on the research question.

Text and opinion papers will also be considered for inclusion in this scoping review.

# Methods

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

The proposed scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews (insert a citation to the [methodology](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687342/Chapter%2B11%3A%2BScoping%2Breviews) ).

### Search strategy

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

The search strategy will aim to locate both published and unpublished studies. An initial limited search of MEDLINE and CINAHL (*change as appropriate*) was undertaken to identify articles on the topic. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, and the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy for (*report the name of the relevant databases/information sources)* (see Appendix #). The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, will be adapted for each included database and/or information source. The reference list of all included sources of evidence will be screened for additional studies.

Studies published in any language *(modify as appropriate)* will be included. Studies published since *insert date* will be included as (*justify date range and any language limitations*).

*Guidance for authors: List all information sources (e.g. electronic databases, contact with study authors etc.)*

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

The databases to be searched include (*insert databases with platforms as appropriate)*. Sources of unpublished studies/ gray literature to be searched include (*insert text, e.g. trial registers etc*).

### Study/Source of Evidence selection

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

Following the search, all identified citations will be collated and uploaded into *(insert the name of the bibliographic software or citation management system e.g. EndNote insert version /year (Clarivate Analytics, PA, USA))* and duplicates removed. Following a pilot test, titles and abstracts will then be screened by two or more independent reviewers for assessment against the inclusion criteria for the review. Potentially relevant sources will be retrieved in full and their citation details imported into the JBI System for the Unified Management, Assessment and Review of Information (JBI SUMARI) (JBI, Adelaide, Australia)*(insert citation to* [*JBI SUMARI paper*](https://journals.lww.com/ijebh/Citation/2019/03000/The_development_of_software_to_support_multiple.5.aspx)*)*. The full text of selected citations will be assessed in detail against the inclusion criteria by two or more independent reviewers. Reasons for exclusion of sources of evidence at full text that do not meet the inclusion criteria will be recorded and reported in the scoping review. Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers at each stage of the selection process will be resolved through discussion, or with an additional reviewer/s. The results of the search and the study inclusion process will be reported in full in the final scoping review and presented in a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for scoping review (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram *(insert citation to* [*PRISMA-ScR statement*](https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M18-0850) *and include in the reference list).*

### Data Extraction

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

Data will be extracted from papers included in the scoping review by two or more independent reviewers using a data extraction tool developed by the reviewers. The data extracted will include specific details about the participants, concept, context, study methods and key findings relevant to the review question/s.

*Guidance for authors: Discuss the planned piloting of the draft extraction form in the protocol, and how this was conducted in the review.*

*Edit set text as appropriate:*

A draft extraction form is provided (see Appendix XX*).*The draft data extraction tool will be modified and revised as necessary during the process of extracting data from each included evidence source. Modifications will be detailed in the scoping review. Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with an additional reviewer/s. If appropriate, authors of papers will be contacted to request missing or additional data, where required.

*Guidance for authors: Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence: This is generally not required for scoping reviews. If it will be done, provide a rationale as to why and describe the methods, including tools which will be used.*

### Data Analysis and Presentation

# *Guidance for authors: The evidence presented should directly respond to the review objective and question(s). The data is commonly presented graphically or in diagrammatic or tabular form. Preparation of the review protocol is the opportunity for authors to pilot and determine how to best present their data or map and provide detailed description for the reader. Insert information on data presentation/mapping techniques, if any. A narrative summary will accompany the tabulated and/or charted results and will describe how the results relate to the reviews objective and question/s.*

# Acknowledgements

*Guidance for authors: Insert the full names and precise contributions of individuals, or institutions, who have not already been listed as co-authors. Specify if this review is to contribute towards a degree award and for which author (initials). Note: the acknowledgement section must be included in the submission title page to facilitate the double-blind peer-review process. For further guidance, please refer to the JBI Evidence Synthesis manuscript style and preparation guidelines.*

# Funding

*Guidance for authors: Provide details on sources of funding for the review and explicitly describe the role of funders in the review process. For further guidance, please refer to the JBI Evidence Synthesis manuscript style and preparation guidelines.*

# Conflicts of interest

*Guidance for authors: Include a statement that describes a potential conflict of interest or any personal, financial, professional, or intellectual bias for any of the authors listed on the manuscript. If no conflict exists, include the following statement: There is no conflict of interest in this project.*
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# Appendices

### Appendix I: Search strategy

*Guidance for authors: For protocols - present a full search strategy for at least one electronic database including planned limits, such that it can be reviewed and repeated. For systematic reviews, all search strategies should be presented.*

### Appendix II: Data extraction instrument

#Only append the JBI or non-JBI data extraction instrument if the standardized tool has been modified in any way, otherwise simply cite the tool used in the text. Any modifications made to the instrument should also be described in the text.