8.5.2 Mixed methods systematic review using a CONVERGENT SEGREGATED approach to synthesis and integration

Title of a mixed method systematic review

The title should be informative and give clear indication of the topic and population of the MMSR. Titles should not be phrased as questions and there should be congruency between the title, review question (s) and inclusion criteria. The title should always include the phrase “…a mixed methods systematic review” to allow easy identification of the type of document it represents. An example title may be:

Mindfulness-based interventions for nurses: a mixed methods systematic review

Abstract

This section is a summary of the review in 500 words, stating the objective, methods, main findings and principal conclusions of the review. The abstract should not contain abbreviations or references.

The following headings should be included in the abstract.

Objective: State an overarching review objective structured using the key components of the inclusion criteria (approximately one to two sentences).

Introduction: Briefly describe what is already known on the topic and what this review will add to the evidence base (approximately two to three sentences).

Inclusion criteria: Summarize the inclusion criteria as it relates to the type of review being conducted. Present the information in one or two sentences – NOT under individual subheadings.

Methods: List the key information sources searched (those that provided the majority of included studies), any limits placed on the scope of the search (e.g. language), and the date range, or the date of the last search. State the recommended JBI approach to MMSR was followed e.g. study selection, critical appraisal, data extraction and data synthesis and integration. The method of synthesis and integration should be clearly reported (convergent segregated). Otherwise, briefly describe any notable deviations to the methodological approach taken (e.g. criteria used to exclude studies on the basis of methodological quality etc.).

Results: The bulk of the abstract should be reserved to convey the main results of the review. As a general rule, report the number and type of included studies, and any pertinent study characteristics. Summarize the overall quality of the included studies.

Report the results obtained from quantitative synthesis, and the findings from the qualitative synthesis. Key findings from the integration of quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence should also be presented.

Conclusions: Provide a conclusion based on a general interpretation of the results considering, for example, the methodological quality of the included studies and any limitations of the review. Briefly convey key implications for practice and/or research.

Introduction

As with all JBI systematic reviews, the introduction to a MMSR should describe and situate the topic of interest under review. Definitions can assist to provide clarity. Where complex or multifaceted phenomena are described, it may be important to detail the whole of the phenomenon for an international readership. Explanation of how the review question can be answered by both quantitative and qualitative studies is required as is an explanation on how the review will add to the evidence base or inform clinical practice.

Additionally, a statement that a preliminary search of databases (with databases listed) was undertaken and no existing or ongoing mixed method or individual systematic reviews on the topic were identified should be provided. If other systematic reviews on the topic existed, indication on how the proposed systematic review differed should be detailed. Finally the introduction should conclude with an overarching review objective that captures and aligns with the core elements of the inclusion criteria. The introduction should be approximately 1000 words.

Review question(s)

The review question(s) should be explicitly stated in unambiguous terms. See Section 8.4 of this Chapter for further information regarding the question(s) of a MMSR.
Inclusion criteria

This section of the review details the basis on which studies were considered for inclusion in the systematic review and should be as clear and unambiguous as possible. Inclusion criteria should be reasonable, sound and justified and address the elements in the PICO/PICO questions.

Population

This section should specify the details about types of participants considered for the review (e.g., age, disease/condition, severity of illness, setting, gender, ethnicity etc.). This section is universal, for example:

The review considered studies that included #describe population#

Intervention

Details about the intervention of interest should be specified, for example:

The quantitative component of the review considered studies that evaluated #insert text#. Information about the comparator(s) should also be detailed here.

Phenomena of interest

The qualitative component of this review considered studies that investigated #insert text#

Like the protocol, details about the phenomena of interest should be adequately described.

Outcomes

This should address the quantitative component only, for example:

The quantitative component of this review considered studies that included the following outcome measures: #insert text#

Like the protocol, all outcomes should be adequately described including how they will be measured.

Context

This should address the qualitative component only, for example:

The qualitative component of this review considered studies that investigated #insert text#

Like the protocol, details regarding the context should be provided.

Types of studies

This should address each of the syntheses included in the review, for example:

This review considered quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods studies. Quantitative studies included #insert text#. Qualitative studies included #insert text#. Mixed method studies were considered if data from the quantitative or qualitative components could be clearly extracted.

There should be a congruence in this section between the methodology of the primary research studies to be considered for the review and the review question(s).

Methods

This section of the review is reserved for the methods used to conduct the review and should be presented under the relevant subheadings, including any deviations from the method outlined in the a priori protocol and a rationale.

Directly below the Methods heading provide the following information:

- State and appropriately cite the JBI methodology that was employed in the conduct of the review and synthesis.
- Refer to and cite the a priori protocol that was published, or accepted for publication (e.g. ‘in press’), in the JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports.
- If the protocol was registered with PROSPERO, provide registration information including registration number (e.g. PROSPERO CRD42015425226).

Search strategy
The search strategy section of a review should provide explicit and clear information regarding all information sources (electronic bibliographic databases; gray literature sources; relevant journals; websites of relevant organizations; etc.) that were used in the review, and the actual strategies used for searching (all should be provided in the appendix). The review should specify the timeframe for the search, the date of the last search for each database, and any language and date restrictions, with appropriate justifications. For example:

The search strategy aimed to find both published and unpublished studies. A three-step search strategy was utilized in this review. First an initial limited search of #MEDLINE and CINAHL# change as appropriate# was undertaken followed by analysis of the text words contained in the title and abstract and the index terms used to describe the articles. The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms was adapted for each included information source and a second search was undertaken on #insert month and date searched#. The full search strategies are provided in Appendix #. Finally the reference list of all studies selected for critical appraisal will be screened for additional studies.

**Information sources**

The databases that were searched included: #insert databases with platforms as appropriate#.

Sources of unpublished studies and gray literature included #insert text, e.g. trial registers etc.#

Where databases/registries/sources were specific to a particular design, the reviewers should clearly indicate such e.g.:

Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (For quantitative studies only)

**Study selection**

The review should describe the actual process of study screening for all stages of selection (e.g. title and abstract examination; full text examination) and the procedures used for solving disagreements between reviewers. For example:

Following the search, all identified citations were collated and uploaded into #insert bibliographic software or citation management system (e.g. EndNote version/year (Clarivate Analytics, PA, USA)# and duplicates removed. Titles and abstracts were then screened by two reviewers for assessment against the inclusion criteria for the review. Studies that met the inclusion criteria were retrieved in full and their details imported into the JBI System for the Unified Management Assessment and Review of Information package (JBI SUMARI). The full text of selected studies were retrieved and assessed in detail against the inclusion criteria by two independent reviewers. Full text studies that did not meet the inclusion criteria were excluded and reasons for exclusion are provided in #insert Appendix number#. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion (OR There were no disagreements that arose between reviewers).

**Assessment of methodological quality**

The review should specify the critical appraisal process, the instruments that were used and the procedures for solving disagreements between reviewers. The details of the decision processes and criteria used for exclusion of studies based on the results of critical appraisal should be explicitly provided. All details about the scoring systems and the cut-off scores (if applicable) for inclusion of studies in the review should be described and justified. For example:

Eligible studies were critically appraised by two independent reviewers for methodological quality using the #insert names of tools used  and cite them.# Authors of papers were contacted to request missing or additional data for clarification, where required. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

Indicate what constituted acceptable levels of information for a study to receive a positive, negative or unclear response to a critical appraisal question and if applicable, the rationale and criteria for excluding studies on the basis of methodological quality.

**Data extraction**

The review should specify the data extraction process and instruments that were used in the review process and the procedures for solving disagreements between reviewers. For example:
Quantitative and qualitative data were extracted from included studies by two independent reviewers using the relevant JBI data extraction tool. #modify if other software or processes were used for your review#. #Cite the tool used or append the data extraction tool if an existing tool was modified or a new tool developed. Any modifications to existing tools should be described in the text#. For quantitative studies (and the quantitative component of mixed methods studies), data extracted included specific details about the populations, interventions, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question. For qualitative studies (and the qualitative component of mixed methods studies), data extracted included specific details about the population, context, culture, geographical location, study methods and the phenomenon of interest relevant to the review question. Findings with their corresponding illustrations were also extracted and assigned a level of credibility. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer. Authors of #insert number of studies# were contacted for missing information or additional data.

Data synthesis and integration

The review should indicate that a convergent segregated approach to synthesis and integration was applied. This section should also indicate the approach used to perform the quantitative synthesis (i.e. meta-analysis and/or narrative synthesis) and the qualitative synthesis (i.e. meta-aggregative or narrative synthesis). See Section 8.4 of this Chapter for further information. The approach to the integration of the quantitative and qualitative evidence should be described in as much detail as is reasonably possible. For example:

Quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence were integrated using configurative analysis. This involved constant comparison of the quantitative evidence and the qualitative evidence, followed by the analysis of interventions, which had been investigated in the quantitative studies, in line with the experiences of participants explored in the qualitative studies in order to organize/link the evidence into a line of argument. Where configuration was not possible the findings are presented in narrative form.

Results

This section of the review has distinct sub-sections describing study inclusion, the methodological quality of included studies, detailed characteristics and description of the included studies and, importantly, the findings of the individual syntheses and results of the integration of the quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence.

Study inclusion

This section should allow the reader to clearly follow how the included studies were identified and selected for inclusion in the review. There should be a narrative description of the process accompanied by a PRISMA flowchart; details to be reported include narrative summary of the numbers of studies identified, numbers screened, studies selected for retrieval and included/excluded and their reasons for exclusion, numbers appraised and included/excluded, and numbers included in the review. This section should report the number of studies which contributed to the quantitative component and the number of studies which contributed to the qualitative component.

Ideally, a list of all excluded studies, excluded after full text examination and after critical appraisal, with the explicit reasons for exclusion, should be provided in appendices to the review. As a minimum, at least the list of studies excluded after critical appraisal and the reasons for exclusion should be reported. If no studies were excluded after critical appraisal then the list of all studies excluded after full text examination including the explicit reasons for exclusion, should be provided in appendices to the review.

Methodological quality

This section should focus on methodological quality as determined by the relevant critical appraisal instrument. There should be a separate narrative summary for the overall methodological quality of the quantitative (and quantitative component of mixed methods studies) and qualitative (and qualitative component of mixed methods studies) studies, which can be supported by tables showing the results of the critical appraisal (see Tables 8.6 and 8.7 for examples). Please note, not all quantitative study designs are shown below). Where only few studies are identified, or there are specific items of interest from included studies, these should be addressed in the narrative also, particularly where studies were deficient, or particularly good. Use of ‘Unclear’ and ‘Not Applicable’ should also be explained in the text.

Table 8.6: Critical appraisal results for included studies using the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomized Controlled Trials (and RCT component of mixed methods studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>O4</th>
<th>O5</th>
<th>O6</th>
<th>O7</th>
<th>O8</th>
<th>O9</th>
<th>O10</th>
<th>O11</th>
<th>O12</th>
<th>O13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Y - Yes, N - No, U - Unclear, N/A - not applicable

Table 8.7: Critical appraisal results for included studies using the JBI Qualitative Critical Appraisal Checklist (and qualitative component of mixed methods studies)
If modified appraisal tools are not appended to the review, the appraisal questions should be added as a footnote/caption to the tables so readers can clearly interpret the information presented.

**Characteristics of included studies**

This section of the results should include an overall description of the included studies (with reference to the table of included study characteristics in the appendices), with the main aim to provide some context to the results section and sufficient detail for the reader to confirm that the studies match the eligibility criteria for the review. This includes the descriptive and demographic features (e.g. the country and setting of the study) of the included studies, methodology of included studies, geographic context of included studies and participant characteristics, characteristics of the interventions, and phenomena of interest, as they relate to the review questions and the inclusion criteria. Specific items/points of interest from individual studies may also be highlighted here and synthesized in a narrative.

**Findings of the review**

**Quantitative evidence**

This section should be organized in a meaningful way based on the review question(s) and types of interventions and outcomes. This section should provide comprehensive information regarding the results of all performed meta-analyses and additional analyses (e.g. sub-group analysis). Summary results from meta-analyses should be reported as summary point estimates and interval estimates (confidence intervals) with consideration of any heterogeneity present. The meta-analysis forest plots should also be presented in this section. A narrative summary should complement the forest plots and provide additional commentaries and explanations for all performed meta-analyses (Munn, Tufanaru, & Aromataris, 2014).

If meta-analysis is not performed, a narrative summary should be included. The narrative summary should provide an overall summary of the findings of the included studies and their biases, strengths and limitations. Textual commentaries and tables are used in order to summarize the results from the included studies and to provide context information for these results, thus facilitating understanding of the summarized results.

**Qualitative evidence**

This section should be organized in a meaningful way based on the review question(s). A meta-aggregative schematic should constitute part of this section, which must be accompanied by sufficient narrative to explain the categories and synthesized findings. Where textual pooling was not possible the findings should be presented in narrative form.

Findings and illustrations should be located in an appendix, or may be incorporated into the body of the review. There should be a logical and informative presentation of the findings, categories and synthesized findings.

**Integration of quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence**

This section should provide a narrative summary that represents the configured analysis of the quantitative and qualitative evidence. This should include statements that address ALL of the following questions:

- Are the results/findings from individual syntheses supportive or contradictory?

For example, the quantitative evidence might show improvements in patient outcomes following exposure to the intervention. These results support the qualitative evidence, which might demonstrate patients' perceived benefits from taking part in the intervention. In this example, the quantitative evidence supports the qualitative evidence. In some instances, however, the results/findings from individual syntheses may be conflicting. For example, while the qualitative evidence might describe patients' perceived benefits from the treatment, the quantitative evidence might fail to demonstrate a reduction of patient symptoms following the intervention.

- Does the qualitative evidence explain why the intervention is/is not effective?

For example, findings from the qualitative evidence might reveal that patients perceived the intervention of interest as a pleasant experience and that it contributed to their sense of well-being. This can then be used to explain and support why compliance to the intervention was high and why the majority of patients actively engaged with their health practitioners, which would be useful for explaining the effectiveness of the intervention.
• Does the qualitative evidence explain differences in the direction and size of effect across the included quantitative studies?

For example, results from the quantitative evidence might show differences in the effects of the intervention which might have been explored in the qualitative studies e.g. it is possible that some results in the quantitative evidence are better understood when the results from the qualitative evidence are taken into account?

• Which aspects of the quantitative evidence were/were not explored in the qualitative studies?

For example, the reviewer might indicate that some outcomes measured in the quantitative studies (e.g. health-related quality of life, family relationships, anxiety) were not explored in the qualitative studies and can therefore be investigated in future qualitative studies.

• Which aspects of the qualitative evidence were/were not tested in the quantitative studies?

For example, findings from the qualitative evidence might indicate some perceived positive effects (e.g. improved mood) from the intervention which might not have been measured in the quantitative studies; this would have implications for future trials.

All of the questions above should be answered, however dependent on the evidence included in the review it is acknowledged that some responses will be more detailed than others.

Please note: Due to the complexities associated with recommendations being derived from both streams of evidence and the impact of data transformation and/or integration on the grading process, an assessment of the certainty of the evidence using either the GRADE or ConQual approach is currently not recommended for JBI MMSR following either the integrated or segregated approach and requires further investigation.

Discussion

This section should provide a detailed discussion of the findings of the review and of the significance of the review findings in relation to practice and research as well as a discussion of issues arising from the conduct of the review. The findings should be discussed in the context of current literature, practice and policy. It should also include a narrative discussion of the review results in comparison with other external literature, and against the broad directions established in the introduction of the review. The discussion does not bring in new findings that have not been reported in the results section but does seek to establish a line of argument based on the findings regarding the intervention and phenomenon of interest.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section should include the overall conclusions of the review. The conclusions should provide direct answers to the review question(s). These conclusions should be based only on the results of the review and directly inferred from the review results.

Recommendations for practice

This sub-section of the Conclusions section should include the recommendations for practice inferred from the results of the integration of the quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence. Recommendations should be assigned a JBI Grade of Recommendation.

Recommendations for research

This should include the recommendations for future research inferred from the results of the integration of the quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence, specifically, inferred from the gaps identified during the configurative analysis, and issues and problems noted in the review process related to the search, selection of studies, critical appraisal, data extraction, and data synthesis.
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