



31 Framework under DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q6HVT. Database selection and search strategy were  
32 determined by a librarian specializing in health sciences. The literature search will be  
33 conducted in PubMed, Scopus, EMBASE, LILACS, and Web of Science databases. Eligible  
34 studies include primary and secondary research, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, clinical  
35 trials, case studies, and observational studies on return-to-work post-transplant, in English or  
36 Portuguese, with no time restrictions. Two reviewers will independently perform the  
37 selection and data extraction. Discrepancies will be resolved through consensus, with a third  
38 researcher addressing conflicts. The data will be extracted using a standardized form  
39 developed for this review to collect key details about the studies' origin, context, purpose,  
40 content, population, and variables related to the return-to-work process. These data will be  
41 synthesized following Synthesis Without Meta Analysis guidelines and summarized  
42 narratively using tables, graphs, thematic analysis, and, if feasible, a meta-analysis will be  
43 conducted. This scoping review protocol relies solely on publicly available data and does not  
44 involve human participants, so institutional review board approval was unnecessary. Ethical  
45 aspects of included studies will be assessed in our analysis.

## 46 **Introduction**

47 Solid organ transplantation has emerged as the central treatment for organ failure and  
48 end-stage diseases involving the liver, kidney, heart, and lung. Its objective is to improve  
49 longevity and quality of life while reducing the impact of diseases and the costs associated  
50 with care [1]. In this context, in addition to representing an indicator of treatment success,  
51 return to work after solid organ transplantation also plays a positive role in financial,  
52 psychosocial, and clinical indicators [2-6]. Furthermore, it endorses the importance of  
53 investments in vocational rehabilitation programs and the economic sustainability of

54 transplant services [7]. However, the possibility of labor reintegration is conditioned by  
55 multiple factors that sometimes involve elements beyond the individual (economic,  
56 geographic, political conditions, etc.) [2, 3, 8]. This characterizes challenges and barriers in  
57 which labor return is far from uniform for all transplant recipients [1,4].

58 The assessment and analysis of return to work after transplantation require further  
59 validation and the development of standardized instruments, as their absence hinders cross-  
60 study comparisons, conceptual clarity, and the identification of key determinants [7]. This is  
61 especially relevant as the literature indicates the influence of variables with biopsychosocial  
62 scope, such as the effect of immunosuppressants, pre-transplant diagnosis, post-transplant  
63 complications, depression, anxiety [1, 4, 6, 7], social security system, access to benefits, age,  
64 sex, education, physical effort in professional activities, pre-transplant unemployment,  
65 inaccessible labor market, among others [2-4, 6, 9, 10].

66 A preliminary search in the National Library of Medicine (PubMed), and Scopus  
67 (Elsevier) databases was conducted in May 2024, not identifying recent scoping reviews  
68 specifically addressing the return to work after multiple solid organ transplants. This scoping  
69 review aims to map the existing literature, identify knowledge gaps, and explore key concepts  
70 related to return-to-work post-transplantation, providing a foundation for future research,  
71 new methods, psychometric instruments, and policies for this crucial area.

72 The inclusion of these four vital organs in the proposed study's scope will potentially  
73 allow an updated, comparative, and dynamic analysis to promote an understanding of the  
74 multifactorial processes and challenges that engender a return to work after transplantation.

75 Conducting a protocol and a scoping review study investigating the return to work  
76 after solid organ transplantation is paramount. In addition to the limited number of recent

77 reviews on this topic, the study set needs to incorporate the joint analysis of the leading solid  
78 organ transplanted organs included in the criteria of this protocol. Nevertheless, the  
79 mentioned studies also lack critical analyses or possible biases in the scope of return to work  
80 [2, 11].

## 81 **Materials and methods**

### 82 **Type of study**

83 This is a scoping review that will be conducted according to the methodological frameworks  
84 proposed by the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) for scoping reviews [12]. The review process will  
85 adhere to the following steps: 1 - formulation of the research question; 2 - identification of  
86 relevant studies; 3 - study selection; 4 - data extraction; 5 - synthesis and reporting of results;  
87 and 6 - expert consultation.

### 88 **Protocol registration**

89 This protocol was created and recorded on the Open Science Framework (OSF) [13] under  
90 DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/Q6HVT.

### 91 **Research question**

92 What has the literature shown about return-to-work after solid organ transplantation?

### 93 **Objective**

94 To identify knowledge gaps and map biopsychosocial processes and outcomes in the  
95 literature on return to work after liver, kidney, heart, and lung transplantation, considering  
96 transnational contexts and diverse methodological approaches.

### 97 **Inclusion criteria**

98 Studies that centrally analyze the return-to-work process after solid organ transplantation will  
99 be included, encompassing primary research such as observational and experimental studies,  
100 as well as secondary studies like systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Both qualitative,  
101 quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches will be considered. No hierarchy will be  
102 established among the types of studies, with all being equally considered for the literature  
103 mapping. Eligible studies must be published in English or Portuguese, with no restrictions on  
104 publication date or country of origin.

#### 105 **Exclusion criteria**

106 Studies that contain arbitrary analyses or a limited set of variables on the return-to-work  
107 process. Gray literature, including theses and dissertations, as well as duplicate publications,  
108 letters to editors, abstracts, and opinion articles, will not be considered. Pediatric and cell  
109 transplant studies and any research not specifically related to liver, kidney, heart, or lung  
110 transplantation will also be excluded.

#### 111 **Information sources**

112 **Research strategy:** Widely applied in scoping and systematic reviews, the Population,  
113 Concept, and Context strategy was used to formulate the research question [14].

114 **Population:** The population of interest for this scoping review includes adult ( $\geq 18$   
115 years) **recipients of solid organ transplants**, specifically liver, kidney, heart, and lung.  
116 Studies with participants of all sexes and gender identities will be considered,  
117 regardless of pre-transplant employment status. The review will cover studies  
118 evaluating return to work at any post-transplant period, from the immediate  
119 postoperative phase to the long-term ( $> 5$  years). Both participants who were

120 employed prior to transplantation and those seeking employment after the procedure  
121 will be included.

122 **Concept:** The central concept examined in this scoping review is the **return to work**  
123 **after solid organ transplantation.** For the purposes of this study, 'return to work' is  
124 defined as the resumption of any form of paid employment, whether full-time, part-  
125 time, or self-employment, after transplantation. The concept encompasses not only  
126 the act of returning to work but also related aspects such as employability, workability,  
127 vocational rehabilitation, and job retention post-transplantation.

128 **Context:** The context of this scoping review is broad and global. **Studies from all**  
129 **geographic regions** will be considered without restrictions, providing a worldwide  
130 perspective on the return to work after solid organ transplantation. The review will  
131 include research conducted in various settings, such as transplant centers, post-  
132 transplant follow-up clinics, workplaces, and communities. Additionally, the review  
133 will encompass studies from countries with diverse healthcare systems and transplant  
134 policies, enabling comparisons between different models of care and support.

### 135 **Databases and search strategy**

136 The search strategies were developed in collaboration with a librarian specializing in  
137 health sciences. To ensure precision, accuracy, and comprehensiveness in the research, the  
138 controlled vocabulary MeSH was used for the PubMed database and the controlled  
139 vocabulary Emtree for the Excerpta Medica Database (EMBASE) database. The searches will  
140 be conducted in May 2024. The strategies may be refined during the review process to  
141 optimize the sensitivity and specificity of the search.

142 The search strategy will follow the three steps recommended by JBI:

143 1. **Initial limited search:** An initial search will be conducted in the PubMed and Scopus  
144 databases to identify relevant articles on return to work after solid organ  
145 transplantation. The indexing terms and keywords used in these articles will be  
146 analyzed to refine the search strategy.

147 2. **Expanded second search:** Based on the results of the initial search, a comprehensive  
148 search will be carried out across all included databases, using all identified indexing  
149 terms and keywords.

150 3. **Reference list search:** The reference lists of the selected articles will be examined to  
151 identify additional relevant studies that may not have been captured through  
152 electronic search.

153 The descriptors used in the search were "Employment," "Return to Work," and  
154 "Transplantation." The databases consulted included PubMed, Scopus, EMBASE, Literatura  
155 Latino Americana e do Caribe em Ciências da Saúde (LILACS), and Web of Science, ensuring  
156 comprehensive coverage of the literature relevant to the research. The search strategy used  
157 these descriptors associated with the Boolean operators AND, OR, and NOT, being customized  
158 for each database.

159 The detailed approach to the search strategy is exemplified in Table 1, which outlines  
160 the methodology tailored for the PubMed database. Furthermore, this strategy, along with  
161 those applied to other databases and the respective number of references retrieved, is  
162 available in S1 File. Search Strategy.

Table 1. Search strategy in PubMed.

---

### Search strategy used for PubMed

---

("Return to Work"[Title/Abstract] OR "Work, Return to"[Title/Abstract] OR "Back-to- Work"[Title/Abstract] OR "Return-to-Work"[Title/Abstract] OR "Back to Work"[Title/Abstract] OR "Work, Back to"[Title/Abstract] OR Employment[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment Termination"[Title/Abstract] OR "Termination, Employment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Labor Force"[Title/Abstract] OR "Labor Forces"[Title/Abstract] OR "Precarious Employment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment, Precarious"[Title/Abstract] OR "Marginal Employment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment, Marginal"[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment Insecurity"[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment Insecurities"[Title/Abstract] OR "Insecurity, Employment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Employment Status"[Title/Abstract] OR "Status, Employment"[Title/Abstract] OR "Status, Occupational"[Title/Abstract] OR "Occupational Status"[Title/Abstract] OR Underemployment[Title/Abstract]) AND Transplantations NOT (Cell OR Cells)

---

Source: Authors, 2024

---

### 163 Study selection

164 The study selection process will be conducted independently by two reviewers using  
165 a double-blinded approach in the Rayyan web tool for reference management [15]. Before  
166 starting the selection process itself, the reviewers will participate in a training session to  
167 ensure a uniform understanding of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. An initial sample of 50  
168 studies (titles and abstracts) will be reviewed by both reviewers for calibration, and any  
169 discrepancies will be discussed to refine the application of the criteria. A standardized  
170 selection form will be used to ensure consistency.

171 Initially, titles and abstracts will be screened, followed by removing duplicates and full-  
172 text reading of potentially relevant studies. With the support of the Rayyan platform, the  
173 removal of articles that do not meet the inclusion criteria will be recorded and reported in  
174 the scoping review. Discrepancies will be resolved by consensus or by a third reviewer. The  
175 selection process will follow the recommendations of PRISMA-ScR (PRISMA extension for  
176 Scoping Reviews) [16] and will be presented through a flowchart.

### 177 Data extraction



178 Data will be extracted using a standardized form developed specifically for this review  
 179 [17]. The form will include information about authorship, year of publication, country,  
 180 objective, study summary, variables used to characterize the population, variables used to  
 181 analyze the process of return to work after solid organ transplantation, evaluated outcomes,  
 182 primary results, and conclusions. These and other variables are available in Table 2.

183 Table 2. Data extraction form.

<b>Data extraction</b>	
<b>Article title</b>	
<b>First author</b>	
<b>Journal</b>	
<b>Year of publication</b>	
<b>Country</b>	
<b>Study type</b>	
<b>Study objective</b>	
<b>Methods</b>	
<b>Sample size (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	
<b>Exclusion criteria</b>	
<b>Transplanted organ</b>	
<b>Living or deceased donor transplant?</b>	
<b>Main sociodemographic variables (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Main psychosocial variables (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Main clinical variables (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Variables used to measure and analyze return to work</b>	
<b>Positive factors for return to work</b>	
<b>Negative factors for return to work</b>	
<b>Main conclusions</b>	
<b>Reported biases</b>	
<b>Additional notes</b>	
Source: Authors, 2024.	

184  
 185 Data extraction will be conducted independently by two reviewers using a  
 186 standardized form. Before full extraction, the form will be piloted with a sample of 5 studies  
 187 to ensure its suitability and make any necessary adjustments. Any discrepancies in the  
 188 extraction process will be resolved through discussion between the reviewers, with the

189 involvement of a third reviewer if needed. After extraction, a random sample comprising 20%  
190 of the studies will have their data verified by a third reviewer to ensure accuracy. Although  
191 formal quality assessment of studies is not typical in scoping reviews, notes on the  
192 methodological robustness of the studies will be included in the 'Additional notes' field of the  
193 extraction form.

#### 194 **Data synthesis and presentation**

195 The data synthesis will be performed in a narrative form, with tables and graphs to  
196 summarize the findings [18]. Qualitative analyses, such as thematic analysis, may be  
197 performed to identify recurring themes in the included studies [19]. If possible and  
198 appropriate, quantitative analyses, such as meta-analyses, will be considered to combine the  
199 results of similar studies [20]. To enhance rigor and minimize potential bias, the results will  
200 be processed using appropriate software and subjected to statistical analyses. Additionally,  
201 peer evaluation will be conducted to identify any potential overlooked biases. The narrative  
202 synthesis will follow the guidelines of Synthesis Without Meta-analysis (SWiM) [21], ensuring  
203 transparency and reproducibility. Additionally, the IRAMUTEQ software will be used to  
204 analyze the textual corpus of the selected articles.

205 The thematic analysis, if conducted, will follow the six-phase approach proposed by  
206 Braun and Clarke [22], using the NVivo software for coding and organizing themes. The  
207 heterogeneity among studies will be narratively assessed, considering methodological,  
208 population, and contextual differences. Gaps in the literature will be explicitly identified and  
209 discussed as potential areas for future research. In case of inconsistencies between studies,  
210 we will seek to explain the possible reasons for these divergences, considering factors such  
211 as study design, context, and population characteristics.

212 In addition to the mentioned tables and graphs, we plan to use a conceptual map to  
213 illustrate the relationships between the main factors influencing the return to work after solid  
214 organ transplantation. A summary table with the main characteristics of the included studies  
215 will be presented, highlighting authors, year, country, type of transplant, sample size, and  
216 main results. A world map will be used to visualize the geographical distribution of the  
217 included studies. Relevant direct quotations from the studies will be incorporated into the  
218 narrative synthesis to illustrate key themes. A specific section will be dedicated to presenting  
219 the identified gaps in the literature, along with recommendations for future research.

## 220 **Consultation**

221 Consultations with experts in the field of solid organ transplantation will be conducted  
222 to validate the findings and provide additional insights [1]. A panel of 5-7 experts, including  
223 transplant surgeons, occupational rehabilitation specialists, and representatives of transplant  
224 patient associations, will be selected based on their experience and relevant publications. The  
225 experts will be recruited through email invitations, and their feedback will be integrated into  
226 the final synthesis of the results, contributing to the interpretation and contextualization of  
227 the findings.

228 The consultation process will be conducted after the initial data synthesis, comprising  
229 individual semi-structured interviews and a subsequent online focus group session to validate  
230 findings and refine interpretations. The interviews and group sessions will be recorded,  
231 transcribed, and thematically analyzed. The feedback from the experts will be documented in  
232 a summary table, indicating how each suggestion was incorporated into the final synthesis or,  
233 if not incorporated, the justification for such a decision.

234 This scoping review will strictly follow the PRISMA-ScR (PRISMA extension for Scoping  
235 Reviews) guidelines to ensure transparent and comprehensive reporting [16]. The PRISMA-  
236 ScR checklist will be used as a guide throughout the review process and the preparation of  
237 the final report. All 22 items of the checklist will be addressed, with particular emphasis on  
238 elements related to the review rationale, search strategy, study selection process, data  
239 extraction, and result synthesis. The completed PRISMA-ScR checklist will be included as an  
240 appendix in the final report, allowing readers to easily assess the review's compliance with  
241 these guidelines. No significant adaptations to the PRISMA-ScR guidelines were made for this  
242 review, thus ensuring full adherence to the established standard.

### 243 **Study timeline**

244 The scoping review is proceeding according to the following schedule:

- 245 1. Protocol Development and Registration (completed: October 2023).
- 246 2. Search Strategy Refinement (completed: February 2025):
  - 247 • The search strategy was finalized in collaboration with a health sciences
  - 248 librarian.
- 249 3. Initial Database Searching (in progress: March-April 2025):
  - 250 • Systematic searches are being conducted across multiple databases.
- 251 4. Title and Abstract Screening (anticipated: May-June 2025):
  - 252 • Two independent reviewers will assess titles and abstracts using the Rayyan
  - 253 platform.

254 5. Full-Text Review and Data Extraction (anticipated: July-August 2025):

- 255 • Full-text articles meeting the inclusion criteria will be retrieved and reviewed.  
256 • Data extraction will be carried out using a standardized pre-developed form.

257 6. Data Synthesis and Analysis (anticipated: September-October 2025):

- 258 • Thematic analysis and data synthesis will be performed.

259 7. Manuscript Preparation and Submission (anticipated: November-December 2025).

260 The anticipated results, expected by December 2025, may include a comprehensive  
261 mapping of the literature on return to work after solid organ transplantation, identification  
262 of gaps in existing knowledge, and recommendations for future research and instrument  
263 development.

264 **Ethics statement**

265 This study is a scoping review protocol that does not involve direct human participant's  
266 research. It utilizes only publicly available, previously published information. Therefore,  
267 institutional review board approval was not required or sought for this study. The ethical  
268 considerations of the studies included in our review will be critically assessed and reported as  
269 part of our analysis.

270 **References**

- 271 1. Åberg F. Quality of life after liver transplantation. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol*. 2020  
272 Jun 1;46:101684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpg.2020.101684> PMID: [33158471](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33158471/)

- 273 2. Jobst S, Schaefer J, Kleiser C, Kugler C. A systematized review of professional employment  
274 following thoracic transplantation. Prog Transplant. 2022 Mar;32(1):55-66.  
275 <https://doi.org/10.1177/152692482111064883> PMID: [35006009](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35006009/)
- 276 3. Fazekas C, Kniepeiss D, Arold N, Matzer F, Wagner-Skacel J, Schemmer P. Health-related  
277 quality of life, workability, and return to work of patients after liver transplantation.  
278 Langenbecks Arch Surg. 2021 Sep;406(6):1951-61. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-021-02183-z)  
279 [02183-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-021-02183-z) PMID: [33956200](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33956200/)
- 280 4. Cao C, Haleboua-DeMarzio D, Guirguis S, Chen C, Fenkel JM, Herrine S. Employment and  
281 patient satisfaction after liver transplantation. J Clin Transl Hepatol. 2020 Sep 9;8(3):299.  
282 <https://doi.org/10.14218/JCTH.2020.00010> PMID: [33083253](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33083253/)
- 283 5. Dunn MA, Rogal SS, Duarte-Rojo A, Lai JC. Physical function, physical activity, and quality  
284 of life after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl. 2020 May;26(5):702-8.  
285 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.25742> PMID: [32128971](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32128971/)
- 286 6. Jordakieva G, Grabovac I, Steiner M, Winnicki W, Zitta S, Stefanac S, et al. Employment  
287 status and associations with workability, quality of life and mental health after kidney  
288 transplantation in Austria. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020 Feb;17(4):1254.  
289 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041254> PMID: [32075277](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32075277/)
- 290 7. Wesolowska-Gorniak K, Wojtowicz M, Gierus J, Czarkowska-Paczek B. The correlation of  
291 patients' anxiety after a liver or kidney transplantation with functional and self-reported  
292 work ability. Medicine (Baltimore). 2020 May 1;99(18):e20108.  
293 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000000020108> PMID: [32358401](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32358401/)
- 294 8. O'Hare AM, Rodriguez RA, Eijk MV. Supporting the employment goals of people with  
295 kidney disease. Am J Kidney Dis. 2021 Dec;78(6):772-3.  
296 <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2021.05.010> PMID: [34312057](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34312057/)

- 297 9. Mokamelkhah EK, Malakoutian T, Mohammadi S, Kassiri N, Safaei N, Zarafshar A.  
298 Predictor Factors of Return to Work in Workers with Kidney Transplantation in Iran: A  
299 Retrospective Cohort Study. Iran J Kidney Dis. 2023 Mar 1;17(2):108.  
300 <https://doi.org/10.52547/ijkd.7210> PMID: [37060345](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37060345/)
- 301 10. Visser A, Alma MA, Bakker SJL, Bemelman FJ, Berger SP, Boog PJMV, et al. Employment  
302 and ability to work after kidney transplantation in the Netherlands: the impact of  
303 preemptive versus non-preemptive kidney transplantation. Clin Transplant. 2022  
304 Sep;36(9):e14757. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ctr.14757> PMID: [35716362](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35716362/)
- 305 11. Kirkeskov L, Carlsen RK, Lund T, Buus NH. Employment of patients with kidney failure  
306 treated with dialysis or kidney transplantation—a systematic review and meta-analysis.  
307 BMC Nephrol. 2021 Dec;22:1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-021-02552-2> PMID:  
308 [34686138](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34686138/)
- 309 12. Peters MDJ, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for  
310 conducting systematic scoping reviews. Int J Evid Based Healthc. 2015 Sep 1;13(3):141-6.  
311 <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050> PMID: [26134548](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26134548/)
- 312 13. Foster ED, Deardorff A. Open science framework (OSF). J Med Libr Assoc. 2017  
313 Apr;105(2):203. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2017.88>
- 314 14. Stern C, Jordan Z, McArthur A. Developing the review question and inclusion criteria. Am  
315 J Nurs. 2014 Apr 1;114(4):53-6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NAJ.0000445689.67800.86>  
316 PMID: [24681476](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24681476/)
- 317 15. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app  
318 for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016 Dec 5;5(1):210. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4)  
319 [016-0384-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4) PMID: [27919275](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27919275/)

- 320 16. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for  
321 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018 Oct  
322 2;169(7):467-73. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850> PMID: [30178033](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30178033/)
- 323 17. Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E. JBI's systematic reviews: data extraction and synthesis.  
324 *Am J Nurs.* 2014 Jul 1;114(7):49-54.  
325 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NAJ.0000451683.66447.89> PMID: [25742352](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25742352/)
- 326 18. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, et al. About Guidance. In: Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A,  
327 et al. *Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A product*  
328 *from the ESRC methods programme Version.* England: Lancaster; 2006. pp. 5-8. Available  
329 from:  
330 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233866356\\_Guidance\\_on\\_the\\_conduct\\_of](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233866356_Guidance_on_the_conduct_of_narrative_synthesis_in_systematic_reviews_A_product_from_the_ESRC_Methods_Programme)  
331 [narrative synthesis in systematic reviews A product from the ESRC Methods Prog](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233866356_Guidance_on_the_conduct_of_narrative_synthesis_in_systematic_reviews_A_product_from_the_ESRC_Methods_Programme)  
332 [ramme](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233866356_Guidance_on_the_conduct_of_narrative_synthesis_in_systematic_reviews_A_product_from_the_ESRC_Methods_Programme)
- 333 19. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in  
334 systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2008 Dec 10;8(1):45.  
335 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45> PMID: [18616818](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18616818/)
- 336 20. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis.* 2nd  
337 edition. John Wiley & Sons; 2021. 544 p.
- 338 21. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, Katikireddi SV, Brennan SE, Ellis S, et al. Synthesis  
339 without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ.* 2020 Jan  
340 16;368. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l6890> PMID: [31948937](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31948937/)
- 341 22. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
342 *Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>

343 **Supporting information**



344 **S1 File. Search Strategy.**

345 (DOCX)