

Barriers and facilitators associated with staying at work or returning to work following a road traffic crash: protocol for a systematic review
Venerina Johnston, Masoumeh Abedi, Manijeh Soleimanifar

Citation

Venerina Johnston, Masoumeh Abedi, Manijeh Soleimanifar. Barriers and facilitators associated with staying at work or returning to work following a road traffic crash: protocol for a systematic review. PROSPERO 2018 CRD42018084638 Available from:

https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42018084638

Review question

What are the views of injured adults on the barriers and facilitators influencing staying at or returning to work following a traffic accident?

Searches

The literature search will include articles that explore factors associated with early return to work following a road traffic accident. Nine following search engines will be searched: MEDLINE, PubMed, Web of Science, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, CINAHL, Scopus. English language qualitative studies published in peer-reviewed journals during past twenty years from 1997 to 2017 will be selected. The literature search will include a combination of search terms have been used in relevant studies and MeSH terms.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PubMed/?term=%E2%80%9Creturn%20to%20work%20%9D%20%20OR%20%20employment%20OR%20%20Sick%20Leave%20%20Work%20Engagement%20OR%20%20employed%20OR%20%20occupation%20OR%20%20job%20OR%20%20work%20disability%20OR%20%20work%20capacity%20OR%20%20Occupational%20Health%20OR%20%20Disability%20Evaluation%20OR%20%20Rehabilitation%20Vocational%20AND%20%20Accidents%20Traffic%20>

Types of study to be included

The study uses qualitative data (eg, interviews, focus groups, documentaries, observations, conversation, discourse, narrative analysis and video analysis.) and recognizable qualitative data analysis methods (eg, narrative, thematic, ethnographic analysis).

Condition or domain being studied

Car accident injuries which result in lost time from work, apart from their devastating emotional and physical impact on employees, can lead to significant financial consequences. Despite improvements in road safety by various governments, for instance just in Australia according to the BITRE each year, road crashes cause about 1,400 deaths and 32,500 serious injuries. The overall estimated cost to society is around \$27 billion. Furthermore, statistics show that in 2014, approximately 78.9% of hospitalized injuries following road accidents, involved 17 - 64-year-old people which are within the Australian working population (1).

As employment is important for health, quality of life and life satisfaction, postponing the return to work following an injury, could have a knock-on effect on a worker's self-esteem (2). In addition, prompt access to care and earlier return to work are considered essential to ensure optimal functional outcomes and thus reduce the economic burden associated with health and legal expenses, staff retraining, and lost productivity (3-5).

Previous studies have examined the contribution of multiple risk factors for return to work which is not always directly related to the severity of the medical condition or injury. Demographic, occupational, psychological and socioeconomic factors, as well as compensation eligibility, have been shown to have a significant effect on the duration of RTW even more than physical injuries (6-10).

Therefore, decreasing such a tremendous number of the hospitalized population following car accident

injuries and subsequently improving timely return to work, requires not only an understanding of these barriers and facilitators but also offering applicable solutions at the individual, social and governmental levels. While there is a growing body of literature on return to work after occupational injuries, there are still few studies on return to work after a road traffic crash (11, 12)

Participants/population

The study investigates the experiences of adult (claimants and non-claimants) injured in a road traffic crash. Studies focusing on other players involved in return to work, like employers, colleagues, healthcare professionals, insurers will be excluded

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

The study focuses on factors (facilitators or barriers) experienced by adults involved in road traffic accidents to remain at work or return to work; studies exploring interventions to improve return to work will be excluded.

Comparator(s)/control

Not applicable

Context

Studies in the traffic accident will be included.

Main outcome(s)

Establishing the barriers and facilitators to staying or returning to work after a traffic accident.

Additional outcome(s)

Not applicable

Data extraction (selection and coding)

The selection process will employ three reviewers. All potential articles will pass a five-stage screening process. Each database will be initially reviewed by one member of the research team (MA) and screened based on the title, abstract, and keywords. Relevant papers will be imported into Endnote software and screened for duplicates. Second, third and fourth stages will be performed by two reviewers (MA, MS) independently that will include screening titles, abstract and then full text respectively based on the selection criteria. Reviewers will arrange a meeting after each stage to discuss results. At the fifth stage, a third reviewer (VJ) will meet to discuss any discrepancies to reach consensus. Authors will be contacted for missing or incomplete information. If there is no response within 2 weeks, the article may be excluded on the basis of missing information.

Thorough records of all searches will be maintained by a PRISMA flow chart as a pictorial representation of search process to map out the number of citations identified, included and excluded, and the reasons for exclusions.

The methodological quality of screened papers will be appraised by the modified version of qualitative assessment framework developed by MacEachen et al (15). The initial version of this tool published by the National Center for Social Research in the United Kingdom was for development and evaluation of social policies (16). This framework places great emphasis on the quality of the document and the analysis that has shaped it rather than other features of conduct that cannot be well assessed from the written output. The modified framework consists of 17 main questions. In addition, there is a set of quality indicators for each of question. Appraisal questions are embedded inside four central principles which are commonly used in literature reviews. First, contribution in promoting broader knowledge or comprehension of approach, application or theory; second, defensible in design by supplying a research plan that can deal with the appraisal questions raised; third, rigorous performance by the systematic and clear selection, analysis and interpretation of qualitative data; Fourth, credible in claim through contributing justifiable and reasonable statements about the importance of the evidence generated. This framework is chosen because it is one of the most practical and rapid ways to assess quality. Thus, while not designed to assess the full range of traditions and paradigms in qualitative research, because of its open-ended questions, it is possible to modify the framework based on the context and objectives of the review.

Each selected article will be reviewed by two independent reviewers (MA, MS) and its quality will be rated as

low, medium, high or very high. Data extraction will be done by the above-mentioned reviewers separately and all reviewers will meet to negotiate extraction completeness and relevance. The review will focus simultaneously on both the first order constructs (participant's quotes) and the second-order constructs (researcher finding, interpretation, and statements). Extracting both forms of information helps to ensure the review findings are thoroughly founded on the original experiences of the participants (17). The descriptive characteristics to be extracted will include details about research questions, study design, study context, number and descriptions of samples, study period, study findings and analysis. A summary of the extracted data from final included articles will be created in a tabulated format.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

Data extraction will be done by the two reviewers independently and all reviewers will meet to negotiate extraction completeness and relevance.

Strategy for data synthesis

A descriptive meta-synthesis will be used in this review article, so that intact transcripts of the main research studies will include the information for analysis and these findings will not be deconstructed earlier than synthesis. This has been already adopted by previous studies(6). Two reviewers (MA, MS) will independently search unchanged text to identify barriers and facilitators to return to work. Recognized barriers and facilitators will be analyzed using thematic analysis technique by mentioned reviewers.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Themes and subthemes will be emerged comprehensively and will be organized using the disability prevention management model published by Loisel et al (18). This conceptual model represents several elements and their various levels, ranging from the personal system (physical, psychological and social) to workplace system, legislation, and insurance system, and healthcare system.

Contact details for further information

Masoumeh Abedi
abedi.zohre@gmail.com

Organisational affiliation of the review

AJA University of medical sciences
WWW.AJAUMS.AC.IR

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Assistant/Associate Professor Venerina Johnston. University of Queensland,Australia
Mrs Masoumeh Abedi. AJA University of Medical Sciences
Dr Manijeh Soleimanifar. AJA University of Medical sciences

Type and method of review

Qualitative synthesis

Anticipated or actual start date

01 February 2018

Anticipated completion date

01 February 2020

Funding sources/sponsors

No funding available

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

Australia, Iran

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Accidents, Traffic; Automobile Driving; Humans

Date of registration in PROSPERO

18 January 2018

Date of publication of this version

05 February 2018

Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors

Stage of review at time of this submission

The review has not started

Stage	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

Versions

18 January 2018

05 February 2018

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.