

TEODOROWSKI, P., DOUGLAS, F., KENNEDY, C., and MACIVER, E. 2020. Adults with type 1 and 2 diabetes and healthcare professionals' experiences of household food insecurity management in high income countries: a systematic review. [Protocol]. PROSPERO [online], item number CRD42019127618. Available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42019127618](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019127618)

# Adults with type 1 and 2 diabetes and healthcare professionals' experiences of household food insecurity management in high income countries: a systematic review.

TEODOROWSKI, P., DOUGLAS, F., KENNEDY, C., and MACIVER, E.

2020



Adults with type 1 and 2 diabetes and healthcare professionals' experiences of household food insecurity management in high income countries: a systematic review  
*Piotr Teodorowski, Flora Douglas, Catriona Kennedy, Emma MacIver*

### Citation

Piotr Teodorowski, Flora Douglas, Catriona Kennedy, Emma MacIver. Adults with type 1 and 2 diabetes and healthcare professionals' experiences of household food insecurity management in high income countries: a systematic review. PROSPERO 2019 CRD42019127618 Available from: [https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\\_record.php?ID=CRD42019127618](https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019127618)

### Review question

1. What are the experiences of self-management among adults with types 1 or 2 diabetes and household food insecurity?
2. What are the experiences of diabetes management and food insecurity among healthcare professionals in high-income countries?
3. What evidence is there around diabetes management and food insecurity?

### Searches

The search strategy will aim to locate published peer-reviewed studies.

An initial limited search of MEDLINE, CINAHL and Web of Science was undertaken to identify articles on the topic.

The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, and the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy for MEDLINE and CINAHL.

The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, will be adapted for each included information source.

Only studies in English, and those published from 2008 to the present will be included, as it was the end of the 2007-2008 financial crisis which had a profound impact on food poverty in high-income countries.

The reference lists of all studies selected for critical appraisal will be screened for additional studies.

The search strategy has been constructed with the assistance of a librarian.

### Types of study to be included

This review will consider interpretive studies that draw on the experiences of health professionals or patients including, but not limited to, designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, action research and feminist research.

This review will consider studies that have populations in high-income countries. For this review, high income countries will include: United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Japan and European states.

Only studies in English, and those published from 2008 to the present will be included, as it was the end of the 2007-2008 financial crisis which had a profound impact on food poverty in high-income countries.

### Condition or domain being studied

This review will look into type 1 or 2 diabetes.

### Participants/population

The primary target of this review will be adults, who are at least 18 years old, who live with type 1 or 2 diabetes, and experience household food security issues.

For this review, we will document age groups employed by authors to describe the participants, and will record any variation in the syntheses.

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

Household food insecurity.

### Comparator(s)/control

Not relevant.

### Main outcome(s)

This review will explore diabetics' experiences of household food security self-management and health professionals' experiences of household food security management.

#### \* Measures of effect

Not applicable.

### Additional outcome(s)

None.

#### \* Measures of effect

Not applicable.

### Data extraction (selection and coding)

Data will be extracted from studies included in the review by two independent reviewers using Word.

The data to be extracted will include specific details about the populations, geographical location, study methods and the phenomena of interest relevant to the review objective.

The findings, and their illustrations, will be extracted and assigned a level of credibility.

Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

The authors of papers will be contacted to request missing or additional data, where required.

### Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Eligible studies will be critically appraised by two independent reviewers for methodological quality using the standard Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklist for Qualitative Research (Lockwood et al., 2015).

The authors of papers will be contacted to request missing or additional data for clarification, where required.

Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

The results of the critical appraisal will be reported in a narrative form and in a table.

The final synthesized findings will be graded according to the CERQual approach for establishing confidence in the output of qualitative research synthesis and presented in a summary of findings table (Lewin et al., 2015). The overall CERQual assessment of evidence will be assessed based on the assessment of methodological limitations, relevance, coherence and adequacy of each finding. The summary of findings includes a review finding, assessment of confidence, explanation of CERQual assessment and studies which contribute to the review findings.

## References

Lewin,. 2015. Using Qualitative Evidence in Decision Making for Health and Social Interventions: An Approach to Assess Confidence in Findings from Qualitative Evidence Syntheses. PLoS Medicine

Lockwood,. 2015. Qualitative research synthesis: methodological guidance for systematic reviewers utilizing meta-aggregation. International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare

## Strategy for data synthesis

Qualitative research findings will be analysed thematically (Braun & Clarke, 2006) with all researchers contributing to it to build consensus. Themes will be developed inductively and iteratively and arranged their relationships in the conceptual map.

## Analysis of subgroups or subsets

This review is a qualitative synthesis, and while subgroup analyses may be undertaken, it is not possible to specify the groups in advance.

## Contact details for further information

Piotr Teodorowski  
p.teodorowski@rgu.ac.uk

## Organisational affiliation of the review

Robert Gordon University

## Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Mr Piotr Teodorowski. Robert Gordon University  
Dr Flora Douglas. Robert Gordon University  
Professor Catriona Kennedy. Robert Gordon University  
Dr Emma Maclver. Robert Gordon University

## Type and method of review

Epidemiologic, Systematic review

## Anticipated or actual start date

01 February 2019

## Anticipated completion date

31 December 2019

## Funding sources/sponsors

None

## Conflicts of interest

## Language

English

## Country

Scotland

## Stage of review

Review Completed not published

## Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

## Subject index terms

Adult; Developed Countries; Diabetes Mellitus; Diet; Food Supply; Health Personnel; Health Status  
Disparities; Humans; Income; Poverty; Risk Factors; Self-Management

### Date of registration in PROSPERO

25 March 2019

### Date of first submission

06 March 2019

### Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
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

New researcher joined the team. Review is now completed.

*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

25 March 2019

30 September 2020

#### PROSPERO

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