

INPLASY

Key factors reported in reviews that support athlete transition: an overview of reviews

INPLASY202460002

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.6.0002

Received: 01 June 2024

Published: 01 June 2024

Lavallee, D; Lavallee, R.

Corresponding author:

David Lavallee

d.lavallee@abertay.ac.uk

Author Affiliation:

Abertay University.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - None.

Review Stage at time of this submission - Preliminary searches.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202460002

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 01 June 2024 and was last updated on 01 June 2024.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective The proposed overview of reviews will address the following question: What are the key factors reported in reviews that support athletes in making career transitions effectively?

Rationale There is growing evidence that athletes who retire from sport, either by choice or through deselection, require support to help them make career transitions more effectively. A number of systematic reviews, meta analyses, and scoping reviews have been conducted on the topic [e.g., 1-3] but there is a knowledge gap in relation to identifying key factors reported across these reviews that support athlete transition. An overview of the the evidence reported in reviews can help better inform practice.

Condition being studied The focus of the review includes the key factors and support provision for athletes retiring from sport.

METHODS

Search strategy Electronic bibliographic databases detailed in Information Sources will be searched. Reference lists of included reviews will be screened for other potential eligible reviews and review authors will be contacted if a review cannot be accessed.

Participant or population A participant classification framework will be used to identify athletes for this review [4], with no exclusion based on age, gender or ethnicity.

Intervention Not applicable.

Comparator Not applicable.

Study designs to be included Published systematic reviews, meta analyses, and scoping reviews; and independent grey literature reports.

Eligibility criteria Eligibility criteria for review selection will follow overview of reviews guidance [5], including the PICOS framework where relevant. As noted in Language Restriction, only reviews published in English will be included.

Information sources The following electronic bibliographic databases will be searched from inception to May 2024: Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, ERIC, PsychINFO, and PubMed; SportDiscus will be a subject-specific bibliographic database. Targeted searches will be conducted in Google Scholar. Grey literature databases will also be searched for other reports, surveys, and reviews.

Main outcome(s) The outcomes most relevant for the proposed review include self-identity, transition preparation, control over retirement decision, and wellbeing.

Additional outcome(s) None.

Data management One reviewer will be involved in identifying reviews for screening through database searching, and removing any duplicate records. Titles and abstracts will be screened for eligibility independently by two reviewers (one with knowledge in the review topic, and the other with methodological expertise) and full-text reviews will be retrieved if deemed potentially eligible. The two reviewers will then carry out full-text reviews independently, any disagreements for inclusion/exclusion will be resolved by consensus.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis The GRADE system [6] will be used as part of the Data Management process. Given the overall objective is to identify the key factors that support athletes in making career transitions effectively, quality assessment scores and risk of bias analysis will not be used when aggregating the factors reported in the overview of reviews.

Strategy of data synthesis An iterative extraction and analysis process will be employed, guided by direct content analysis of the reviews. Where relevant, percentages and ranges will be reported for prevalence, trends and baselines related to outcomes.

Subgroup analysis None.

Sensitivity analysis A sensitivity analysis will be conducted if reviews including studies with prospective designs are identified.

Language restriction Only reviews published in English will be considered for inclusion.

Country(ies) involved United Kingdom.

Keywords Athlete; Transition; Support; Sport Retirement.

Dissemination plans A manuscript will be prepared and submitted to be considered for publication and conference presentations following the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Because the review is being carried out in the UK (Country Involved), UK evidence will be extracted and disseminated to help inform practice in the UK. Blogs and social media posts will be able to be considered as ways to disseminate the review to practitioners and other stakeholders.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - David Lavallee.

Email: d.lavallee@abertay.ac.uk

Author 2 - Ruth Lavallee.

Email: r521449@uad.ac.uk

References cited in the protocol

[1] Knights S, Sherry E, Ruddock-Hudson M. Investigating elite end-of-athletic-career transition: A systematic review. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*. 2016 Jul 2;28(3):291-308.

[2] Filbay S, Pandya T, Thomas B, McKay C, Adams J, Arden N. Quality of life and life satisfaction in former athletes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine*. 2019 Nov;49:1723-38.

[3] Carmody S, Anemaat K, Massey A, Kerkhoffs G, Goutteborge V. Health conditions among retired professional footballers: a scoping review. *BMJ Open Sport & Exercise Medicine*. 2022 Apr 1;8(2):e001196.

[4] McKay AK, Stellingwerff T, Smith ES, Martin DT, Mujika I, Goosey-Tolfrey VL, Sheppard J, Burke LM. Defining training and performance caliber: a participant classification framework. *International journal of sports physiology and performance*. 2021 Dec 29;17(2):317-31.

[5] Goossen K, Hess S, Lunny C, Pieper D. Database combinations to retrieve systematic reviews in overviews of reviews: a methodological study. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2020 Dec;20:1-5.

[6] Schünemann, H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A. *The GRADE handbook*. 2013: 280.