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Review question/objective

The overall aim of this mixed methods systematic review is to explore the effectiveness, and experience of early intervention programs which have used volunteers, peer supporters and community champions that aim to improve one or more of the following outcomes of children from conception to two years:

1. Cognitive development
2. Social and emotional development,
3. Speech and language

The review will aim to answer the following research questions:

1. Are community based interventions using non-paid volunteers/peers effective in improving cognitive, social and emotional development, speech, language and nutrition?
2. What is the level of engagement (number of sessions attended, adherence) with such interventions in trial settings?
3. What are the experiences of families/caregivers of engaging in such interventions?
4. What are the reported changes in health and wellbeing of families/caregivers involved in these interventions?

Background

Providing children with the best start in life has been a priority in many governments’ agendas over the past decade. Early intervention has been repeatedly recognized as the most appropriate way of ensuring that every child has the best chance of achieving their full potential. 1, 2 There is growing evidence to support the assertion that biological and psychosocial experiences in early life can affect brain development and behavior 3, suggesting that the most effective and cost-effective way to prevent health inequalities is to intervene early before behavior and health patterns have been firmly established. 4 Therefore, interventions targeting early childhood may offer a unique opportunity to improve long-term health and psycho-social outcomes.

Although early intervention is a priority worldwide, this review will focus on early intervention programs that have been developed and tested in High Income Countries (based on their Human Development Index) in order to identify evidence that could be replicated in a UK context.

Since 2010, UK government guidance has been calling for early intervention programs which target children’s development. 5-7 Ensuring that children fulfill their developmental potential can improve school attainment, build resilience and improve wellbeing. A number of elements have been identified as risk factors regarding children’s development. Poor communication skills, inadequate cognitive stimulation and nutrient deficiencies resulting from poor nutrition have been found to be the main factors leading to poor child development. 8 For this reason, many early intervention programmes in the UK are now trying to address those factors by intervening as early as possible. 9

Some literature suggests that early interventions targeting child development can be effective. Examples include early care and education (ECE) programmes in the U.S, such as Head Start, Early Head Start, and the Chicago Child–Parent Centres. 10 These programmes, which share common aspects, aim to improve language development by providing services and educational resources to parents and children. The services involved continuous intervention and assessment of child development (physical, cognitive and emotional), family support and counseling. 11 Evaluation studies of these programmes have demonstrated that children show significant improvements in language development following their participation in the programmes. 10 In addition, an early intervention program in Canada had positive effects on language and development for children, as well as improvements in parental wellbeing. 11 The program included center-based early learning (preschool and kindergarten education), nutrition advice, and strengthening of parental psychosocial resources.

However, there is some debate around the longer-term effectiveness of early interventions. There is promising evidence to support the longer-term effectiveness and cost effectiveness of early interventions to prevent antisocial or delinquent behavior later in life. 12-13 Nevertheless, with regards to children’s development, the long term effectiveness of early years interventions is still uncertain. 14, 15

More recently, governments and local authorities have suggested that a community approach, mainly through the use of volunteers, should be incorporated in early intervention programmes. By including
volunteer members of the community in such programmes, advocates have stated that this will improve
relationships between early years services and the community, increase the levels of engagement with
services, improve sustainability of universal services and allow for specialist staff to focus on families
who need more targeted support. In fact, a study conducted in Nepal showed that volunteers were
able to identify low birth weight of babies and provide advice and support to mothers in order to increase
the baby’s weight. Moreover, studies on the use of peer supporters as part of maternal and neonatal
care in India and Kenya have shown that it improves both community and self-resilience. However,
the principal measured outcomes of these studies involved infant mortality and disease control and
therefore may not be applicable to child development interventions of the type to be studied here. In
addition to the benefits for the community, the use of volunteers can also be a valuable experience for
the volunteers themselves as it increases their employability and improves self-confidence.

However, some have warned that the use of volunteers, despite the potential benefits, also comes with
potential risks. The increased numbers of unqualified/untrained individuals could mean that mistakes
in terms of service provision and support can be made.

There is a gap in terms of the evidence of the effectiveness of a community based model applied in
early intervention; particularly in early interventions targeting the outcomes of this review (cognitive,
social and emotional development, speech and language and nutrition). In addition, the evidence
base in terms of what works, for whom and when, is weak. Although systematic reviews in child
development outcomes have been conducted, to our knowledge systematic reviews on the
effectiveness of volunteers, peer supporters and community champions in improving those, have not.
Previous systematic reviews have focused on improving maternal outcomes, such as mental health whereas others have only included studies from the USA or have focused on emotional and behavioral
difficulties rather than other aspects of development. In addition they have used a quantitative
approach. The proposed mixed methods review, appraising both the quantitative and qualitative
evidence base, will fill this research gap by specifically assessing the effect of volunteers, peer
supporters and community champions on all domains of child development (cognitive, social and
emotional, speech and language) and growth/nutrition. It is expected that much of the evidence base
regarding the effectiveness of volunteers in improving child development outcomes will be in the gray
literature (i.e. evaluation reports from within voluntary organizations) and therefore would not have been
picked up in other systematic reviews. Lastly, an initial scope of the literature by searching MEDLINE,
The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) and the JBI Database of Systematic Reviews
and Implementation Reports found no mixed methods systematic reviews which have answered the
research question of this review.

However, there is evidence from qualitative systematic reviews that mothers involved in early years
interventions prefer support from peers rather than health professionals. In addition, quantitative
systematic reviews have shown that lay health professionals (members of the community) can improve
a number of health-related outcomes for both mothers and children, such as breastfeeding and
immunization uptake. Generally, most existing systematic reviews have focused on the use of
volunteers and peer supporters in breastfeeding. However, there seems to be a lack of evidence on
their effectiveness in improving child cognitive, social and emotional development and behavior
outcomes. By synthesizing quantitative and qualitative evidence on the subject, questions around the
feasibility, meaningfulness, appropriateness and effectiveness of utilizing volunteers in early
intervention programs targeting child development will be answered and gaps in the evidence base will be identified.

The findings of this review will help to inform practice, make recommendations for future programs as well as guiding further research.

**Keywords**

**Inclusion criteria**

**Types of participants**

The quantitative component of this review will consider studies that include community dwelling children from conception to two years old. Studies which focus primarily on children who have been diagnosed with a developmental condition as defined in the DSM-V or ICD-10 (e.g. intellectual disability, autism spectrum disorder, Down syndrome, language and learning disorder, cerebral palsy, vision impairment, hearing loss) will be excluded. However, we will include studies that have used a universal intervention where children with developmental disorders have not been specifically targeted.

The qualitative component of this review will consider studies that include parents of children who are two years old or younger. Studies which focus on parents of children with a developmental condition will be excluded.

**Types of intervention(s)/phenomena of interest**

The quantitative component of the review will consider studies that independently or dependently evaluate early interventions which have used volunteers, peer supporters and community champions who are not part of the Health System and aim to improve cognitive, social and emotional development, speech, language and nutrition in children 2 years old or younger. Studies that have evaluated community based interventions will be included (for the purposes of this review ‘community based interventions’ will be defined geographically, to include interventions that have been implemented citywide or within community institutions such as neighborhoods, schools, churches, work sites, voluntary agencies, or other organizations).

In addition, the focus of this review will be on early intervention programs that have been developed in High Income Countries (based on the Human Development Index HDI). The HDI was chosen as an indicator because it takes into account, not only the economic growth of a country but also life expectancy, education and standard of living. It is therefore, a more inclusive indicator of the development of a country. The focus on High Income Countries was chosen in order to identify effective early years interventions that could be replicated in a UK context and therefore inform policy and practice in this country.

**Comparator**

The quantitative component of the review will consider studies that have compared the intervention children who have not received intervention (usual care). Studies which compare two community based...
early interventions will also be included.

**Types of outcomes**

This review will consider studies that include validated outcome measures that relate to changes in cognitive, social and emotional development, speech, language and/or nutrition. Outcomes for development will include assessments using a validated developmental screening tool (e.g. Ages and Stages Questionnaires, Bayley Scales of Infant Development II, Social and Emotional Assessment/Evaluation Measure). Outcomes for nutrition will include BMI scores and dietary intake. Outcomes can be measured or self-reported.

**Phenomena of Interest**

The qualitative component of this review will explore the experiences of parents/caregivers who have participated in early year intervention programs.

**Context**

The qualitative component of this review will explore a specific community context including, interventions delivered by non-paid volunteers, peer supports or community champions in a community setting.

**Types of studies**

**Study designs**

The quantitative component of the review will consider both experimental and epidemiological study designs including randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental, before and after studies, prospective and retrospective cohort studies, case control studies and analytical cross sectional studies.

The qualitative component of the review will consider studies that focus on qualitative data including, but not limited to, designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, action research and feminist research.

**Search strategy**

The search strategy aims to find both published and unpublished studies. A three-step search strategy will be utilized in this review. An initial limited search of MEDLINE (PubMed) and CINAHL will be undertaken followed by analysis of the text words contained in the title and abstract, and of the index terms used to describe article. The keywords that will be used are: new-born OR baby AND volunteers AND communication OR language OR cognitive development OR social development OR emotional development OR diet OR nutrition A second search using all identified keywords and index terms will then be undertaken across all included databases (listed below separately for published and unpublished literature). Thirdly, the reference list of all identified reports and articles will be searched for additional studies. Only studies published in English will be considered in this review. Studies published from 1980 onwards will be included. This is the start period when relevant studies (e.g. the
evaluations of the Family Nurse Partnership) started to be published and therefore was selected as the range for this review.

Following the initial search, the following databases will be searched:

ASSIA
CINAHL
MEDLINE (PubMed)
Social Care Online
ScienceDirect
Cochrane Register of trials
Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE)
Child Development & Adolescent Studies
PsycINFO
Scopus
Sage Journals Online

The search for grey literature will include (1):

Best Evidence Encyclopedia:
http://www.bestevidence.org/

Blueprints for Health Youth Development:
http://www.blueprintsprograms.com

Centre for Excellence and Outcomes (C4EO):

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL):
http://casel.org/guide/

Centre for Analysis of Youth Transitions (CAYT):
http://www.ifs.org.uk/centres/caytRepository

Child Trends LINKS (Lifecourse Interventions to Nurture Kids Successfully):
http://www.childtrends.org/whatworks/

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy:
http://evidencebasedprograms.org/wordpress/

Databank of Effective Youth Interventions:
www.nji.nl/jeugdinterventies

Evidence Informed Policy in Education in Europe (EiPPE):
Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre):

EU-Compass for Action on Mental Health and Well-being:
http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/eu_compass/index_en.htm
https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/sanco_mental_health/

European Alliance for Families:
http://europa.eu/epic/practices-that-work/index_en.htm

Investing in Children:
www.investinginchildren.eu

Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Netherlands Youth Institute:
http://www.youthpolicy.nl/yp/Youth-Policy/Youth-Policy-subjects/Netherlands-Youth-Institute-Effective-youth-interventions

National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP):
http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/

Promising Practices Network (PPN):
http://www.promisingpractices.net/programs.asp

Partnership for Results (PRF):
http://www.partnershipforresults.org/programs.html

What Works Clearing House (WWCH):

Search terms:
Search terms will include: new-born OR baby OR child OR infant OR toddler AND volunteers OR peer supporters OR community champions AND communication OR language OR cognitive development OR social development OR emotional development OR diet OR nutrition. Each electronic database will be systematically searched using combinations of these search terms, tailored to the syntax and functionality of each database.

Assessment of methodological quality

Quantitative papers selected for retrieval will be assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Meta Analysis of Statistics Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-MASTARI) (Appendix I). Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.
Qualitative papers selected for retrieval will be assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from the Joanna Briggs Institute Qualitative Assessment and Review Instrument (JBI-QARI) (Appendix I). Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer.

**Data collection**

Quantitative data will be extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-MAStARI (Appendix II). The data extracted will include specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives.

Qualitative data will be extracted from papers included in the review using the standardized data extraction tool from JBI-QARI (Appendix II). The data extracted will include specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives.

**Data synthesis**

Evidence from RCT data will, where possible be pooled in statistical meta-analysis using JBI-MAStARI. All results will be subject to double data entry. Effect sizes expressed as odds ratio (for categorical data) and weighted mean differences (for continuous data) and their 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for analysis. Heterogeneity will be assessed statistically using the standard Chi-square. Where statistical pooling is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form including tables and figures to aid in data presentation where appropriate.

Qualitative research findings will, where possible be pooled using JBI-QARI. This will involve the aggregation or synthesis of findings to generate a set of statements that represent that aggregation, through assembling the findings rated according to their quality, and categorizing these findings on the basis of similarity in meaning. These categories are then subjected to a meta-synthesis in order to produce a single comprehensive set of synthesized findings that can be used as a basis for evidence-based practice. Where textual pooling is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form.

The findings of each single-method synthesis included in this review will be aggregated using the JBI-MMARI. This will involve the configuration of the findings to generate a set of statements that represent that aggregation through coding any quantitative to attribute a thematic description to all quantitative data. The resulting themes will be assembled from quantitative and qualitative syntheses; and configured to produce a set of synthesized findings in the form of a theoretical framework, set of recommendations or conclusions.
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Appendix I: Appraisal instruments
**MAStARI Appraisal instrument**

**JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Randomised Control / Pseudo-randomised Trial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the assignment to treatment groups truly random?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were participants blinded to treatment allocation?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed from the allocator?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were the outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Were those assessing outcomes blind to the treatment allocation?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the control and treatment groups comparable at entry?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were groups treated identically other than for the named interventions</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were outcomes measured in the same way for all groups?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall appraisal:** Include ☐ Exclude ☑️ Seek further info. ☑️

Comments (including reason for exclusion)

____________________________
____________________________

Created by XMLmind XSL-FO Converter.
JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Descriptive / Case Series

Reviewer ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Author ___________________________ Year __________ Record Number ________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was study based on a random or pseudo-random sample?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Were confounding factors identified and strategies to deal with them stated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were outcomes assessed using objective criteria?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If comparisons are being made, was there sufficient descriptions of the groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was follow up carried out over a sufficient time period?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were the outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall appraisal: Include □ Exclude □ Seek further info □

Comments (including reason for exclusion)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Comparable Cohort/ Case Control

Reviewer: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Author: ___________________________ Year: ____________ Record Number: ____________

1. Is sample representative of patients in the population as a whole? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
2. Are the patients at a similar point in the course of their condition/illness? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
3. Has bias been minimised in relation to selection of cases and of controls? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
4. Are confounding factors identified and strategies to deal with them stated? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
5. Are outcomes assessed using objective criteria? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
6. Was follow up carried out over a sufficient time period? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
7. Were the outcomes of people who withdrew described and included in the analysis? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
8. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable
9. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? [ ] Yes [ ] No [ ] Unclear [ ] Not Applicable

Overall appraisal: [ ] Include [ ] Exclude [ ] Seek further info. [ ]

Comments (including reason for exclusion)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
JBI Database of Systematic Reviews & Implementation Reports

**QARI Appraisal instrument**

**JBI QARI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice versa, addressed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall appraisal: ☐ Include ☐ Exclude ☐ Seek further info. ☐

Comments (including reason for exclusion)

---

Created by XMLmind XSL-FO Converter.
Appendix II: Data extraction instruments
MAStARI data extraction instrument

JBI Data Extraction Form for Experimental / Observational Studies

Reviewer __________________________ Date __________________________

Author __________________________ Year __________________________

Journal __________________________ Record Number __________________

Study Method

RCT □ Quasi-RCT □ Longitudinal □

Retrospective □ Observational □ Other □

Participants

Setting

Population

Sample size

Group A _______________ Group B _______________

Interventions

Intervention A

Intervention B

Authors Conclusions:

________________________

Reviewers Conclusions:

________________________
### Study results

#### Dichotomous data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention (number / total number)</th>
<th>Intervention (number / total number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Continuous data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Intervention (number / total number)</th>
<th>Intervention (number / total number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QARI data extraction instrument**

**JBI QARI Data Extraction Form for Interpretive & Critical Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Record Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Description**

- Methodology
- Method
- Phenomena of Interest
- Setting
- Geographical
- Cultural
- Participants
- Data analysis
- Authors Conclusions
- Comments

**Complete**

- Yes ☐
- No ☐
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Illustration from Publication (page number)</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unequivocal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction of findings complete

Yes ☐

No ☐
4. You hereby warrant that in the case of a multi-authored Article you have obtained, in writing, authorization to enter into this Agreement on their behalf and that all co-authors have read and agreed the terms of this Agreement;
5. You warrant that any formula or dosage given is accurate and will not if properly followed injure any person;
6. You will indemnify and keep indemnified the Editors/The Joanna Briggs Institute against all claims and expenses (including legal costs and expenses) arising from any breach of this warranty and the other warranties on your behalf in this Agreement.

By signing this Agreement you agree that the Joanna Briggs Institute may arrange for the Article to be:

- Published in the above Library, and sold or distributed, on its own, or with other related material;
- Published in multi-contributor book form or other edited compilations by the Joanna Briggs Institute;
- Reproduced and/or distributed (including the abstract) throughout the world in printed, electronic or any other medium whether now known or hereafter devised, in all languages, and to authorize third parties (including Reproduction Rights Organizations) to do the same;
- You agree to the Joanna Briggs Institute using any images from the Article in any marketing material.

You authorize the Joanna Briggs Institute to act on your behalf to defend the copyright in the Article if anyone should infringe it and agree to do everything reasonably necessary to assist the Joanna Briggs Institute to do so, although there is no obligation on the Joanna Briggs Institute to act in this way.

As the Author, copyright in the Article remains in your name (or your employer’s name if your employer owns copyright in your work).

The Joanna Briggs Institute undertakes that every copy of the Article published by the Joanna Briggs Institute will include the full bibliographic reference for your Article, together with the copyright statement.

This Agreement is governed by the law of South Australia, Australia and you and the Joanna Briggs Institute unconditionally and irrevocably submit to the non-exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of South Australia, Australia in relation to any matter arising out of this Agreement and waive any right to object to proceedings being brought in those courts.

☐ BOX A: to be completed if copyright belongs to you

☐ BOX B: to be completed if copyright belongs to your employer (e.g. HMSO, CSIRO)

The copyright holder grants the Joanna Briggs Institute an exclusive license to publish the Article including the abstract in printed and electronic form, in all languages, and to administer subsidiary rights agreements with third parties for the full period of copyright and all renewals, extensions, revisions and revivals.

Print Name of Copyright holder: __________________________________________________________

This will be printed on the copyright line on each page of the Article. It is your responsibility to provide the correct information of the copyright holder.

☐ BOX C: to be completed if the Article is in the public domain (e.g. US Federal Government employees) You certify that the Article is in the public domain. No license to publish is therefore necessary.

Signature (on behalf of all co-authors if any) ___________________________ Print name: ___________________________

Date: _______________ 05/11/2015 ___________________________

If your employer claims copyright in your work, this form must also be signed below by a person authorized to sign for and on behalf of your employer, as confirmation that your employer accepts the terms of this license.

Signature (on behalf of the employer of the author(s)) ___________________________

Print name: ___________________________

Print name of employer: ___________________________

Date: _______________ ___________________________

The rights conveyed in this license will only apply upon acceptance of your Article for publication.

Privacy & Data Protection: The Publisher may store your name and contact details in electronic format in order to correspond with you about the publication of your Article in the library. We would like to contact you from time to time with information about new Joanna Briggs Institute publications and services in your subject area. (For European or Australian contributors, this may involve transfer of your personal data or information outside the European Economic Area or Australia, respectively). Please check the following boxes if you are happy to be contacted in this way:

☐ (conventional mailing) ☐ (via e-mail)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Year of publication ...................... JBI Journal............... JBI Number ..................... Volume/Issue .....................

Date of form: 11July2014