

SWAR 40: Evaluating the PRO-EDI tool in a Mixed Method Evidence Synthesis

Objective of this SWAR

We plan to evaluate the PRO-EDI tool from a user perspective (researcher and decision maker/evidence user). The tool will be incorporated into our data extraction and, where possible, synthesis methods and processes. It will be used to inform how we present Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) data and insights to our stakeholders.

Some methodological innovations do not lead to changes in practice, particularly if they are difficult or time consuming to use. Central to the development of PRO-EDIT, therefore, is the need for it to be useable by any review team. It is also important to consider whether the content of the tool is comprehensive, user friendly and practical to ensure a robust approach and efficient use of resources. To establish whether PRO-EDI delivers on these, we will use a user experience / user testing approach to enable reviewers and stakeholders to share their thoughts, experiences, and opinions of applying it in a systematic review (reviewers) and when consuming the outputs (decision maker and evidence users).

Therefore, the objectives of this Study Within a Review (SWAR) [1] are to improve understanding of the experiences of using PRO-EDI to collect, synthesise and share EDI data in a systematic review. We will seek to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the experiences of reviewers of using PRO-EDI to collect and synthesise EDI data?
2. What are the workload implications for reviewers using PRO-EDI to collect and synthesise EDI data?
3. How useful and accessible are the outputs from PRO-EDI to evidence users and decision makers?

Study area: Data Extraction, Synthesis and Interpretation, Dissemination

Sample type: Review Authors, Evidence users, Practitioners

Estimated funding level needed: Low

Background

This SWAR will be conducted alongside two linked systematic reviews of education and information interventions for people managing early-stage chronic kidney disease (CKD).

Many patients face significant barriers to accessing the high-quality education or information they need to facilitate self-management and prevent disease progression [2]. These include low levels of health literacy, low readiness to learn, an insufficient prioritisation of kidney health amongst the demands of other comorbidities, clinical time and resource constraints, and a lack of consensus on when and how to deliver information [3,4]. Reduced access to preventative interventions known to slow progression has profound impacts for patients. For example, even though more women have kidney disease, more men progress to dialysis [4,5]; people from Black and South Asian backgrounds are 3-5 times more likely to progress to needing dialysis and people who are socially disadvantaged are more likely to start dialysis [5,6]. Many of these groups will have co-morbid conditions such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease, so they are at higher risk of developing CKD, therefore early detection and access to appropriate information is critical.

Ideally, interventions which aim to provide information, and education would reduce inequities in health. However, this is not always the case, and some interventions may increase inequities. Consideration of equity issues is therefore a critical component of our proposed evidence syntheses. Several frameworks have been proposed to address equity in reviews including the PROGRESS-Plus framework. Despite this, equity issues are rarely adequately assessed and reported in systematic reviews [7-10]. The PRO-EDI tool has been developed to operationalise the assessment of EDI in systematic reviews of trials [11,12]. It aims to inform both applicability judgements and highlight EDI evidence gaps and uncertainties.

The tool should facilitate the review process through explicit consideration of equity, diversity, and inclusion, and guide a researcher and an end-user of evidence through an objective, analytical, evaluation process that covers all relevant factors and helps articulate whether the review findings apply equally to all those who could benefit.

Interventions and Comparators

Intervention 1: PRO-EDI tool

Index Type: Full Review

Method for Allocating to Intervention or Comparator:

N/A

Outcome Measures

Primary: RQ1: Reviewer user experience (i.e. usability, efficiency, comprehensiveness, satisfaction, pros and cons, potential improvements) - Likert and open survey items [% and qualitative experience].

RQ2: Workload/time to complete tasks [time for each task] (i.e. find, extract, use data in synthesis and to formulate applicability statements) - [time measured using automated desktop or mobile timer apps such as Clockify or Harvest].

RQ3: Stakeholder user experience – i.e. how useful and accessible are the PRO-EDI informed outputs for evidence users such as applicability statements, how could they be improved) – consultation workshops [qualitative].

Secondary: RQ1: inter-‘extractor’ levels of agreement on content extracted for PRO-EDI, differences in experience of extracting and using PRO-EDI data based on study type*.

RQ2: List of tasks for extracting and presenting PRO-EDI data, differences between reviewers, over time or between study types.

RQ3: Expressed differences in usefulness or accessibility between study types*.

*PRO-EDI is designed for systematic reviews of randomised trials, therefore considering utility in qualitative evidence synthesis is a novel application of the tool.

Analysis Plans

RQ1: Overall experience and opinions of using PRO-EDI in relation to usability, efficiency etc., and comparison of experience of using PRO-EDI between reviewers (e.g. does this differ by study type?).

RQ2: Calculate time burden (i.e. average time to complete tasks) and assess differences between study types, reviewers and over time (learning).

RQ3: Summarise stakeholder perception of usefulness and accessibility of PRO-EDI supported outputs (such as applicability statements).

Triangulate the data and provide feedback and, where pertinent, recommendations to PRO-EDI developers. The evaluation will cover (but not be limited to) the scope included in the PRO-EDI feedback form.

Possible Problems in Implementing This SWAR

Data collection will rely on the EDI information provided in the publications included in the systematic reviews for this project. The scope of this content is unknown at this stage and may impact on the outcomes.

As PRO-EDI is in early development and the developers are requesting feedback, the findings and recommendations from this SWAR might be out of date before it is completed, if important changes to PRO-EDI are made in the interim.

References

1. Devane D, Burke NN, Treweek S, Clarke M, Thomas J, Booth A, et al. Study within a review (SWAR). *Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine* 2022;15(4):328-32.
2. Kidney Research UK. *Kidney Health Inequalities in the United Kingdom: Reflecting on the Past, Reducing in the Future*. 2018. Available from https://www.kidneyresearchuk.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Health_Inequalities_Report_Complete_FINAL_Web_20181017.pdf (accessed 20 November 2024).
3. Cassidy BP, Getchell LE, Harwood L, Hemmett J, Moist LM. Barriers to Education and Shared Decision Making in the Chronic Kidney Disease Population: A Narrative Review. *Canadian Journal of Kidney Health and Disease* 2018;5:2054358118803322.
4. Roth M, Roderick P, Mindell J. Kidney disease and renal function. *Health survey for England*. 2009:37-58.
5. Gilg J, Methven S, Casula A, Castledine C. UK Renal Registry 19th Annual Report: Chapter 1 UK RRT Adult Incidence in 2015: National and Centre-specific Analyses. *Nephron* 2017;137 Suppl 1:11-44.
6. Drey N, Roderick P, Mullee M, Rogerson M. A population-based study of the incidence and outcomes of diagnosed chronic kidney disease. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases* 2003;42(4):677-84.
7. Evans J, Mwangi N, Burn H, Ramke J. Equity was rarely considered in Cochrane Eyes and Vision systematic reviews and primary studies on cataract. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2020;125:57-63.
8. Tugwell P, Maxwell L, Welch V, Kristjansson E, Petticrew M, Wells G, et al. Is health equity considered in systematic reviews of the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Group? *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2008;59(11):1603-10.
9. Aves T, Kredo T, Welch V, Mursleen S, Ross S, Zani B, et al. Equity issues were not fully addressed in Cochrane human immunodeficiency virus systematic reviews. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2017;81:96-100.
10. Welch V, Dewidar O, Tanjong Ghogomu E, Abdisalam S, Al Ameer A, Barbeau VI, et al. How effects on health equity are assessed in systematic reviews of interventions. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2022;(1):MR000028.
11. PRO EDI participant characteristics table: PRO EDI participant characteristics table 22/3/2024; Available from <https://www.trialforge.org/trial-diversity/pro-edi-improving-how-equity-diversity-and-inclusion-is-handled-in-evidence-synthesis/> (accessed 20 November 2024).
12. Guidance: PRO EDI interpretation guidance 25/4/2024. Available from <https://www.trialforge.org/trial-diversity/pro-edi-improving-how-equity-diversity-and-inclusion-is-handled-in-evidence-synthesis/> (accessed 20 November 2024).

Publications or presentations of this SWAR design

N/A

Examples of the implementation of this SWAR

People to show as the source of this idea: Jo Thompson Coon, Paula Ormandy

Contact email address: j.thompson-coon@exeter.ac.uk

Date of idea: 01/MAY/2024

Revisions made by: N/A

Date of revisions: