

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

## Systematic review

Fields that have an **asterisk (\*)** next to them means that they **must be answered**. **Word limits** are provided for each section. You will be unable to submit the form if the word limits are exceeded for any section. *Registrant* means the person filling out the form.

### 1. \* Review title.

Give the title of the review in English

Disability, sexual and reproductive health: A mixed methods systematic review of Healthcare professionals views on their confidence and competence in care provision

### 2. Original language title.

For reviews in languages other than English, give the title in the original language. This will be displayed with the English language title.

### 3. \* Anticipated or actual start date.

Give the date the systematic review started or is expected to start.

08/01/2020

### 4. \* Anticipated completion date.

Give the date by which the review is expected to be completed.

01/05/2020

### 5. \* Stage of review at time of this submission.

Tick the boxes to show which review tasks have been started and which have been completed. Update this field each time any amendments are made to a published record.

**Reviews that have started data extraction (at the time of initial submission) are not eligible for inclusion in PROSPERO.**

If there is later evidence that incorrect status and/or completion date has been supplied, the published PROSPERO record will be marked as retracted.

This field uses answers to initial screening questions. It cannot be edited until after registration.

The review has not yet started: No

Review 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	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

Review stage	Started	Completed
Data analysis	No	No

Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here.

### 6. \* Named contact.

The named contact is the guarantor for the accuracy of the information in the register record. This may be any member of the review team.

Lucy Craig

Email salutation (e.g. "Dr Smith" or "Joanne") for correspondence:

Miss Craig

### 7. \* Named contact email.

Give the electronic email address of the named contact.

lucyc1999@gmail.com

### 8. Named contact address

**PLEASE NOTE this information will be published in the PROSPERO record so please do not enter private information, i.e. personal home address**

Give the full institutional/organisational postal address for the named contact.

University of Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

### 9. Named contact phone number.

Give the telephone number for the named contact, including international dialling code.

07920776693

### 10. \* Organisational affiliation of the review.

Full title of the organisational affiliations for this review and website address if available. This field may be completed as 'None' if the review is not affiliated to any organisation.

University of Edinburgh

Organisation web address:

s1711285@ed.ac.uk

### 11. \* Review team members and their organisational affiliations.

Give the personal details and the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team. Affiliation refers to groups or organisations to which review team members belong.

**NOTE: email and country now MUST be entered for each person, unless you are amending a published record.**

Miss Lucy Craig. University of Edinburgh

Dr Zhong Eric Chen. Chalmers Sexual Health Clinic

Mrs Joanne Barrie. Central Sexual Health

### 12. \* Funding sources/sponsors.

<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/#recordDetails>

2/9

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

Details of the individuals, organizations, groups, companies or other legal entities who have funded or sponsored the review.

No funding

Grant number(s)

State the funder, grant or award number and the date of award

### 13. \* Conflicts of interest.

List actual or perceived conflicts of interest (financial or academic).

None

### 14. Collaborators.

Give the name and affiliation of any individuals or organisations who are working on the review but who are not listed as review team members. **NOTE: email and country must be completed for each person, unless you are amending a published record.**

### 15. \* Review question.

State the review question(s) clearly and precisely. It may be appropriate to break very broad questions down into a series of related more specific questions. Questions may be framed or refined using PI(E)COS or similar where relevant.

To explore the views of healthcare professionals on their confidence and competency in providing sexual and reproductive healthcare to people with disabilities.

### 16. \* Searches.

State the sources that will be searched (e.g. Medline). Give the search dates, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication date). Do NOT enter the full search strategy (it may be provided as a link or attachment below.)

Database searching was carried out on PubMed and Scopus in January 2020, the search was restricted to English language papers only.

### 17. URL to search strategy.

Upload a file with your search strategy, or an example of a search strategy for a specific database, (including the keywords) in pdf or word format. In doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

Or provide a URL or link to the strategy. Do NOT provide links to your search **results**.

[https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPEROFILES/197736\\_STRATEGY\\_20210103.pdf](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPEROFILES/197736_STRATEGY_20210103.pdf)

Yes I give permission for this file to be made publicly available

### 18. \* Condition or domain being studied.

Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied in your systematic review.

Sexual and reproductive health of people with disabilities

### 19. \* Participants/population.

Specify the participants or populations being studied in the review. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Healthcare professional providing sexual and reproductive care to people with disabilities

### 20. \* Intervention(s), exposure(s).

<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/#recordDetails>

3/9

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

Give full and clear descriptions or definitions of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion criteria:

Peer reviewed papers reporting primary data on the experiences of healthcare professionals surrounding sexual and reproductive healthcare for people with disabilities, or results of staff training programmes/workshops surrounding the subject.

Exclusion criteria:

Studies not published or translated into English

Articles without full text available

Papers which only discussed staff attitudes on the subject due to previous systematic reviews, except in the context of training programmes

### 21. \* Comparator(s)/control.

Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the intervention/exposure will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group). The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

not applicable

### 22. \* Types of study to be included.

Give details of the study designs (e.g. RCT) that are eligible for inclusion in the review. The preferred format includes both inclusion and exclusion criteria. If there are no restrictions on the types of study, this should be stated.

There was no restrictions on the types of study to be included within the review. However, inclusion and exclusion regarding the data within studies were as followed:

Inclusion criteria:

Peer-reviewed papers reporting primary data on the experiences of healthcare professionals surrounding sexual and reproductive healthcare for people with disabilities, or results of staff training programmes/workshops surrounding the subject.

Exclusion criteria:

Studies not published or translated into English.

Articles without full text available.

Paper which only discussed staff attitudes on the subject due to previous systematic reviews, except in the context of training programmes.

### 23. Context.

Give summary details of the setting or other relevant characteristics, which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

### 24. \* Main outcome(s).

Give the pre-specified main (most important) outcomes of the review, including details of how the outcome is defined and measured and when these measurement are made, if these are part of the review inclusion criteria.

The review aims to explore the views of healthcare professionals confidence and competency in providing sexual and reproductive healthcare to people with disabilities. This will give us an insight of current practices within this field and understand what is working and what can be improved upon in order to improve health outcomes.

\* Measures of effect

not applicable

### 25. \* Additional outcome(s).

List the pre-specified additional outcomes of the review, with a similar level of detail to that required for main outcomes. Where there are no additional outcomes please state 'None' or 'Not applicable' as appropriate to the review

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

not applicable

**\* Measures of effect**

not applicable

**26. \* Data extraction (selection and coding).**

Describe how studies will be selected for inclusion. State what data will be extracted or obtained. State how this will be done and recorded.

Studies will be imported into an Microsoft Excel file for storage, electronic and manual removal of duplicates and selection with regards to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. This will be carried out by the first author and second authors and disagreements about inclusion verdict will be resolved by the third author.

Data to be extracted will include author(s), publication date, country of publication, methodology, population characteristics and key findings. This will be carried out by the first author and reviewed by the second and third authors.

**27. \* Risk of bias (quality) assessment.**

State which characteristics of the studies will be assessed and/or any formal risk of bias/quality assessment tools that will be used.

Quality assessment of studies will be carried out using Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. This will be carried out by the first author and reviewed by the second and third authors.

**28. \* Strategy for data synthesis.**

Describe the methods you plan to use to synthesise data. This **must not be generic text** but should be **specific to your review** and describe how the proposed approach will be applied to your data.

If meta-analysis is planned, describe the models to be used, methods to explore statistical heterogeneity, and software package to be used.

Prior to data synthesis, quantitative data will be transformed into 'qualitised' data to facilitate data synthesis. Data will then be synthesized into the two integrated findings of 'experiences of healthcare professionals' and 'results from training programmes/workshops'. Data within these findings will be organised into themes.

**29. \* Analysis of subgroups or subsets.**

State any planned investigation of 'subgroups'. Be clear and specific about which type of study or participant will be included in each group or covariate investigated. State the planned analytic approach.

Prior to data extraction, it has been decided to analyse studies in two integrated findings as the study aims and designs were different.

**30. \* Type and method of review.**

Select the type of review, review method and health area from the lists below.

**Type of review**

Cost effectiveness	No
Diagnostic	No
Epidemiologic	No
Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis	No
Intervention	No
Meta-analysis	No
Methodology	No

1/29/2021	PROSPERO
Narrative synthesis	No
Network meta-analysis	No
Pre-clinical	No
Prevention	No
Prognostic	No
Prospective meta-analysis (PMA)	No
Review of reviews	No
Service delivery	No
Synthesis of qualitative studies	No
Systematic review	Yes
Other	No
<b>Health area of the review</b>	
Alcohol/substance misuse/abuse	No
Blood and immune system	No
Cancer	No
Cardiovascular	No
Care of the elderly	No
Child health	No
Complementary therapies	No
COVID-19	No
Crime and justice	No
Dental	No
Digestive system	No
Ear, nose and throat	No
Education	Yes
Endocrine and metabolic disorders	No
Eye disorders	No

1/29/2021	PROSPERO
General interest	No
Genetics	No
Health inequalities/health equity	Yes
Infections and infestations	No
International development	No
Mental health and behavioural conditions	No
Musculoskeletal	No
Neurological	No
Nursing	No
Obstetrics and gynaecology	Yes
Oral health	No
Palliative care	No
Perioperative care	No
Physiotherapy	No
Pregnancy and childbirth	Yes
Public health (including social determinants of health)	Yes
Rehabilitation	No
Respiratory disorders	No
Service delivery	No
Skin disorders	No
Social care	No
Surgery	No
Tropical Medicine	No
Urological	Yes
Wounds, injuries and accidents	No
Violence and abuse	No

### 31. Language.

Select each language individually to add it to the list below, use the bin icon to remove any added in error.

1/29/2021

PROSPERO

English

There is not an English language summary

**32. \* Country.**

Select the country in which the review is being carried out. For multi-national collaborations select all the countries involved.

Scotland

**33. Other registration details.**

Name any other organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered (e.g. Campbell, or The Joanna Briggs Institute) together with any unique identification number assigned by them.

If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here. If none, leave blank.

**34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol.**

If the protocol for this review is published provide details (authors, title and journal details, preferably in Vancouver format)

No I do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

**35. Dissemination plans.**

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

Yes

**36. Keywords.**

Give words or phrases that best describe the review. Separate keywords with a semicolon or new line. Keywords help PROSPERO users find your review (keywords do not appear in the public record but are included in searches). Be as specific and precise as possible. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations unless these are in wide use.

**37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.**

If you are registering an update of an existing review give details of the earlier versions and include a full bibliographic reference, if available.

**38. \* Current review status.**

Update review status when the review is completed and when it is published.

New registrations must be ongoing so this field is not editable for initial submission.

Review\_Ongoing

**39. Any additional information.**

Provide any other information relevant to the registration of this review.



1/29/2021

PROSPERO

**40. Details of final report/publication(s) or preprints if available.**

Leave empty until publication details are available OR you have a link to a preprint (NOTE: this field is not editable for initial submission).

List authors, title and journal details preferably in Vancouver format.