

## Protocol for Systematic Review 13.04.15

Title	Checklist
<b>Identification - title</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Values-Based Commissioning and Service Development in Child and Adolescent Mental Health: a Systematic Review</b></li> </ul>
<b>Update</b>	n/a
<b>Registration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be registered with PROSPERO 13.04.15.</li> <li>• Updated 08.06.15</li> </ul>
<b>Authors and contributors: contact details</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr Frances Whitaker , Dr Peter Hindley Royal College of Psychiatrists 21 Prescot Street London E1 8BB</li> <li>• Prof Bill Fulford Collaborating Centre for Values-Based Practice St Catherine’s College, Oxford University Manor Road Oxford OX1 3UJ</li> <li>• Dr Jacinta Tan Swansea University Singleton Park, Swansea, Wales SA2 8PP</li> <li>• Ms Katie Carter Warneford Hospital Library Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust Warneford Hospital, Old Road, Headington Oxford OX3 7JX</li> </ul>
<b>Contributions</b>	<p>Dr Frances Whitaker – main author.            Dr Peter Hindley – author, supervisor.            Dr Bill Fulford – advisor.            Dr Jacinta Tan – advisor.            Oxford Health librarian Katie Carter – consulted regarding literature search strategy.</p>
<b>Amendments</b>	The protocol will be updated (with date) if amendments are made.
Support	
<b>Sources</b>	Dr Frances Whitaker – part-time 1 year research fellowship funded by the Dinwoodie (1968) Settlement.
<b>Sponsor</b>	Dinwoodie (1968) Settlement. Royal College of Psychiatrists. Young minds.
<b>Role of sponsor or</b>	Funding only.

<b>funder</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Commissioners need to ensure that they involve patients and the public in developing services. The use of Values-Based Commissioning (VBC) is one method of achieving this. Values Based Commissioning uses the principles of Values-Based Practice (VBP) and applies them to commissioning. VBP aids complex decision-making, by bringing together the evidence base, clinical experience and patient values.</p> <p>This systematic review will be looking at the use of Values-Based principles in commissioning or service development projects within Child and Adolescent Mental Health.</p>
<b>Objectives</b>	<p><b><u>The aims and objectives of this review are :</u></b></p> <p>To systematically review the current evidence on commissioning and service development projects within Child and Adolescent Mental Health using Values-Based Principles.</p>
<b>Methods</b>	
<b>Eligibility criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original studies of any design, size or patient population in which a Values-Based approach has been used in commissioning or service development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inclusion criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Values-Based Practice, Values-Based Commissioning or “patient or carer values”. Other descriptions such as: patient involvement or participation, co-commissioning and collaboration will be included if values were elicited.</li> <li>• Commissioning and service development may include: part of the “commissioning cycle” such as needs assessment, service design and outcome measurement. Development of quality standards will be included.</li> <li>• The values examined must include those of patients, or parents/carers.</li> <li>• Study relates to child and/or adolescent mental health in any tier of service.</li> <li>• Systematic and non-systematic reviews will be included.</li> <li>• Qualitative and/or quantitative outcomes reported.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exclusion criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-original studies such as comments, opinions, letters and editorials.</li> <li>• Studies using patient or parent/carer values in clinical research.</li> <li>• Studies where values examined have only been those of professionals or other family members such as siblings.</li> <li>• The study’s main outcome is cost-effectiveness or related outcome.</li> </ul>
<b>Information sources</b>	<p><b>Database search (from inception):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medline, Psycinfo, Embase, BNI, CINAHL, Health Business Elite, Amed, HMIC</li> <li>• Cochrane database, including the Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group’s Specialised Register.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environmental scan and manual search:</b></p> <p>To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Google Scholar, experts in the field.</li> <li>• Citation searching</li> <li>• Policy documents available online, reports by recognised bodies in the field.</li> <li>• Knowledge4Commissioning website.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commissioning Handbook for Librarians website.</li> </ul>
<b>Search strategy</b> <b>HMIC</b> ( <i>search strategy will vary slightly based on thesaurus terms for each database</i> ).	Commission* OR Co-commission* OR service adj5 (design* OR develop* OR re-design* OR improv*) OR Co-produc* OR policy adj5 (design* OR develop* OR re-design* OR improv*) OR “quality” adj5 (design* OR develop* OR re-design* OR improv*) OR exp COMMISSIONING/ OR exp SERVICE DEVELOPMENT/  <hr/> AND Values-based OR (patient* OR parent* OR carer OR consumer OR customer OR public OR “service user” OR lay OR non-expert OR survivor OR community AND involv* OR particip* OR engag* OR prefer* OR attitude* OR perception* OR satisfaction OR centred OR centered OR experienc* OR collaborat* OR share* OR sharing) OR exp PATIENT PARTICIPATION  <hr/> AND Child* OR Young* OR Youth OR adolescen* OR teen*  <hr/> 1 [result of topic search] 2 exp ADULT/ NOT (exp CHILD/ OR ADOLESCENT/ OR exp INFANT/) 3 1 NOT 2
<b>Patient and Public Involvement</b>	
<b>Young Advisor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will aim to recruit a Young Advisor aged 18-23 already involved in another project within the Royal College of Psychiatrists to review the outcomes of this systematic review.</li> </ul>
<b>Study records</b>	
<b>Data management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References will be saved in Word file and Endnote Basic.</li> </ul>
<b>Selection process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove duplicates.</li> <li>Screening by FW.</li> <li>Potentially eligible studies reviewed in full text.</li> <li>Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion between FW and PH.</li> </ul>
<b>Data collection process</b>	Data extraction form in Word. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pre-designed data extraction form.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Piloted on 5 similar studies from general adult literature chosen by convenience.</li> </ul>
<b>Data items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study name.</li> <li>• Study design.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Using categories informed by the National Involvement Partnership (NIP) “PPPI” involvement standards:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Purpose:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary goal of study.</li> <li>• How does the study use Values-Based principles?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Presence:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whose values are examined? (<i>i.e. patient, or parent/carer</i>).</li> <li>• Number of participants.</li> <li>• Demographics of participants– <i>age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status</i>.</li> <li>• How were participants selected – <i>convenience, random, volunteer, other?</i></li> </ul> <p><b><u>Process:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were values elicited? <i>By who?</i></li> <li>• Degree of involvement/roles of participants.</li> <li>• Was ethical approval applied for/granted?</li> <li>• Was support available?</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Impact:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative outcomes – authors’ view, participants’ views. Patient/carer reported outcomes. To include impact participants had on project and impact of involvement on them.</li> <li>• Quantitative outcomes – any data evaluating effectiveness of implementation.</li> <li>• Recommendations made</li> </ul>
<b>Outcomes and prioritisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative outcomes – authors’ view, participants’ views. Patient/carer reported outcomes. To include impact participants had on project and impact of involvement on them.</li> <li>• Quantitative outcomes – any data evaluating effectiveness of implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>Risk of bias in individual studies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies will be assessed using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) for qualitative research.</li> </ul>
<b>Data synthesis and analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thematic analysis to synthesise qualitative data.</li> <li>• Meta-analysis not appropriate for this review.</li> </ul>
<b>Confidence in cumulative evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRADE criteria will be used.</li> </ul>