

To enable PROSPERO to focus on COVID-19 submissions, this registration record has undergone basic automated checks for eligibility and is published exactly as submitted. PROSPERO has never provided peer review, and usual checking by the PROSPERO team does not endorse content. Therefore, automatically published records should be treated as any other PROSPERO registration. Further detail is provided [here](#).

Review methods were amended after registration. Please see the revision notes and previous versions for detail.

### Citation

Tiffany Sandell, Heike Schütze. Factors influencing the translation of shared cancer follow-up care into clinical practice: A systematic review. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020191538 Available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42020191538](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020191538)

### Review question [1 change]

What factors influence translating shared cancer follow-up care into clinical practice?

### Searches [1 change]

- MEDLINE, Science Citation Index, Academic Search Complete, CINAHL, APA PsycINFO, Health Source: Nursing/Academic edition and Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection

-1999 to 2021

-peer reviewed papers published in full

-human subjects

### Types of study to be included

All study designs will be included:observational, case controlled,

cohort, cross-sectional, randomised, pilot studies, mixed methods, and qualitative.

### Condition or domain being studied [1 change]

This study aims to systematically review the literature that focuses on factors influencing the translation of shared cancer follow-up care into clinical practice.

### Participants/population [2 changes]

Inclusion criteria: (a) general practitioner, patient, and/or oncologist perceptions of shared cancer follow-up care; (b) general practitioner involvement in cancer follow-up care; (c) intervention with the general practitioner involved in cancer follow-up care; (d) adults patients in the follow-up period; and (e) papers peer-reviewed, published in English between 1990 and 2021.

Exclusion criteria: (a) commentary, editorial, literature review, protocol; (b) patients on active treatment; (c) palliative care; (d) surgical only treatment; (e) paediatric; (f) skin cancer, melanoma or blood cancer.

### Intervention(s), exposure(s)

During the follow-up care period.

### Comparator(s)/control

General practitioner and oncologist

### Context

A study will be included if it addresses the communication and preferences between the general practitioner and oncologist.

### Main outcome(s) [1 change]

By identifying factors that influence implementing shared cancer follow-up care, it will allow for the development of a model of care that addresses the issues.

- barriers

- enablers

### Measures of effect

none

### Additional outcome(s)

none

### Measures of effect

none

### Data extraction (selection and coding)

Two reviewers (TS and HS) will independently use a stepwise procedure to identify relevant articles.

TS will perform the initial search and screen the titles and abstracts against the inclusion/exclusion criteria, the remaining texts will be retrieved in full and screened against the inclusion/exclusion criteria.

HS will independently checked the results and compare her findings with the first author.

In case of disagreement, the reviewers will meet and reach consensus through discussion. Thematic analysis will be the method for research synthesis. The first step will be to develop descriptive themes based on the text, followed by generating analytical themes with a descriptive approach to present the findings.

Results will be exported from Zotera Reference Managing system to Microsoft Excel to create a database on: author, year, study type, cancer type, sample size, study aim, data collection and analysis; outcomes, barrier/enablers.

### Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Two reviewers will independently assess risk of bias.

Joanne Briggs critical appraisal tools will be used to assess the quality.

A pre-designed Excel template will be used to collate these assessments.

Appraising reviewers will resolve disagreements about risk of bias by discussion.

### Strategy for data synthesis

A systematic narrative synthesis will be provided to analyse the relationships within and between the included studies.

The synthesis will be developed using the narrative synthesis framework as described in CRD:

1. Develop theory around intervention
2. Preliminary synthesis - grouping of populations, interventions and outcomes
3. Explore relationships within and between studies
4. Assess robustness of synthesis

#### Analysis of subgroups or subsets

There is no planned investigation of subgroups

#### Contact details for further information

Tiffany Sandell  
tem785@uowmail.edu.au

#### Organisational affiliation of the review

Wollongong Hospital and University of Wollongong

#### Review team members and their organisational affiliations [1 change]

Mrs Tiffany Sandell. Wollongong Hospital and University of Wollongong  
Dr Heike Schütze. University of Wollongong

#### Type and method of review

Narrative synthesis, Systematic review

#### Anticipated or actual start date

01 July 2020

#### Anticipated completion date [1 change]

22 July 2022

#### Funding sources/sponsors

This review is unfunded.

#### Conflicts of interest

None known

#### Language

English

#### Country

Australia

#### Stage of review [1 change]

Review Completed not published

#### Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

#### Subject index terms

Humans; Neoplasms

#### Date of registration in PROSPERO

11 July 2020

**Date of first submission**

10 June 2020

**Stage of review at time of this submission [1 change]**

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Started</b>	<b>Completed</b>
Preliminary searches	Yes	Yes
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	Yes
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	Yes	Yes
Data extraction	Yes	Yes
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	Yes	Yes
Data analysis	Yes	Yes

**Revision note**

updated date range as suggested by journal editor.

*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**

11 July 2020

16 June 2022

17 June 2022

21 July 2022

02 August 2022