

Supporting carers: Study protocol of a meta-review of psychosocial interventions for carers of people with cancer

Authors

Bróna Nic Giolla Easpaig, PhD¹ Bronwyn Newman, PhD² Judith Johnson, PhD³ Rebekah Laidsaar-Powell, PhD⁴ Ursula M Sansom-Daly, PhD⁵⁻⁷ Lucy Jones, MBA⁸ Lukas Hofstätter, PhD⁹ Eden G Robertson, PhD^{5,10}, Stephen Mears,² Kabir Sattarshetty, MPhil¹ and Reema Harrison, PhD²

Affiliations

¹School of Nursing, Faculty of Health, Charles Darwin University, Sydney, Australia

²Australian Institute for Health Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

³School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

⁴Psycho-Oncology Co-Operative Group (PoCoG), School of Psychology, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

⁵School of Clinical Medicine, Discipline of Paediatrics & Child Health, UNSW Medicine and Health, Randwick Clinical Campus, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

⁶Kids Cancer Centre, Sydney Children's Hospital, Sydney, Australia

⁷Sydney Youth Cancer Service, Nelune Comprehensive Cancer Centre, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick, Sydney, Australia

⁸Neuroblastoma Australia, Sydney, Australia

⁹Carers New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

¹⁰Redkite, Sydney, Australia

Abstract

Background: While there is a clear need for psychosocial interventions that promote cancer carer wellbeing, the corresponding evidence base is disparate, complex and difficult for end-users to navigate and interpret. Carers remain under-supported with a lack of dedicated, effective, evidence-based programs. We will conduct a meta-review to synthesise this evidence and determine the state of science in this field.

Objectives: This study aims to address the question of: "What psychosocial interventions are available to promote the wellbeing of carers for people with cancer?"

Methods: A meta-review will synthesise relevant reviews of psychosocial interventions that have been developed and/ or evaluated with carers for people with cancer. Four electronic databases (PsychInfo, Medline, CINAHL and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews) will be searched for reviews published between Jan 2013 and Dec 2023. A team-based approach will be taken to screening and assessment of the returned records against the eligibility criteria to determine inclusion. Included reviews will be critically appraised using JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses. Relevant data of study characteristics, carer and patient populations, intervention details and psychosocial outcomes will be extracted, synthesised and the findings will be presented in a narrative format. This study is registered with the

International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (reference: CRD42023403219).

Results: It is anticipated that the study will be completed by April 2024.

Conclusion: Ensuring that carers have access to evidence-based programs which promote their wellbeing as they care for loved ones is critical. This meta-review will contribute to program development and translation efforts through providing a clear picture of the cancer carer intervention evidence-base, identifying notable strengths, weaknesses, and gaps across the literature. The findings are anticipated to offer future directions to advance research in the field.

Keywords: cancer; carer; caregiver; psychosocial; supportive intervention

Introduction

Family and friend carers serve as a core, yet under acknowledged members of the health team in coordinating and providing care for loved ones diagnosed with cancer [1]. The partners, parents, siblings, children and friends of patients often fulfil this role; a role which spans pragmatic, clinical and emotional domains of support [2-4]. Shifts in oncology care delivery, increasingly towards outpatient, community and home settings have widened the scope of carers' roles and responsibilities [1, 4-6]. Carers of people with cancer may assume significant responsibilities in not only coordinating and organising care, but in providing direct clinical care too (e.g., administering medications) [4, 6].

Becoming a carer is a role that many feel unprepared for and are overwhelmed by, with implications for health and wellbeing [7, 8]. Carers experience depression, anxiety and distress, commonly at higher rates than the general population [9-11]. Further, both the quality of care and clinical outcomes of the patient are linked to the wellbeing of carers [6]. There has been a growing interest in identifying psychosocial interventions that may be effective in supporting this population [7, 12].

While there appears to be a large volume of literature reporting on studies of psychosocial interventions for cancer carers, this body of work is complex, fragmented, and it is challenging to draw clear conclusions about the evidence for specific types of programs or carer groups. The result is that carers remain under-supported, with limited evidence of the effective interventional approaches. Key issues within the cancer carer evidence-base that limit advancement in practice are the divergent scope and focus of current interventions (e.g. in person therapy for carers, web-based interventions for patient-spouse dyads [13], compared with psychological interventions for parents of children and adolescents with chronic illness [14]) all of which may be included in a single review.

A potential weakness in the current literature is that interventions have not necessarily been designed for carers as the target primary population; programs may be developed for patients and extended to include carers [15]. In such cases, carer-specific needs may not be met. Additionally, the nature of relationships between carers and the person being cared for are not always sufficiently considered in the collation of intervention evidence. While findings suggest that distress and stress can arise while providing health care and with a loved one being ill [3, 16], this appears under-explored. These limitations alongside the divergences in the literature described pose barriers for end-users of this evidence [17].

Review aim and question

Undertaking a meta-review was identified as a useful first step in addressing the abovementioned barriers to enable the development of targeted interventions that may offer greater impacts to reduce carer distress and enhance support [18]. A meta-review offers a means to develop an overall, coherent picture of a large volume of evidence [19, 20], that is useful for those wishing to navigate this literature and identify the evidence relevant to them. The aim of this study is to synthesise the evidence from reviews of psychosocial interventions designed to support the wellbeing of carers of people with cancer.

This study will address the question of:

What psychosocial interventions are available to promote the wellbeing of carers for people with cancer, as reported in the evidence from reviews?

Methods

Meta-review was employed as a method that offers a systematic and rigorous approach to the identification and review of relevant evidence in the form of various types of reviews [21]. The protocol for this study is registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (reference: CRD42023403219). In the absence of a method-specific protocol reporting framework, the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 guidelines are used to report this study protocol (please see Supplementary file 1)[22].

Eligibility criteria

The PICO framework was used as a basis for developing the eligibility criteria. The following criteria will be used to determine study inclusion.

Table 1. Eligibility criteria

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Carer for a family member or a person with whom they have a personal relationship who has received a diagnosis of cancer.-People who are providing care on an ‘informal’ basis, which they have not been professionally contracted to provide.	
Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Non-pharmacological interventions which are designed to positively impact some aspect of the psychosocial wellbeing of carers of people with cancer (such as interventions focused on improving mental health, health related-quality of life or life satisfaction).-Psychosocial interventions can include educational, informational and therapeutic activities designed to promote wellbeing (e.g., cognitive behavioural therapy).-Remote, in-person and hybrid	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Interventions in which psychosocial wellbeing (e.g. reduced psychological distress, improved quality of life) is not a stated outcome.-Studies that do not report the data and results separately for carers of people with cancer.

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
	<p>modes of intervention delivery will be eligible for inclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both facilitated and self-directed interventions will be eligible for inclusion 	
Context	Care in the home, community, health care or any other settings.	
Outcome	<p><i>Primary</i> Psychosocial outcomes of carers: quality of life, depression, anxiety, resilience, psychological distress, and any other psychosocial outcomes reported on.</p> <p><i>Secondary</i> -Patient or family wellbeing outcomes associated with the intervention (e.g. patient psychological distress) -Implementation-related outcomes, such as: acceptability, feasibility and uptake into practice.</p>	
Study methods	<p>-Any type of review (e.g., scoping reviews, narrative reviews, integrated reviews, systematic reviews, meta-syntheses and meta-analyses) of interventions including controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies, pilot studies, feasibility studies, pre-post studies and evaluation studies.</p> <p>-Reviews of studies using any methods are eligible - quantitative, qualitative, mixed and multi methods.</p>	Non-review studies

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Publication type	Peer reviewed publications	Conference abstracts, editorials, opinion pieces, non-peer reviewed research, and non-empirical research will be excluded.
Publication date	1 st January 2013–31 st December 2023	
Language	English	

Information sources

Systematic searching will be undertaken of the PsychInfo, Medline, CINAHL and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews databases. Additionally, the reference lists of relevant reviews will be audited to identify other potentially eligible reviews. The search will cover a ten-year period from the 1st of January, 2013 until the 1st of December 2023.

Search strategy

The search strategy for the databases listed was developed via consultation with a medical research librarian. The search was developed based on the search strategy employed in the Treanor et al.'s (2018) Cochrane review of the psychosocial interventions for informal carers of people living with cancer [23], and informed by concepts encompassed in Fletcher et al. (2012) model of the cancer family carer experience [24]. Search terms updated as required, including for terms related to study type (e.g. "systematic review"). The search period was selected to identify recently published reviews and capture the current evidence landscape. The finalised search strategy uses a combination of Medical Subject Heading terms and key words and as an example, the strategy developed for the Medline (Ovid) database is included in Supplementary file 2.

Selection process

Records retrieved from the searches will be imported into EndNote X9 (citation management software) [25], and duplicates subsequently removed. The remaining records will then be uploaded to Covidence (literature review management tool) [26], which will be used to manage the screening of records. The titles, abstracts and keywords of records will be screened by one of the team members against the criteria to determine inclusion. The full texts for included records will then be retrieved and two team members will independently assess each text against the eligibility criteria. Disagreements will be resolved by team discussion, with discrepancies discussed with a third team member until resolution is reached. The search results will be documented and reported using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews

and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidance [27], with adaptations made as needed to reflect the meta-review method.

Data collection process

A draft data extraction template will be developed, and two team members will independently extract data for a shared 10% of the included reviews to identify any amendments needed to the template. Once finalised, a team-based approach to data extraction will be taken whereby data will be extracted by one team member, all of which will be subsequently cross-checked by another member of the team. Discrepancies will be resolved via discussion. Microsoft Excel will be used to manage the data extraction process [28]. Data will be extracted in the areas of: study characteristics, populations of carers and patients, intervention details, outcomes of interest. See Table 2 for full details.

Table 2 Data items for extraction

Areas of data collection	Data item details
Study characteristics	Year, review aim(s), types of review, any geographical restrictions of review, condition(s) of those cared for methods, study types/ designs included in review, total number of included studies (and articles, if different), participants total number/ sample size details, search period, synthesis method, critical/ quality appraisal tool used and any other notable details
Population	Population focused on in the review, target carer population, target, patient population and any other notable details.
Intervention details	Details about of intervention development, mode of delivery, theoretical bases, settings, facilitators, details about frequency/duration/length of interventions, and any other notable details.
Outcomes of interest	Carer psychosocial outcomes: quality of life, depression, anxiety, resilience, psychological distress, and any other psychosocial outcomes reported on. Implementation-related outcomes: acceptability, feasibility and uptake into practice and other implementation-relevant outcomes. Patient or family wellbeing outcomes associated with the intervention such as patient psychological distress.

Data synthesis

The extracted data will be collated and organised. A narrative approach will be taken to describe the results, study characteristics, populations, interventions, outcomes and any other details of interest. Data will be categorised and grouped (e.g., by types of intervention facilitators) and where possible, a quantitative description will be provided (e.g. total number of studies reported across reviews).

Critical appraisal

The risk of bias and quality of methodological results for the included reviews will be evaluated using a standardised appraisal tool specifically designed for the appraisal of systematic reviews and research syntheses [29]. One team member will initially

conduct an appraisal which will be cross-checked by a second team member. Any discrepancies will be discussed by team members and resolved.

Results

To date the search and study selection process is underway, with a search to be re-run in January 2024 to encompass the full search period. A preliminary extraction method has been developed, tested and discussed among the team to help refine the process. It is anticipated that the study will be completed by April 2024.

Discussion

There is a clear need to ensure that carers have access to evidence-based programs that can effectively support their wellbeing as they care for their loved one. Current models of cancer care rely heavily on the work of carers, and given the growing burden of cancer worldwide [30], this caregiving work is also vital to health system sustainability. This meta-review will facilitate improved understanding of the evidence-base, enabling better identification of research strengths, limitations, and gaps. It will also enhance navigation of the literature, allowing researchers, clinicians, and policymakers to more readily review evidence relevant to them [18, 19], in turn supporting the translation of evidence into practice.

Acknowledgements

Dr Bróna Nic Giolla Easpaig is supported by a Charles Darwin University IAS Rainmaker Start-up Grant. Dr Ursula Sansom-Daly is supported by an Early Career Fellowship from the Cancer Institute NSW (ID: 2020/ECF1163). Dr Rebekah Laidsaar-Powell is

supported by an Early Career Fellowship from the Cancer Institute NSW (ID: 2022/ECF1457). Associate Professor Reema Harrison is supported by a Career Development Fellowship from the Cancer Institute NSW (ID: 2021/CDF1104).

Conflicts of Interest

None to declare.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval is not required for this manuscript. The manuscript does not contain any data.

Author contributions

R.H., B.N., B.N.G.E and J.J. conceptualisation the study. Contributions were made by the full authorship team to provide ongoing guidance about the focus and direction of the study, including in refining data collection. Screening and preliminary data extraction is being undertaken by R.H., B.N., B.N.G.E., R.L-P. and K.S. BNGE produced an initial draft of the manuscript which was reviewed and revised by the full authorship team. The final version of the manuscript is approved by the full authorship team.

References

1. Ugalde A, Winter N, Sansom-Daly U, Rhee J, Jongebloed H, Bergin R, et al. Effective integration of caregivers and families as part of the care team for people with cancer. *Aust J Gen Pract.* 2021;50:527-31. Doi: 10.31128/AJGP-03-21-5897

2. Frambes D, Given B, Lehto R, Sikorskii A, Wyatt G. Informal Caregivers of Cancer Patients: Review of Interventions, Care Activities, and Outcomes. *West J Nurs Res*. 2018;40(7):1069-97. Doi: 10.1177/0193945917699364
3. Harrison R, Raman M, Walpola RL, Chauhan A, Sansom-Daly UM. Preparing for partnerships in cancer care: an explorative analysis of the role of family-based caregivers. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):620. Doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06611-0
4. Olson RE. Is cancer care dependant on informal carers? *Aust Health Rev*. 2012;36(3):254-7. Doi: 10.1071/AH11086.
5. Rubin G, Berendsen A, Crawford SM, Dommett R, Earle C, Emery J, et al. The expanding role of primary care in cancer control. *Lancet Oncol*. 2015;16(12):1231-72. Doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00205-3
6. Litzelman K, Kent EE, Mollica M, Rowland JH. How Does Caregiver Well-Being Relate to Perceived Quality of Care in Patients With Cancer? Exploring Associations and Pathways. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016;34(29):3554-61. Doi: 10.1200/JCO.2016.67.3434
7. Ferrell B, Wittenberg E. A review of family caregiving intervention trials in oncology. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2017;67(4):318-25. Doi: 10.3322/caac.21396
8. Northouse L, Williams AL, Given B, McCorkle R. Psychosocial care for family caregivers of patients with cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30(11):1227-34. Doi: 10.1200/JCO.2011.39.5798
9. Karimi Moghaddam Z, Rostami M, Zeraatchi A, Mohammadi Bytamar J, Saed O, Zenoian S. Caregiving burden, depression, and anxiety among family caregivers of patients with cancer: An investigation of patient and caregiver factors. *Front Psychol*. 2023;14. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1059605
10. Kirk DL, Kabdebo I, Whitehead L. Prevalence of distress and its associated factors among caregivers of people diagnosed with cancer: A cross-sectional study. *J Clin Nurs*. 2022;31(23-24):3402-13. Doi: 10.1111/jocn.16167
11. Teo I, Ng S, Bundoc FG, Malhotra C, Ozdemir S, Steel JL, et al. A prospective study of psychological distress among patients with advanced cancer and their caregivers. *Cancer Med*. 2023;12(8):9956-65. Doi: 10.1002/cam4.5713
12. Fu F, Zhao H, Tong F, Chi I. A Systematic Review of Psychosocial Interventions to Cancer Caregivers. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:834. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00834
13. Luo X, Gao L, Li J, Lin Y, Zhao J, Li Q. A critical literature review of dyadic web-based interventions to support cancer patients and their caregivers, and directions for future research. *Psychooncology*. 2020;29(1):38-48. Doi: 10.1002/pon.5278
14. Law E, Fisher E, Eccleston C, Palermo TM. Psychological interventions for parents of children and adolescents with chronic illness. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;3(3):Cd009660. Doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009660.pub3
15. Gurney I. n.d.
16. Zaleta A, Fortune E, Clark K, Kranzler E, editors. Caregiving support roles and anxiety among short- and long-term informal cancer caregivers [Paper presentation]. 2021 American Psycho-Oncology Society (APOS) Virtual Conference; 2021 March 10-12.
17. Fusar-Poli P, Radua J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2018;21(3):95-100. Doi: 10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014
18. Choi GJ, Kang H. The umbrella review: a useful strategy in the rain of evidence. *Korean J Pain*. 2022;35(2):127-8. Doi: 10.3344/kjp.2022.35.2.127
19. Cant R, Ryan C, Kelly MA. A nine-step pathway to conduct an umbrella review of literature. *Nurse Author Ed*. 2022;32(2):31-4. Doi:10.1111/nae2.12039

20. Gosling CJ, Cartigny A, Mellier BC, Solanes A, Radua J, Delorme R. Efficacy of psychosocial interventions for Autism spectrum disorder: an umbrella review. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2022;27(9):3647-56. Doi: 10.1038/s41380-022-01670-z
21. Aromataris E, Fernandez R, Godfrey C, Holly C, Khalil H, P. T. Chapter 10: Umbrella Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, editors. *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis 2020*. Doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-11
22. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Alessandro Liberati, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015;349:g7647. Doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647 (
23. Treanor CJ, Santin O, Prue G, Coleman H, Cardwell CR, O'Halloran P, et al. Psychosocial interventions for informal caregivers of people living with cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;6(6):Cd009912. Doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009912.pub2.
24. Fletcher BS, Miaskowski C, Given B, Schumacher K. The cancer family caregiving experience: an updated and expanded conceptual model. *Eur J Oncol Nurs*. 2012;16(4):387-98. Doi: 10.1016/j.ejon.2011.09.001
25. The EndNote Team. *EndNote X9 Version*. 2013. <https://endnote.com/?language=en>
26. Veritas Health Innovation. *Covidence systematic review software*. <https://www.covidence.org/>
27. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. Doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71
28. Microsoft Corporation. 2018. *Microsoft Excel*. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-au/microsoft-365/excel>
29. Aromataris E, Fernandez R, Godfrey CM, Holly C, Khalil H, Tungpunkom P. Summarizing systematic reviews: methodological development, conduct and reporting of an umbrella review approach. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015;13(3). Doi:10.1097/XEB.0000000000000055
30. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2021;71(3):209-49. Doi: 10.3322/caac.21660.