

This work is made freely available under open access.

AUTHOR(S):	
TITLE:	
YEAR:	
Original citation:	
OpenAIR citation:	
Version history:	
This version of the	this protocol was originally made available on protocol was originally made available on been known revisions of the protocol.
Copyright stateme	
	iew protocol forms part of research that has been funded byand made publicly
	and made publicly
OpenAIR takedow	n statement:
students/library/lib consider withdraw any other reason s	Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <u>http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-</u> prary-policies/repository-policies) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will ing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for hould not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact <u>openair-help@rgu.ac.uk</u> with the details of ature of your complaint.
This protocol is dist	ibuted under a CC license.



PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

Professional body and regulatory organisation guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals: a systematic review protocol

Alyson Brown, Derek Stewart, Sarah Pederson, Katie MacLure, Brian Addison

Citation

Alyson Brown, Derek Stewart, Sarah Pederson, Katie MacLure, Brian Addison. Professional body and regulatory organisation guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals: a systematic review protocol. PROSPERO 2016:CRD42016026877 Available from http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO_REBRANDING/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42016026877

Review question(s)

The aim of this review is to critically appraise, synthesize and present the available evidence on professional body and regulatory organisation guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals.

To describe how professional body and regulatory organisations have derived and provided guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals

To describe the similarities and differences in terms of the nature and content of the guidance

To describe the emphasis placed on implementation and evaluation within the professional body and regulatory organisation guidance

Searches

Articles, guidelines and policy documents for review will be selected from a range of sources including electronic databases and snowballing from references. Readily accessible peer-reviewed full articles, conference proceedings and grey literature published in English since 1st January 2010 will be included. Due to the changing nature of social media and the definition of e-professionalism in 2009, guidance produced before this date is unlikely to be relevant to the current climate.

The databases to be searched are:

- 1. AMED
- 2. ASLIB
- 3. CINAHL
- 4. IPA
- 5. EMBASE
- 6. MEDLINE
- 7. Cochrane Library
- 8. ScienceDirect
- 9. SpringerLink
- 10. Zetoc



The search for grey literature and unpublished studies will be undertaken using:

- 1. EThOS
- 2. Web of Science Conference Proceedings Citation Index
- 3. Google Scholar
- 4. Google

Types of study to be included

There are no restrictions on the types of study design eligible for inclusion

Condition or domain being studied

Guidance and e-professionalism for registered healthcare professionals.

Participants/ population

Inclusion criteria:

Registered healthcare professionals as defined by the Department of Health (2015) similarly registered professions in other English speaking countries::

- Medical Doctor
- Nurse
- Midwife
- Dentist
- Optometrist
- Osteopath
- Chiropractor
- Pharmacist
- Arts therapist
- Biomedical scientist
- Chiropodist / podiatrist
- Clinical scientist
- Dietitian
- Hearing aid dispenser
- Occupational therapist
- Operating department practitioner
- Orthoptist
- Paramedic

UNIVERSITY of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

- Physiotherapist
- Practitioner psychologist
- Prosthetist / orthotist
- Radiographer
- Social workers
- Speech and language therapist

Exclusion criteria:

Guidance is usually readily available, but where this is not the case and is not in the public domain, these items will be excluded.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Not applicable.

Comparator(s)/ control

Not applicable.

Context

Registered healthcare professionals are expected to adhere to a code of conduct. Where a concern is raised about an individual's social media behaviour, this has the potential to be tested against professional expectations of behaviours and may have implications for the individual's fitness to practise.

Outcome(s)

Primary outcomes

A report presenting the available evidence on professional body and regulatory organisation guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals.

Secondary outcomes

- A description of how professional body and regulatory organisations have derived and provided guidance on the use of social media for registered healthcare professionals

- A description of the similarities and differences in terms of the nature and content of the guidance

- A description of the emphasis placed on implementation and evaluation within the professional body and regulatory organisation guidance

Data extraction, (selection and coding)

Titles and guidance will be independently screened by two reviewers from a team of five with abstracts and executive summaries followed by full articles where any doubt remains. Consensus on final inclusions will be negotiated with the third reviewer. Inclusions and exclusions will be recorded following PRISMA guidelines

A data extraction tool has been designed to capture:

- Population
- Context
- Timeline and review
- Geographical location



- Development process
- Structure and content
- Implementation
- Definitions

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Critical appraisal checklists appropriate to each study design type have been identified (CASP) and will be applied independently by two of the review team. Guidance will not be subject to quality assessment.

Strategy for data synthesis

A descriptive synthesis is planned with a narrative report.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

None planned

Dissemination plans

- conference proceedings

-peer reviewed journal publication

-PhD thesis

Contact details for further information

Mrs Brown

School of Pharmacy and Life Sciences

Sir Ian Wood Building

Garthdee Road

Aberdeen

AB10 7GJ

alyson.brown@rgu.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review None

Review team

Mrs Alyson Brown, Robert Gordon University Professor Derek Stewart, Robert Gordon University Professor Sarah Pederson, Robert Gordon University Dr Katie MacLure, Robert Gordon University Dr Brian Addison, Robert Gordon University

Anticipated or actual start date 08 February 2016

Anticipated completion date 06 May 2016

UNIVERSITY of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

Funding sources/sponsors Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest None known

Language English

Country Scotland

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Health Personnel; Humans; Names; Organizations; Social Media

Stage of review

Ongoing

Date of registration in PROSPERO

07 February 2016

Date of publication of this revision

07 February 2016

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

PROSPERO

International prospective register of systematic reviews

The information in this record has been provided by the named contact for this review. CRD has accepted this information in good faith and registered the review in PROSPERO. CRD bears no responsibility or liability for the content of this registration record, any associated files or external websites.