

1 Title: Diagnostic delay of sarcoidosis: protocol for an integrated systematic review

2 Authors

3 Tergel Namsrai MD, MSc¹

4 Jane Desborough RN, RM, MPH, PhD^{1*}

5 Dianne Gregory^{2,4}

6 Elaine Kelly^{2,4}

7 Matthew Cook MBBS, PhD, FRACP, FRCPA, FFSc(RCPA)³

8 Christine Phillips MBBS, BMedSc, MA, MPH, DipEd, FRACGP, MD, AM⁴

9 Anne Parkinson BA (Hons), AFHEA, PhD¹

10

11 Affiliations

12 1. National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National University,

13 Canberra, Australia

14 2. Sarcoidosis Australia

15 3. John Curtin School of Medical Research, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

16 4. Australian National University Medical School, Canberra, Australia

17

18 *Correspondence

19 Anne Parkinson, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National

20 University, 63, Eggleston Road, Acton ACT, 2601, Australia

21 Email: anne.parkinson@anu.edu.au

22

- 23 Keywords:
- 24 Sarcoidosis, delayed diagnosis, time to diagnosis, misdiagnosis, missed diagnosis, patient
- 25 experience
- 26 Word count:
- 27 Abstract 297 words
- 28 Manuscript 1342 words (excluding abstract, tables, figures, and references)

29 **Diagnostic delay of sarcoidosis: protocol for an integrated systematic review**

30 **Funding**

31 This review is part of the “Missed opportunities in clinical practice: Tools to enhance healthcare
32 providers’ awareness and diagnosis of rare diseases in Australia” project funded by the
33 Commonwealth represented by Department of Health Australia (Grant ID 4-G5ZN0T7).

34

35 The funders had and will have no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
36 publish or preparation of the manuscript.

37 **Competing interests**

38 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

39 **Data availability**

40 No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study. All relevant data from this
41 study will be made available upon study completion.

42 **Abstract**

43 Sarcoidosis is a rare systemic inflammatory granulomatous disease with broad manifestation
44 ranging from acute epileptic seizures to fatigue and pain syndromes that are subject to the organ
45 involved. Delays in the diagnosis of sarcoidosis are attributed to the lack of a single diagnostic
46 test or unified commonly used diagnostic criteria, and diagnosis based on exclusion of possible
47 alternative diagnoses. We aim to systematically review the evidence about diagnostic delay in
48 sarcoidosis to elucidate the causes and consequences of diagnostic delay, including people with
49 sarcoidosis' experiences. This will inform the development of interventions, tools, and health
50 policies aiming to improve diagnostic efficiency and patients' experiences of sarcoidosis.

51 **Methods and analysis**

52 A systematic search of the literature will be conducted using PubMed/Medline, Scopus, and
53 ProQuest databases, and sources of grey literature, up to 25th of May 2022, with no limitations on
54 publication date. We will include all study types (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods)
55 except review articles, examining diagnostic delay, incorrect diagnosis, missed diagnosis or slow
56 diagnosis of all types of sarcoidosis across all age groups. We will also examine evidence of
57 patients' experiences associated with diagnostic delay. Only studies in English, German and
58 Indonesian will be included. The outcomes we examine will be diagnostic delay time, patients'
59 experiences, and causes and consequences associated with diagnostic delay in sarcoidosis. Two
60 people will independently screen the titles and abstracts of search results, and then the remaining
61 full-text documents against the inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved with a third
62 reviewer until consensus is reached. Selected studies will be appraised using the Mixed Methods
63 Appraisal Tool (MMAT). A meta-analysis and subgroup analysis of quantitative data will be

64 conducted. Meta-aggregation methods will be used to analyse qualitative data. If there is
65 insufficient data for these analyses, a narrative synthesis will be conducted.

66 **Ethics and dissemination**

67 Ethical approval will not be required as no human recruitment or participation will be involved.
68 Findings of the study will be disseminated through publications in peer-reviewed journals,
69 conferences, and symposia.

70 **Trial registration**

71 PROSPERO Registration number: CRD42022307236

72 URL of the PROSPERO registration:

73 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPEROFILES/307236_PROTOCOL_20220127.pdf

75 **Introduction**

76 Sarcoidosis is a rare systemic inflammatory granulomatous disease of unknown cause with broad
77 manifestation ranging from acute epileptic seizures to subtle symptoms such as fatigue and pain;
78 syndromes that are subject to the organ involved (1-3). Sarcoidosis can manifest in any organ
79 including the lungs, skin, liver, joints, nervous system, and eyes (4, 5), but it most commonly
80 affects the lungs, referred to as pulmonary sarcoidosis (PS) (6). There is no single diagnostic test
81 for sarcoidosis or a unified, commonly used diagnostic criteria. Diagnosis of sarcoidosis relies on
82 clinical manifestations along with radiological or histological evidence and exclusion of possible
83 alternative diagnoses (7).

84

85 Due to its rarity, broad range of clinical features, lack of conclusive diagnostic testing and the
86 requirement for diagnosis to be based on exclusion of other possible diagnoses, timely diagnosis
87 of sarcoidosis can be challenging and result in substantial diagnostic delays and inappropriate
88 treatment. This can potentially result in people with sarcoidosis living with pain and other
89 unnecessary symptoms until the correct diagnosis is determined. Research examining diagnostic
90 delay, including factors associated with diagnostic delay and people's experience of diagnostic
91 delay in sarcoidosis, is rare. Understanding factors associated with diagnostic delay and people's
92 experiences of this could inform the development of interventions aimed at enhancing diagnostic
93 efficiency and improving people's experiences of living with sarcoidosis.

94 **Objective**

95 The aim of this integrated systematic review is to review the evidence regarding diagnostic delay
96 in sarcoidosis. To this end, our aim is to answer two key research questions:

97 RQ1. What are the causes and consequences of diagnostic delay of sarcoidosis?

98 RQ2. What evidence is there about patients' experience of sarcoidosis' diagnostic

99 delay?

100 **Methods and Analysis**

101 **Protocol development**

102 This study protocol has been developed in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for
103 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) and the Cochrane Handbook for
104 Systematic Reviews (8, 9).

105 **Search strategy**

106 The search strategy was developed to ensure reproducibility and increase transparency following
107 the PRISMA-P checklist (8). Research questions and search terms were developed using the
108 PICOS tool (Population/Intervention/Comparison/Outcomes/Study Design) to ensure reliability
109 and homogeneity of search results (10). The study is registered with PROSPERO
110 (CRD42022289830). A systematic search of peer reviewed literature will be conducted using
111 PubMed/Medline, Scopus, and ProQuest databases, and searches of the grey literature will
112 include Open Access Theses and Dissertation (<https://oatd.org/>), ProQuest Thesis and
113 Dissertations and the National Library of Australia. Reference lists of selected studies and review
114 articles will also be searched.

115

116 Search terms were developed in collaboration with research team members (**, **, **), and
117 combined using Boolean operators “AND” and “OR”. A preliminary exploratory search on

118 PUBMED/MEDLINE was conducted on 15th October 2021 (Table 1) to inform the final search
119 strategy and determine outcomes. This search strategy was updated and peer reviewed (**, **)
120 using the PRESS checklist (11). The final search terms will include sarcoidosis AND ("delay in
121 diagnosis" OR "diagnostic delay" OR "misdiagnosis" OR "time to diagnosis" OR "incorrect
122 diagnosis" OR "missed diagnosis" OR "delayed diagnosis") without restrictions on study type,
123 date, and language. The literature search results will be imported to Covidence, an internet-
124 based software that facilitates collaboration between reviewers and ensures independent review
125 of the literature (12).

Search number	Query	Search Details
1	sarcoidosis [Title/Abstract]	sarcoidosis [Title/Abstract]
2	delay in diagnosis [Title/Abstract]	delay in diagnosis [Title/Abstract]
3	delayed diagnosis [Title/Abstract]	delayed diagnosis [Title/Abstract]
4	diagnostic delay [Title/Abstract]	diagnostic delay [Title/Abstract]
5	time to diagnosis [Title/Abstract]	time to diagnosis [Title/Abstract]
6	misdiagnosis [Title/Abstract]	misdiagnosis [Title/Abstract]
7	missed diagnosis [Title/Abstract]	missed diagnosis [Title/Abstract]

8	incorrect diagnosis [Title/Abstract]	incorrect diagnosis [Title/Abstract]
9	#2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7 OR #8	delay in diagnosis [Title/Abstract] OR "delayed diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "diagnostic delay"[Title/Abstract] OR "time to diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "misdiagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "missed diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "incorrect diagnosis"[Title/Abstract]
10	#1 AND #9	sarcoidosis [Title/Abstract] AND ("delay in diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "delayed diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "diagnostic delay"[Title/Abstract] OR "time to diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "misdiagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "missed diagnosis"[Title/Abstract] OR "incorrect diagnosis"[Title/Abstract])

126 **Study selection**

127 Studies will be selected according to the pre-developed PICOS eligibility criteria outlined in
 128 Table 2. All study types (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods) except review articles,
 129 examining diagnostic delay, incorrect diagnosis, missed diagnosis or slow diagnosis of all types
 130 of sarcoidosis will be included. We will also examine evidence of patients' experiences
 131 associated with diagnostic delay. Given the nature of the study there will be no comparison

132 group. No setting or publication date limitations will be applied. Only studies in English,
133 German and Indonesian will be included.

134 As a first step, the title and abstract of the literature search results will be independently screened
135 by two review authors (** and **), against the pre-developed inclusion criteria. Any conflicts
136 will be discussed among the review team and resolved by a third reviewer (**).

137 Full texts will be sourced for all studies that meet the inclusion criteria or where there is any
138 uncertainty. Two review authors (** and **) will then screen the full text documents according
139 to the inclusion criteria, with any conflicts resolved by a third reviewer (**). Exclusion rationales
140 will be recorded.

Table 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria		
PICOS	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	Studies examining people with sarcoidosis of all ages	-
Intervention/Exposure	Studies examining delayed, incorrect diagnosis, missed diagnosis or slow diagnosis of sarcoidosis	-
Comparison	Not applicable	-
Outcome	Primary outcome: diagnostic delay. Secondary outcomes: i) causes and consequences of diagnostic delay	-

	ii) people with sarcoidosis’ experiences of diagnostic delay	
Study design	All study designs	Review articles
Language	English, German, Indonesian	
Setting	No restriction	-
Timing	No restriction	-

141 **Data extraction**

142 Following completion of the study selection process, a data extraction tool will be designed, peer
143 reviewed and piloted. In the piloting process, two reviewers (** and **) will independently
144 extract data from the same five studies and compare their results to establish consensus and
145 validity of the data extraction tool.

146

147 Data items to be extracted include:

- 148 1. Identification of the study (journal, authors, year, citation, research
149 center/university/hospital/organisation, conflict of interest, funding/sponsorship),
- 150 2. Methods (study aim, study design, participant demographics, recruitment process,
151 inclusion, exclusion criteria, statistical analysis),
- 152 3. Main findings (exposure details, diagnostic delays, causes and consequences of delay,
153 patients’ experience, and other relevant outcomes).

154

155 In cases of missing information about diagnostic delay, when available, the date of symptom
156 onset and date of diagnosis will be used to calculate diagnostic delay. Any disagreements will be

157 resolved through discussion, conflicts will be resolved by a third reviewer (**). Study authors
158 will be contacted to resolve uncertainties about extracted data.

159

160 The primary outcome of the review is diagnostic delay time (time from symptom onset to correct
161 diagnosis) in people living with sarcoidosis. Secondary outcomes include patients' experiences,
162 causes and consequences of diagnostic delay in sarcoidosis.

163 **Quality appraisal**

164 The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), will be used to appraise the quality of included
165 studies (quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods) (13). If the selected studies are only
166 quantitative, an appropriate adapted version of Newcastle-Ottawa scale (14) will be used
167 depending on the study types included. The chosen quality appraisal tool will be piloted by two
168 independent review authors (** and **), on a randomly selected five samples with any conflicts
169 resolved by a third reviewer following discussion (**). An independent reviewer (**) will
170 continue quality appraisal on the remaining studies.

171 **Data synthesis and meta-analysis**

172 A systematic narrative synthesis will be undertaken to explore the findings of included studies in
173 relation to time from symptom onset to diagnosis, and people's experiences related to delayed
174 diagnosis in line with guidance from the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (15).

175

176 A meta-analysis will also be conducted if extracted quantitative data are homogenous, using a
177 random-effects model in conjunction with subgroup analyses, including pooled diagnostic delay
178 data in each type of sarcoidosis. Extracted qualitative data will be meta-synthesized using meta-
179 aggregation. Similarly, processed data (findings) from qualitative studies will be extracted and

180 aggregated into a single set of categories, which will then be further aggregated and synthesised
181 into a set of statements that may be useful to inform clinical practice.

182 **Quality of evidence**

183 The quality/certainty of evidence for all quantitative outcomes included in a meta-analysis will
184 be judged using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation
185 (GRADE) working group methodology (16). The domains of risk of bias, consistency of effect,
186 imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias will be used to assess the certainty of the body of
187 evidence, which will be reported in four levels: high, moderate, low, and very low.

188 **Amendments**

189 If the protocol is amended prior to commencing the study, these amendments (date, explanation,
190 and rationale) will be described in the final protocol. The record will be in tabular format as
191 recommended by the Cochrane Collaboration (8).

192 **Author contributions**

193 Conceptualization: Anne Parkinson, Jane Desborough, Dianne Gregory, Elaine Kelly, Matthew
194 Cook, Christine Phillips

195 Data curation: Tergel Namsrai, Anne Parkinson, Jane Desborough

196 Investigation: Tergel Namsrai, Anne Parkinson, Jane Desborough

197 Methodology: Tergel Namsrai, Anne Parkinson, Jane Desborough, Matthew Cook,
198 Christine Phillips

199 Project coordinator: Anne Parkinson

200 Writing – original draft: Tergel Namsrai

201 Writing – review & editing: Anne Parkinson, Jane Desborough, Dianne Gregory, Elaine Kelly,
202 Matthew Cook, Christine Phillips

203 **Competing interests**

204 None declared.

205 **Supplementary files**

206 Original registered protocol is attached as Supplementary file 1.

207 **References**

- 208 1. de Kleijn WP, De Vries J, Lower EE, Elfferich MD, Baughman RP, Drent M. Fatigue in
209 sarcoidosis: a systematic review. *Current Opinion in Pulmonary Medicine*. 2009;15(5):499-506.
- 210 2. Michielsen HJ, Drent M, Peros-Golubicic T, De Vries J. Fatigue Is Associated With
211 Quality of Life in Sarcoidosis Patients*. *Chest*. 2006;130(4):989-94.
- 212 3. Bakkers M, Merkies IS, Lauria G, Devigili G, Penza P, Lombardi R, et al. Intraepidermal
213 nerve fiber density and its application in sarcoidosis. *Neurology*. 2009;73(14):1142-8.
- 214 4. Grunewald J, Grutters JC, Arkema EV, Saketkoo LA, Moller DR, Muller-Quernheim J.
215 Sarcoidosis. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;5(1):45.
- 216 5. Ungprasert P, Ryu JH, Matteson EL. Clinical Manifestations, Diagnosis, and Treatment
217 of Sarcoidosis. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings: Innovations, Quality & Outcomes*. 2019;3(3):358-75.
- 218 6. Fernández-Ramón R, Gaitán-Valdizán JJ, Sánchez-Bilbao L, Martín-Varillas JL,
219 Martínez-López D, Demetrio-Pablo R, et al. Epidemiology of sarcoidosis in northern Spain,
220 1999-2019: A population-based study. *European Journal of Internal Medicine*. 2021;91:63-9.
- 221 7. Costabel U, Hunninghake G. ATS/ERS/WASOG statement on sarcoidosis. Sarcoidosis
222 Statement Committee. American Thoracic Society. European Respiratory Society. World
223 Association for Sarcoidosis and Other Granulomatous Disorders. *European Respiratory Journal*.
224 1999;14(4):735-7.
- 225 8. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
226 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement.
227 *Systematic Reviews*. 2015;4(1):1.
- 228 9. Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA, . *Cochrane*
229 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 2021.

- 230 10. Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO, PICOS
231 and SPIDER: a comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for
232 qualitative systematic reviews. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2014;14(1):579.
- 233 11. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer
234 Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *Journal of Clinical
235 Epidemiology*. 2016;75:40-6.
- 236 12. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software Melbourne, Australia
237 [Available from: Available at www.covidence.org.
- 238 13. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed
239 Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers.
240 *Education for Information*. 2018;34:285-91.
- 241 14. Wells G SB, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-
242 Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2013
243 2013 [Available from: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp.
- 244 15. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. *Systematic Reviews*. University of York: York
245 Publishing Services Ltd; 2009.
- 246 16. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE
247 guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):401-6.