

Citation

Olufikayo Bamidele, Obrey Alexis, Motolani Ogunsanya, Sarah Greenley, Aaron Worsley, Elizabeth D Mitchell. A systematic review of barriers and facilitators to access and utilisation of post-treatment psychosocial support by black men treated for prostate cancer. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020171488 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020171488

Review question

What are the barriers and facilitators to access and utilisation of post-treatment psychosocial support by black men after treatment for prostate cancer?

Searches

Between January and February 2020, two reviewers (SG and AW) will conduct the searches on six bibliographic databases starting from journal default start date to February 2020 and using a sensitive, validated and peer-reviewed search strategy. The databases are: Ovid MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, Cochrane Library, CINAHL plus and Scopus. Unpublished studies and grey literature will be identified from OpenGrey, Web of Science proceedings, Prostate Cancer UK and Movember websites, consultation with professional colleagues, conference proceedings and author contact (where possible). The reference list of included studies and systematic reviews in related research area will also be hand-searched to identify additional potentially relevant studies. Searches will be rerun on the selected databases prior to final analysis to identify any new relevant article. Search results will be imported into an EndNote library and deduplication will be undertaken using a systematic method.

Types of study to be included

Primary studies on prostate cancer (CaP) survivorship which use either a qualitative or quantitative design and report specific data on the psychosocial support aspect of Black men's post-treatment experiences, will be included. Studies on psychosocial support programmes or intervention for CaP survivors which report specific data on Black men's engagement/and or non-engagement with the programme will also be included. Grey literature which lacks a clear methodology (for example, editorials, books and reports) and conference abstracts whose full papers cannot be accessed will be excluded. Studies on psychosocial support/interventions for CaP survivors which have included different ethnic groups but which did not separate the views of Black men will also be excluded. CaP studies on carers' support experiences instead of patients', will be excluded. Studies on psychosocial support for different cancer types but which did not report separate data on CaP in Black men will all also be excluded.

Condition or domain being studied

Prostate cancer.

Participants/population

Black men (men of African or Caribbean racial origin, including immigrant and indigenous black men, African American men) who have undergone active treatment for prostate cancer

Inclusion Criteria

1. Black men aged 18 years actively treated for prostate cancer.

Exclusion criteria

1. Black men with prostate cancer on palliative care.
2. Black men with prostate cancer on active surveillance.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Primary studies which (1) focused on the psychosocial support experiences of black men after treatment for prostate cancer (2) reported on barriers and facilitators to the use of psychosocial support by black men following treatment for prostate cancer (3) investigated black men's views/suggestions on their psychosocial support preferences after treatment for prostate cancer.

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable.

Context

Psychosocial support after active treatment for prostate cancer within the black socio-cultural setting

Main outcome(s)

(i) Experiences/perspectives of black men on existing post treatment psychosocial support (ii) Barriers to access and utilisation of psychosocial support by black men after active treatment for CaP, including structural, cultural, organisational and professional factors (iii) Facilitators to access and utilisation of psychosocial support by black men after active treatment for CaP including cultural, structural, organisational and professional factors

Measures of effect

Outcomes related to the psychosocial support aspects of the post-treatment phase of the prostate cancer trajectory. We define psychosocial support as any type of formal or informal but structured non-clinical service or resource or intervention or programme which is systematically designed to enhance men's ability to cope with the psychosocial impact of CaP treatment side-effects and improve their psychological, emotional and social wellbeing after treatment (American Cancer Society 2019). This will include but not exhaustive to: men and/or couple-focused psychosocial interventions, psychosexual education programmes, peer support, support groups, faith-based groups/organisations, counselling services, information resources (online, face-to-face) and communication activities (e.g. talk with cancer nurse). Self-driven coping mechanisms (for example, resilience) and unstructured support (for example, partner or family support) will be excluded.

Additional outcome(s)

None.

Measures of effect

Not applicable.

Data extraction (selection and coding)

Following the removal of duplicates, the titles and abstracts of the remaining studies will be reviewed by at least two reviewers (OB with either OA or SG or MO) for relevance. Covidence software (2019) will be used to manage the screening of studies while the process of identifying included studies will be reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (PRISMA 2015). The full texts of potentially relevant studies will be independently screened against the inclusion/exclusion criteria by two reviewers (OB with OA or MO). Conflicts will be resolved by discussion. Data extraction from the included studies will be done by two reviewers (OB with OA or MO) using the Covidence tool and Microsoft Excel. Differences in reviewers' views on data extraction will be resolved through discussion. Data to be extracted from each included study will include: study title, authors, year of publication, study setting, study design, population demographics (e.g. age, education, occupation), length of time since treated for prostate cancer, psychosocial support type accessed, experience of psychosocial support; barriers to use of psychosocial support, facilitators to use of psychosocial support, recommendations for psychosocial support development (where stated) and quality appraisal score. Where possible, attempt will be made to retrieve missing data in relevant studies by contacting the corresponding author.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Included studies will be independently appraised for methodological quality by at least two reviewers using the domain relevant to its study design within the Pluye et al's tool (2009). Studies will be rated as either strong (scoring > 70%), moderate (scoring > 40% < 70%) or weak (Scoring < 40%). Quality score for each study will be calculated based on the methodological quality criteria for its design. Quality score will be

calculated by dividing the number of methodology quality criteria reported in the study by the number of 'relevant criteria' on the Pluye et al's tool (2009) multiplied by 100. For example, a qualitative study which reports 3 out of the 6 quality criteria on the Pluye et al.'s tool (2009) will be scored 50% and rated as moderate. No study will be excluded based on quality but stronger studies will be given more weight in the discussion.

Strategy for data synthesis

Data analysis approach will be determined by the methodological design of the included studies. Where both qualitative and quantitative studies are retrieved, the data analysis approach for integrative reviews (Whittemore and Knafl 2005) will be adopted. This will involve using the constant comparison method to iteratively and systematically categorise data from the included studies to distinctly identify patterns, similarities, differences and relationships across the studies. The relevant stages of data reduction, display, comparison, conclusion drawing and verification will be undertaken, following which key findings from the analysis will be summarised to address the review aim. At least two reviewers (OB with OA or MO) will conduct the data analysis.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Subgroup analysis will be carried out for the following:

1. Barriers to access and utilisation of psychosocial support after treatment for prostate cancer.
2. Facilitators to access and utilisation of psychosocial support after treatment for prostate cancer.

Contact details for further information

Olufikayo Bamidele
Olufikayo.Bamidele@hyms.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

University of Hull

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Dr Olufikayo Bamidele. Academy of Primary Care, Hull York Medical School, University of Hull
Dr Obrey Alexis. Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University
Dr Motolani Ogunsanya. College of Pharmacy, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Centre
Ms Sarah Greenley. Academy of primary Care, Hull York Medical School, University of Hull
Mr Aaron Worsley. Directorate of Learning Resources, Oxford Brookes University
Dr Elizabeth D Mitchell. Academy of Primary Care, Hull York Medical School, University of Hull

Type and method of review

Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

27 January 2020

Anticipated completion date

31 August 2020

Funding sources/sponsors

None.

Grant number(s)

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

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

England, United States of America

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

African Americans; Health Services; Humans; Male; Prostatic Neoplasms; Psychotherapy

Date of registration in PROSPERO

12 March 2020

Date of first submission

28 February 2020

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

Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	Yes
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	Yes	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

12 March 2020