Permission to contact for research in healthcare settings

A scoping review

Prepared for the Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale (CIUSSS-CN)

Submitted 3/26/2020

Prepared By:
Marie Baron, PhD
Michèle Dugas, MSc
Andrée-Anne Poirier, PhD
Annie LeBlanc, PhD

Contact:
Catherine Vandal (Coordinator)
Catherine.vandal.ciussscn@ssss.gouv.qc.ca

E: Annie.LeBlanc@fmed.ulaval.ca
T: (418) 663-5712

STUDY PROTOCOL

Review title and timescale

1	**Review title:**		
	Permission to contact for research in healthcare settings: A scoping review		
2	**Anticipated or actual start date:**		
	April, 1st, 2020		
3	**Anticipated completion date:**		
	February, 28th, 2021		
4	**Stage of review at time of this submission:**		
	This review has not yet started	☒	
	Review stage *(Please check all that apply)*	**Started**	**Completed**
	Preliminary searches	☐	☐
	Piloting of the study selection process	☐	☐
	Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	☐	☐
	Data extraction	☐	☐
	Risk of bias (quality) assessment	☐	☐
	Data analysis	☐	☐
	Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here: Not applicable		

Review team details

5	**Named contact**
	Annie LeBlanc
6	**Named contact email**
	Annie.LeBlanc@fmed.ulaval.ca
7	**Named contact address**
	Institut universitaire en santé mentale de Québec, bureau G-2639 2601, chemin de la Canardière Québec (Québec) CANADA G1J 2G3
8	**Named contact phone number**
	418-663-5712
9	**Organisational affiliation of the review**
	Centre de recherche sur les soins et les services de première ligne de l'Université Laval (CERSSPL-UL)
10	**Review team members and their organisational affiliations** Give the title, first name and last name of all members of the team working directly on the review. Give the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team.

First name	**Last name**	**Credentials** *e.g. MSc, PhD*	**Role** *e.g. PI, co-I*	**Affiliation**

Annie	LeBlanc	PhD	PI	Department of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine, Laval University, and CERSSPL-UL
Marie	Baron	PhD	Review Lead	CERSSPL-UL
Michèle	Dugas	MSc	Review Lead	CERSSPL-UL
Andrée-Anne	Poirier	PhD	Review Lead	CERSSPL-UL and INESSS
TBD	TBD		Librarian	The SPOR Evidence Alliance

11 Funding sources/sponsors

SPOR Evidence Alliance will fund this review. CIUSSS-CN and Annie LeBlanc's team will provide in-kind supports for this review.

12 Conflicts of interest

Annie LeBlanc's research center is embedded within the CIUSSS-CN. Implementation of a permission to contact approach in this establishment would facilitate the conduct of her research projects. This was addressed with the CIUSSS-CN Research Director Office and will not hinder the conduct of this review.

Review methods

13 Review question(s):

We aim to assess the state of knowledge on the characteristics and impact of a permission to contact approach for the recruitment of patients in research projects conducted in healthcare settings.
We will conduct a scoping review to answer the following questions:

- What are the characteristics and modalities of the 'permission to contact' approach?
- What is the impact, efficacy and benefit of permission to contact compared to other approaches?
- What are the risks and drawbacks?
- What are the barriers and facilitators to implement this approach?

14 Literature Search:

An experience librarian will conduct comprehensive literature searches of electronic bibliographic databases such as Medline, CINAHL and Web of Science. We will search for sibling papers of included studies and complement our search by reviewing the reference lists of included studies. We will scan the grey literature to identify additional initiatives (e.g. permission to contact programs, studies or laws) that might be missing from published papers using specific key strategies: consulting with content experts, searching for specific initiatives on health or research organizations' websites, and conducting Google searches.

15 URL to search strategy:

Not applicable

16 Condition or domain being studied:

Permission to contact patients for research projects

17 Participants/Population:

Any person or organization involved with the permission to contact approach

18 Intervention(s)/Exposure(s):

Any type of permission to contact approach

19 Comparator(s)/Control(s):

Any or none

20 Types of study to be included initially:

Any. However, we will exclude protocols and conference abstracts.

21 Context:

Healthcare settings

22 Primary outcome(s):

We will document all available outcomes in the following categories:

- Efficacy outcomes, compared to other recruitment methods (ex: participation rates, capacity to achieve minimum sample size, recruitment time, diversity of population recruited)
- Ethical, legal, or organizational risks and benefits (for patients, healthcare professionals, and healthcare organizations)
- Facilitators and barriers encountered during the implementation of this approach

23 Secondary outcome(s):

Not applicable

24 Data extraction (selection and coding):

We will develop a standardized form for study selection and data extraction followed by a training exercise. We will pilot the forms with all reviewers. Pairs of two reviewers will screen titles, abstracts and full text articles independently. Discrepancies will be resolved by discussion or by a third reviewer (senior). Data extraction will be conducted by one reviewer and validated by another. Discrepancies will be resolved by discussion or by a third reviewer (senior). We will extract data on:

- Characteristics of the article (ex: lead author, year, country, study design, setting)
- Description of the 'permission to contact' approach used or discussed in the article (ex: recruitment process such as people involved in recruitment, timeframe, population included, platform used, healthcare setting, etc.)
- Efficacy outcomes, compared to other recruitment methods (ex: participation rates, capacity to achieve minimum sample size, recruitment time, diversity of population recruited)
- Ethical, legal, or organizational risks and benefits (for patients, healthcare professionals, and healthcare organizations)
- Facilitators and barriers encountered during the implementation of this approach

25 Risk of bias (quality) assessment:

None.

26 Strategy for data synthesis:

We will conduct analysis according to the type of data with descriptive methods for quantitative data and content analysis for qualitative data. We will summarize our findings in a narrative way. If there is enough available data, we will follow a meta-analytic approach to generate estimates. Data synthesis will focus on providing information to our knowledge users regarding the characteristics, efficacy, challenges, and benefits

of permission to contact. Specifically, we will look for key characteristics enabling the development and implementation of this method in the Canadian context.

27 Analysis of subgroups or subsets:

N/A

Review general information

28 Type of review

Select one of the following:

Review Type	
Scoping review	✓
Rapid review	☐
Systematic review	☐
Other:_____	☐

29 Language

English and French

30 Country

Canada

31 Other registration details

N/A

32 Reference and/or URL for published protocol

https://osf.io/t7b2z

33 Dissemination plans:

We will hold a meeting will be held to present review results to our knowledge users (before writing the final report) to get their feedback on the draft report and discuss the potential implications of this report. We will share, following this, a one-page, standardized policy brief with members and partners of the SPOR Evidence Alliance, and broadly (through the SPOR Evidence Alliance Website). We will publish a scientific, peer-reviewed publication.

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

Yes ✓
No ☐

34 Keywords

Permission to contact, Research permission, Recruitment of participants

35 Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.

N/A

36 Current review status

Ongoing

37 Any additional information:

N/A

38 Details of final report/publication(s):

Review is ongoing