

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Yang et al. Renal transplant candidates' or recipients' perspectives on living donor transplantation: A Systematic Review and Qualitative Meta-synthesis. Inplasy protocol 202190101. doi: 10.37766/inplasy2021.9.0101

Received: 27 September 2021

Published: 27 September 2021

Corresponding author:
Hongxia Liu

hongxia_t@163.com

Author Affiliation:
School of Nursing, Beijing
University of Chinese
Medicine.

Support: Chinese Government.

Review Stage at time of this submission: The review has not yet started.

Conflicts of interest:
None declared.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: To describe the perspectives, priorities, and beliefs of patients who are transplant candidates or recipients for kidney transplantation, to inform related stakeholders (clinical stuffs, policy management and family members) that address patients' concerns,

Renal transplant candidates' or recipients' perspectives on living donor transplantation: A Systematic Review and Qualitative Meta-synthesis

Yang, L¹; Peng, FC²; Wei, CY³; Zhang, B⁴; Wang, RT⁵; Liu, HX⁶.

Review question / Objective: To describe the perspectives, priorities, and beliefs of patients who are transplant candidates or recipients for kidney transplantation, to inform related stakeholders (clinical stuffs, policy management and family members) that address patients' concerns, preferences and needs. The aim of this study is to describe the perspectives, priorities, and beliefs of patients who are transplant candidates or recipients for kidney transplantation.

Condition being studied: As the worldwide prevalence of living donor kidney transplantation increases it is important to gain a border spectrum of insights on this phenomenon through the synthesis multiple primary qualitative studies which were conducted in different countries and medical centers. From being the transplant candidates to organ recipients, patients are undergoing a series of variations, but the in-depth related qualitative data synthesis is lacking.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 27 September 2021 and was last updated on 27 September 2021 (registration number INPLASY202190101).

preferences and needs. The aim of this study is to describe the perspectives, priorities, and beliefs of patients who are transplant candidates or recipients for kidney transplantation.

Condition being studied: As the worldwide prevalence of living donor kidney transplantation increases it is important to

gain a border spectrum of insights on this phenomenon through the synthesis multiple primary qualitative studies which were conducted in different countries and medical centers. From being the transplant candidates to organ recipients, patients are undergoing a series of variations, but the in-depth related qualitative data synthesis is lacking.

METHODS

Search strategy: The following is the search strategy used: #1(kidney transplantation)(renal transplantation)(renal transplantations)(kidney grafting)(kidney transplantations)(kidney replacement)(renal replacement); #2(renal insufficiency)(dialysis)(haemodialysis)(hemodialysis); #3: #1 or #2; #4(live donor*)(living donor*)(live donation*)(living donation*); #5(qualitative research)OR(surveys and questionnaires) OR(self report)OR(focus groups)OR(qualitative)OR(phenomenolog*)OR(focus group*)OR(interview*) OR(grounded the or*) OR(mixed methods) OR(ethnograph*)OR(survey*)OR(questionnaire) OR(hermeneutic); #6: #3 AND #4 AND #5.

Participant or population: Patients who were prepared to accept the renal transplant or renal transplant recipients.

Intervention: Not applicable.

Comparator: Not applicable.

Study designs to be included: Qualitative method was used in the research, mixed method research with qualitative component.

Eligibility criteria: Literature was included if it met the following criteria:(a)investigated patients who were prepared to accept the renal transplant or renal transplant receipts, (b)was primary qualitative research study including personal experiences or perceptions, interviews, direct observation, focus groups, participating action research, grounded theory, phenomenology, ethnography, content analysis, thematic analysis,

narrative analysis, generic qualitative studies, (c)language in English.

Information sources: A systematic search was conducted in the following electric databases from inception to March 1, 2021 to identify primary studies: MEDLINE via Pubmed, Embase, PsycINFO, and CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature). The reference lists of included articles, grey articles and Google Scholar were also searched for other relevant articles.

Main outcome(s): Not applicable.

Data management: We use ENDNOTE(X9 version) to screen the literature, Excel to conduct data extraction.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: Quality appraisal of each included study was assessed by The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) qualitative research checklist, which was independently conducted by two authors who had received the relevant evidence-based courses. There are total ten items of the checklist which are about the qualitative methodology and are answered either “yes”, “no” or “clear”. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion with study group members.

Strategy of data synthesis: The thematic synthesis process was conducted guided by the Thomas and Harden’s method which was accorded to following three steps. (1)One author performed the line-by-line coding of each study’s characteristics independently by inductively identifying the concepts about the phenomena of interest. (2)Two authors grouped and developed the similar concepts into descriptive themes and subthemes. (3)Conceptual linkages between themes were used to generating analytical themes. To ensure the accuracy of the processes, the first author and third author re-examed generated codes and themes and compared them against all the included studies. Revision of the codes and themes were discussed until the agreements among the whole study group.

Subgroup analysis: Not applicable.

Sensitivity analysis: Not applicable.

Language: English.

Country(ies) involved: China.

Keywords: kidney transplant; recipient; candidate; living donor; systematic review.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Luo Yang conceived this study, constructed the search strategy, ran the searching, exported literature, developed eligibility criteria, designed the structure Excel of data extraction, conducted initial screening, full-text screening and drafted the manuscript.

Email: yangluoyeah@163.com

Author 2 - Fucong Peng involved in screening of search results, data extraction, quality assessment, data synthesis.

Email: 654653677@qq.com

Author 3 - Changyun Wei conducted initial screening and full-text screening.

Email: 3204413085@qq.com

Author 4 - Bei Zhang involved in screening of search results, data extraction, quality assessment, data synthesis.

Email: 18810550163@163.com

Author 5 - Ruiting Wang conducted initial screening and full-text screening.

Email: 1529367961@qq.com

Author 6 - Hongxia Liu generated the idea, conceived this study and give advice to every procedure.

Email: hongxia_t@163.com