Synthesis for health services and policy: case studies in the scoping of reviews

Rob Anderson,[1*] Andrew Booth,[2] Alison Eastwood,[3] Mark Rodgers,[3] Liz Shaw,[1] Jo Thompson Coon,[1,4] Simon Briscoe,[1] Anna Cantrell,[2] Duncan Chambers,[2] Elizabeth Goyder,[2] Michael Nunns,[1] Louise Preston,[2] Gary Raine[3] and Sian Thomas[3]

[1]Exeter Health Services and Delivery Research Evidence Synthesis Centre, Institute of Health Research, University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, UK
[2]Sheffield Health Services and Delivery Research Evidence Synthesis Centre, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
[3]York Health Service and Delivery Research Evidence Synthesis Centre, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, York, UK
[4]National Institute for Health Research Applied Research Collaboration South West Peninsula, Devon, Cornwall and Somerset, UK

*Corresponding author R.Anderson@exeter.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Rob Anderson was a member of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Services and Delivery Research (HSDR) (Researcher-Led) Prioritisation Committee (2016–July 2019). Andrew Booth is a member of the NIHR HSDR Funding Board (2019–present) and the NIHR Evidence Synthesis Programme Advisory Group (2019–present). Jo Thompson Coon is a member of the NIHR Health Technology Assessment General Funding Committee (2018–present). In addition, Jo Thompson Coon was partly supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration South West Peninsula.

Published August 2021
DOI: 10.3310/hsdr09150

Scientific summary

Synthesis for health services and policy
Health Services and Delivery Research 2021; Vol. 9: No. 15
DOI: 10.3310/hsdr09150

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

Between April 2017 and June 2020, the National Institute for Health Research Health Services and Delivery Research programme commissioned the University of Exeter (Exeter, UK), the University of Sheffield (Sheffield, UK) and the University of York (York, UK) to deliver a rapid response evidence synthesis programme. The work involved conducting rapid systematic reviews, scoping reviews and other relevant research projects to directly inform NHS, health-care and social care organisation and delivery.

Objectives

To discuss, analyse and present the experiences of three commissioned evidence synthesis centres during the 3-year programme of reviews, specifically in relation to scoping of topics, question formulation and engagement with stakeholders, in conducting evidence synthesis projects to inform health service and social care organisation and delivery in the UK. Scoping comprises those initial processes in a review that aim to establish or refine the review questions and determine the review's scope (e.g. area of focus, key terms and the types of studies to be included).

Methods

Design

This report used case studies of review-scoping processes, thematic analysis and group discussion of findings. Eight case study reviews were chosen by each centre as examples of where scoping was challenging or interesting, where scoping had demonstrated a variety of approaches and where the teams believed that it was particularly critical to the ultimate delivery, quality and usefulness of the review.

Data sources

Sources included researcher recollection, review of notes and meeting minutes from within teams, e-mail correspondence with stakeholders, scoping searches and search results, from first allocation of a review topic through to review protocol agreement.

Experiences of conducting evidence synthesis projects for the National Institute for Health Research Health Services and Delivery Research programme were captured through three complementary processes:

1. Each team identified two or three candidate case studies of syntheses conducted between 2017 and 2020. Case studies were written up by team members using a standard format and template to allow identification of common themes and issues.
2. The case studies were analysed thematically, and 14 themes were identified by one of the co-authors and corroborated by other authors. This framework was informed by earlier conversations among co-authors on the focus of the report and also drew on factors identified in a published systematic review of evidence use by policy-makers. The 14 themes were mapped onto a framework of three categories –

    i. consultative issues: externally generated issues relating to input from commissioners, stakeholders, experts and patient groups to inform the planned evidence synthesis product

ii. interface issues: issues relating to the interaction between the technical processes of the review team and the requirements of the review user
iii. technical issues: internally managed issues relating to the conduct of the review, as experienced within the review team

3. Members of the three teams met to discuss the case studies to identify common issues and experiences and to agree on the lessons learned.

Findings

Eight case studies were identified (Exeter, $n = 3$; Sheffield, $n = 3$; York, $n = 2$) that covered diverse topics and evidence synthesis types. The chosen case studies represent a good match to the diversity of the National Institute for Health Research Health Services and Delivery Research programme research portfolio. All synthesis projects were commissioned or conducted in direct response to policy or health and social care service needs. The three teams encountered considerable similarity in the challenges typically faced, and the processes developed to scope topics and formulate review questions. Each of the identified issues was, therefore, populated by experience from multiple projects across the three academic centres. Fourteen themes were identified within a three-domain framework (consultative–interface–technical).

Consultative issues

- Managing and deciding priorities (consultative issue 1): how the review team manages and negotiates with the National Institute for Health Research, stakeholders and other customers to ensure that priorities are addressed within resource constraints.
- Reconciling different priorities/perspectives (consultative issue 2): how the review team manages potentially competing tensions between what different groups or stakeholders may want to achieve within the overall project remit.
- Achieving buy-in and engagement (consultative issue 3): how the review team secures input into the scoping and prioritising process from stakeholders and sustains this throughout the project to include reception of the deliverables.
- Educating the end-user about synthesis process and products (consultative issue 4): how the review team communicates aspects of review methodology and different synthesis outputs to the potential users/audience, particularly in terms of what the team will deliver.
- Managing stakeholder expectations (consultative issue 5): how the review team communicates what the review project will and will not be able to achieve within the available resources and time frame, particularly when the review will not seek to meet the conventional systematic review standards.

Interface issues

- Identifying the niche/gap and optimising added value (interface issue 1): how the review team positions the intended synthesis product within previous literature or reviews and in addressing users' specific needs.
- Rigour/reliability/relevance (interface issue 2): how the review team manages potentially competing tensions of scientific quality, confidence in the review output and utility to the intended users within the constraints of remit and resources.
- Transferability/applicability of study evidence to policy/service user context (interface issue 3): how the review team manages the need to provide UK-specific interpretation from an evidence base that may have to be drawn from other countries and contexts.

Copyright © 2021 Anderson *et al.* This work was produced by Anderson *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaption in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Technical issues

- Choosing the method(s) of synthesis (technical issue 1): how the review team explores different options and makes an informed decision about which type of synthesis product will best meet the needs of the intended users.
- Balancing fixed and fluid questions/components/definitions (technical issue 2): the extent to which the question, as a whole and/or its individual components, is predefined and predetermined, or whether or not it emerges during exploration of the literature.
- Taking stock of (and building on) what is already out there (technical issue 3): how the review team explores the quantity, quality and characteristics of existing studies and/or reviews in determining which output will be both feasible and useful.
- Mapping versus scoping versus reviewing (technical issue 4): how the review team manages and intersects the relationship between exploring the characteristics of the existing evidence base (mapping), determining the parameters of the specific synthesis (scoping) and conducting the synthesis (reviewing), and the extent to which these processes transform into discrete project deliverables.
- Scoping/relevance as a continuous process not just at initiation (technical issue 5): the extent to which the scoping process is used as an opportunity to precondition the users to the content and form of the final synthesis product.
- Calibrating general compared with specific and broad compared with deep (technical issue 6): how the review team makes decisions regarding whether to cover an entire topic or to select one or more subtopics as exemplars of the whole, and the extent to which they optimise coverage compared with detail (i.e. description vs. analysis).

Discussion of these themes identified several broader themes or tensions relating to scoping processes and challenges:

- Acknowledging the need for iteration, effort and perseverance to scope review topics well.
- Navigating between 'the two fears' of ending up with 'too much' evidence or 'too little'/no evidence.
- Scoping as negotiation between parties with competing objectives or as honest brokers with shared goals and working towards shared understanding.
- Scoping as co-production (i.e. review teams working as partners with research commissioners, policy-makers and service providers).
- 'Pinning down' compared with 'keeping open' what the review will focus on and produce.
- The role of information specialists.
- The ethics of commissioned reviews.
- Scoping is both a technical (i.e. informational, scientific rule-based) process and a social process (i.e. developing relationships and shared learning).

Looking across all the issues and themes, we have also summarised the practical implications of our findings – for review teams, research commissioners and the users of rapid responsive reviews – as 28 'lessons learned'.

Strengths and limitations of our methods

This report and the case studies within it have been produced by experienced review methodologists who have worked in diverse topic areas and review contexts. The methodologists contribute rich and diverse experience of scoping and question formulation issues, and have researched and, in many cases, published on the methodology of reviews, in general, and of scoping and question framing processes, in particular. The teams reflected a good representation of key review functions in project direction and management, information retrieval and review methodology.

Recollections and reflections of team members may have unintentionally under-reported negative experiences of stakeholder engagement or communication from research commissioners. Selection of case studies was typically based on their perceived value in capturing issues related to scoping or question formulation. However, these may have been subject to availability bias or immediacy effects. Reporting of issues may seek to preserve relationships with current stakeholders, potential collaborators or future review commissioners. Although attempts have been made to preserve the anonymity of those engaged in the planning or conduct of each review, some of these may be readily identifiable from their role, as acknowledged in each case study.

As with the previous report, which reflected on the first 3 years of these commissioned Health Services and Delivery Research evidence synthesis centres (2014–17), scoping processes were mainly focused on policy customer and other professional/organisational end-users or stakeholders. Although some of the described reviews did involve consultation with patients or the public in the scoping stages, it was typically alongside more intensive consultation with the review commissioners and policy end-users. The teams need to transparently consider if this is an inevitable consequence of the rapidity of these reviews and the presumed importance to clarify policy customer expectations first, or if more agile and preplanned efforts to involve patients and the public in scoping stages are both feasible and essential.

Conclusions

The needs of a commissioned, rapid and responsive evidence synthesis programme extend beyond the sound technical and scientific practices of a review team. Relationship-building and social processes are key to the scoping and shared learning process between the review commissioners and the review team; between the review teams and diverse stakeholders, including patient and public involvement representatives; and within the review team itself. In some cases, the intended users are identifiable, offering a focus for consultation, but this adds a requirement for relationship management by the review team and National Institute for Health Research commissioners. Rapid evidence synthesis programmes require experienced research staff to broker the relationship between the objective, the end product and the needs of intended users throughout the scoping and question definition process. Relationships should be conducted within agreed principles for good evidence synthesis for policy. From the shared experiences and reflections from the three centres from 2017 to 2020, we have identified common issues and suggested lessons for improving scoping processes to inform similar commissioned and responsive review programmes. More prospective methodological research conducted alongside such rapid and responsive review teams could be used to validate the considerations and competing goals of scoping identified in this report, and potentially develop strategies and tools for managing them more effectively.

Funding

This report has been based on work commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Services and Delivery Research (HSDR) programme as three university-based evidence synthesis centres to inform the organisation, delivery and commissioning of health and social care; at the University of Exeter (NIHR 16/47/22), the University of Sheffield (NIHR 16/47/17) and the University of York (NIHR 16/47/11). This report was commissioned by the NIHR HSDR programme as a review project (NIHR132708) within the NIHR HSDR programme. This project was funded by the NIHR HSDR programme and will be published in full in *Health Services and Delivery Research*; Vol. 9, No. 15. See the NIHR Journals Library website for further project information.

Copyright © 2021 Anderson *et al.* This work was produced by Anderson *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaption in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Health Services and Delivery Research

ISSN 2050-4349 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4357 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HS&DR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Services and Delivery Research* journal

Reports are published in *Health Services and Delivery Research* (HS&DR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HS&DR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

HS&DR programme

The HS&DR programme funds research to produce evidence to impact on the quality, accessibility and organisation of health and social care services. This includes evaluations of how the NHS and social care might improve delivery of services.

For more information about the HS&DR programme please visit the website at https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/funding-programmes/health-services-and-delivery-research.htm

This report

The research reported here is the product of an HS&DR Evidence Synthesis Centre, contracted to provide rapid evidence syntheses on issues of relevance to the health service, and to inform future HS&DR calls for new research around identified gaps in evidence. Other reviews by the Evidence Synthesis Centres are also available in the HS&DR journal.

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HS&DR programme or one of its preceding programmes as project numbers 16/47/22, 16/47/17, 16/47/11. The contractual start date was in April 2017. The final report began editorial review in March 2021 and was accepted for publication in May 2021. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HS&DR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HS&DR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Copyright © 2021 Anderson *et al.* This work was produced by Anderson *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaption in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Scientific Adviser (Evidence Use), Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk