Title: Recommendations for the extraction, analysis and presentation of results in scoping reviews

Abstract

Scoping reviewers often face challenges in the extraction, analysis and presentation of scoping review results. Using best-practice examples and drawing on the expertise of the JBI Scoping Review Methodology group, and a member who is an editor of a journal that publishes scoping reviews, this paper expands on existing JBI Scoping Review guidance. The aim of this article is to clarify the process of extracting data from different sources of evidence, discuss what data can be extracted (and what should not), how to analyse extracted data including an explanation of basic qualitative content analysis, and to offer suggestions for the presentation of results in scoping reviews.

Introduction

Scoping reviews have been defined as a *"type of **evidence synthesis** that aim to systematically identify and map the breadth of evidence available on a particular topic, field, concept, or issue, often irrespective of source (i.e. primary research, reviews, non-empirical evidence) within or across particular contexts."*[1] (pg 1) Scoping reviews can clarify key concepts/ definitions in the literature and identify key characteristics or factors related to a concept, including those related to methodological research.[2] Scoping reviews can also identify gaps in the literature and be precursors of systematic reviews. While scoping reviews share common elements and steps in their conduct with systematic reviews and other types of evidence syntheses,[2,3] scoping reviews are able to address broader research questions in comparison to the more precise, targeted questions of feasibility, appropriateness, meaningfulness, or the effectiveness of a particular issue more suitable for systematic reviews. For example, a scoping review may look at what outcomes are being reported and how these outcomes are being measured (i.e. how is hearing measured) for children who have grommet insertion due to chronic ear infections; while systematic reviews will assess the effectiveness of grommets on reported outcomes such as hearing, speech and language development.[2] Beyond the kinds of questions that should be addressed by scoping reviews, a key difference between scoping and systematic reviews is the approach to the extraction, analysis, and presentation of data and results.[2]

The process of extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping reviews has been noted to be challenging for scoping review authors.[4] Inconsistencies and inappropriateness in the analytical approaches undertaken in the analysis and presentation of the data within scoping reviews has been a recurrent issue.[5] In part, this may be due to scoping review guidance being unclear and not describing a prescribed approach to how to extract, analyse and present data within scoping reviews. Additionally, scoping reviews can include a variety of evidence sources, such as peer-reviewed primary research, and gray literature, such as guidelines, organizational reports, policies, government documents, and blogs.[6]

Seminal scoping review guidance referred to the process of extraction, analysis, and presentation as 'data charting',[7,8] and this terminology is used in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis extension for Scoping Reviews.[9] The term charting is seen as a higher level of extraction, which is theoretically appropriate for scoping reviews, and was used to differentiate from the term 'extraction'. 'Extraction' suggests that review authors always extract the study outcome results. However, guidance from JBI has recommended that to be consistent with other evidence synthesis approaches, the term 'extraction' was most appropriate. Arksey and O'Malley [7] suggested that for scoping reviews, an analytical framework, which was 'basic numerical analysis' be used, along with the use of 'thematic constructions.' However, Arksey and O'Malley [7] were clear that scoping reviews do not synthesize evidence or 'aggregate findings'. Levac, Colquhoun [8] and colleagues agreed with Arksey and O'Malley [7] on the importance of a descriptive numerical summary analysis, however, argued that there was a need for more guidance on the methodological approach to thematic presentation of data. Levac, Colquhoun [8] proposed the use of qualitative content analysis. JBI guidance recommends the use frequency counts, tabular/graphical presentation and where appropriate 'basic' qualitative content analysis; however, to date, the methodological approach has not been thoroughly described for scoping reviews. Therefore, the JBI Scoping Review Methodology group have developed guidance using best-practice examples of scoping reviews to provide clarity on the following:

1. Data extraction process: what type of data should be extracted from the included evidence sources and the level of detail required during extraction.
2. Data analysis: how to analyse the data collected from evidence sources, including a detailed approach of how to conduct basic qualitative content analysis
3. Data presentation: suggestions for the presentation of results in scoping reviews.

A team approach

As with many other rigorous evidence syntheses, best-practice recommends that scoping reviews require a team approach.[10] The team should meet regularly throughout the entirety

of the review process including data extraction, analysis, and presentation. Meetings during extraction and analysis phases are particularly important to discuss this process, issues encountered during data extraction, if there are any changes to tools used to guide the extraction of data (extraction forms or tables), and any other review issues and results that are encountered. Knowledge users are those that have a vested interest in the research and its outcomes and impacts and can also be a part of the review team and included in all stages of the review process.[11] Knowledge users are people who are most likely to be directly impacted by the research and its outcomes, and can include those with lived experience (e.g. patients, clients, consumers, public), other researchers, healthcare providers or policy decision makers.[11] Review teams can include knowledge users at all stages to inform the analysis plan, review the completed extractions, categories and sub-categories and offer insight into the results (Pollock et al., *accepted*).

Principles of data extraction

As in systematic reviews, scoping review authors should only extract data items that are relevant to the scoping review question/s. The PCC framework (population, concept, and context) is recommended as a guide to construct a clear and meaningful objective and eligibility criteria for a scoping review.[6] Therefore, potential data items of interest can be structured around the PCC framework. Further items for data extraction will depend on the purpose and reasoning behind conducting the review. For example, the individual items could be related to the study design, such as whether it was a randomized controlled trial, the methods used for conduct, and outcome measurement approaches. Alternatively, it could include definitions, statements, or arguments surrounding a concept. It could be interventions studied, their application, dose, duration, and frequency. Data extraction, analysis and presentation are all dependent on each other and require prior planning to ensure consistency. There are broad principles of data extraction that should be followed within a scoping review to ensure its conduct is transparent and rigorous. These principles are as follows:

- Create a standardized data extraction form and guidance for the form, which describes each point that will be extracted (see Table 1 for an example extraction form). The development of the initial data extraction form is guided by the review question and usually includes population, concept and context. It is recommended that an extraction guidance form (see image one for an example) is developed and accompanies the extraction form detailing each item to be extracted and shared with each scoping reviewer.
- Describe the planned data extraction approach within an *a-priori* protocol and include a draft data extraction form. This draft extraction form is usually formatted as a table and should be; developed specifically for the review topic at hand, detailed, and include more than a basic plan (i.e. more than just the population, concept and context) for the items that will be extracted.
- Best-practice is to have at least two scoping review authors extracting data independently per evidence source. However, if this is not possible, one scoping reviewer per evidence source with another person reviewing a proportion of the extraction to ensure it is accurate and complete is also good practice.[12]
- Pilot-test the data extraction form on each type of evidence source, such as primary research articles, evidence synthesis, guidelines, policy statements, or blog posts, included in the review. Aim for each scoping reviewer to independently complete at least 2-3 items per evidence source type, however, this will depend on the complexity of the topic and the variety of evidence sources. During pilot-testing, scoping review authors should reflect on the following questions:
    - Was there anything missing from the extraction form?
    - Was there anything on the extraction form that you did not understand or that could be further clarified?
    - Was there any unclear information in the accompanying guidance form?

- How long did it take you to extract the necessary information? This information will help guide further time allocation.

- Have a review group discussion with all scoping review authors after piloting to agree on all aspects of the tool, data to be extracted, and reach agreement on queries or conflicts.
- Only extract data that is relevant to addressing the stated review questions of the scoping review.
- If scoping review authors need any additional information or to clarify doubts about some of the study's information, the authors of the evidence sources should be contacted as soon as possible. Further follow-up of these authors may be necessary.
- Ensure and plan for regular team meetings during the extraction process to discuss progress and assess if the data extraction form is capturing the necessary information to answer the review question/s.

INSERT TABLE 1

INSERT Image one- Example of data extraction guidance

Data extraction can be an iterative process

Given the breadth of scoping review questions and the varied sources of evidence that can be included, additional relevant data items may be identified by scoping review authors

during the process of extraction from included sources. This means that data extraction can evolve to capture new and different data items requiring an iterative approach, for example if collecting data on education courses, details on assessment methods used may not have been considered initially, but then deemed important throughout the process. It is not uncommon to add additional item(s) to the data extraction form that require extraction during the process. If additional items are extracted which were not pre-specified, it should be made clear in the final report that there was a deviation from the protocol and provide a rationale as to why it occurred.

Identifying the relevant information in the evidence source

In systematic reviews, which analyse primary research articles, data is typically extracted from the methods, and results of included sources. This may not be strictly the case for scoping reviews. This is due to the varied types of data of evidence sources included within scoping reviews. Scoping reviews do not typically pose analytical questions where extracting the results of primary research (such as effect sizes or qualitative results) is necessary.[2] Hence, it may be required to examine other sections of a source including the introduction, discussion, conclusions, and even supplementary information. For example, a scoping review might be conducted to identify and report on the methodological approaches that have been used to investigate a particular topic, and in this case, the methods section would be the primary place where extraction will occur. In the review published by Khalil and Huang [13], the authors extracted both the methodology and methods associated with each study in their data extraction table as part of their review to map the work that has already been undertaken in the area of medication adverse events in primary care. In another scoping review Hoppe, Karimi [14]et al (2022) mapping the research addressing prescription drug monitoring programs, the authors extracted from the discussion section of primary research articles to determine what they perceived their results to practice where, and the gaps and areas in need of further research.

Depending on the purpose and review question/s posed, scoping review authors may or may not aim to extract the results of primary studies. For example, in a scoping review addressing medication safety programs, the authors extracted information about the types of programs used, the personnel involved in the programs and the outcome measures used to measure the efficacy of the programs. Despite extracting some result information, the authors did not gather information about the effectiveness of the programs.[15]

Scoping reviews that serve to be precursors to systematic reviews could, with clear rationale and justification focus on the extraction of results, as seen in a scoping review performed to inform the feasibility and appropriateness of a health technology assessment.[16] In scoping reviews exploring barriers and facilitators, reviewers may extract from the results of qualitative primary studies, and then subsequently categorised. However, in each of these cases, we suggest scoping review authors be explicit regarding the inability to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness (or prevalence or meaningfulness or accuracy or costs) of a practice or phenomenon due the absence of risk of bias assessment or advanced data synthesis techniques such as meta-analysis or meta-synthesis. Scoping review authors can however recommend subsequent specific systematic reviews to be undertaken based on the results of their scoping review.

We advocate for extreme caution in cases where a scoping reviewer would want to extract the results of evidence sources. In most instances, a systematic review approach will be the more suitable methodology for dealing with review questions that require the extraction of the results (e.g., effect measures and variance, phenomenon of experiences) of included sources. Systematic reviews typically include methodological quality assessment and utilize (where appropriate) formal methods of data synthesis or aggregation.

Extracting and presenting results (for example, a relative risk with associated confidence intervals and p-values or themes from a qualitative thematic analysis) may lead to misplaced conclusions regarding the effectiveness (or not) of an intervention, the prevalence of a condition, the accuracy of a test or the experience of a condition/phenomenon. This is due to

the included sources of evidence not having undergone a process of critical appraisal (or risk of bias appraisal) and secondly, not having undergone a process of pooling or aggregation that considers the combination of all study results. Without this assessment of methodological quality and pooling or aggregation, authors and readers may be susceptible to making false assumptions based on a naïve or incomplete reading of the results and be more inclined to apply vote counting of results. In this instance, a systematic review is the more suitable methodology for dealing with review questions that require the extraction of the results (e.g., effect measures and variance) of included sources.

Analysis in scoping reviews

Scoping review authors should present the intended analytical approach that will be used within their scoping review in the protocol. Scoping review authors should clearly articulate how they intend to analyse and present each review question as this may vary. The detail provided by authors should be more than a general statement that they will undertake descriptive statistics, tables and a narrative summary. Rather, there should be a comprehensive description of the analyses undertaken in order to address each individual review question/objective.

Scoping review authors may be tempted to perform more advanced statistical or qualitative analysis within a scoping review.[6] The intention of synthesis methods such as meta-analysis, meta-ethnography, thematic analysis, realist synthesis or meta-aggregation, among others, is to answer questions or inform understandings regarding the feasibility, appropriateness, meaningfulness and effectiveness of a particular intervention or phenomenon.[6] Therefore, for these questions, the most appropriate review type is a systematic review where the findings/results have undergone critical appraisal, and approaches to establish certainty of those results have been applied to generate conclusions that can inform practice and policy recommendations.

Scoping reviews do not address questions of feasibility, appropriateness, meaningfulness and effectiveness, and as such, will not and should not, apply advanced analysis methods. If scoping review authors feel that they are unable to answer their review question without the use of a meta-analysis for example, then the question they are asking is possibly best suited for a quantitative systematic review.[2]

Most scoping reviews will analyse data items by quantifying text and doing frequency counts of data extraction items. These are relatively easy to manage, and should only require the use of descriptive statistics, such as percentages/proportions. For example, common frequencies seen in scoping reviews are the number of evidence sources, which used a particular method (i.e., numbers of randomized controlled trials, surveys, evidence synthesis) or the location/country/context where the article was conducted. Furthermore, scoping review authors can extract relevant information aligning to a framework with single-word responses such as 'yes', 'no', 'unsure', or even through the use of a Likert scale. For example, in a recent scoping review, the scoping review authors mapped exercise interventions to the template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist.[17] For the nine items on the checklist, reviewers classified each as either fully reported, partially reported or not reported for each included evidence source. [18]

Using basic qualitative content analysis

In scoping reviews that include qualitative evidence, it is not uncommon for scoping review authors to use qualitative synthesis approaches that go beyond the scope of a scoping review, such as thematic synthesis, or a meta-aggregative approach. These approaches are not appropriate within a scoping review as they are better suited to examining questions of experiences and meaningfulness, and require a level of interpretation, which would align more appropriately with a qualitative systematic review. Approaches that aim to synthesize evidence are not consistent with the purposes of a scoping review, which and descriptive, map the available evidence and identify characteristics or factors. For the most part, there will be no need for scoping review authors to go beyond basic descriptive analysis. However,

there may be times when it would be appropriate to use a basic qualitative content analysis, such as if the scoping review is identifying key characteristics or factors related to a concept, a more complex qualitative data analysis beyond simple frequency counts may be required. This may be necessary when a scoping review has the objective of informing the development of a conceptual framework or theory.

When performing basic qualitative content analysis, categorization is required to map the results in a way to aid their simplification to address the scoping review question. For example, in a scoping review by Hoppe, Ristevski [19] the authors mapped the evidence associated with community pharmacists' views towards drug misuse management. The authors mapped the results into pharmacists' knowledge, training and education, attitudes, and practice strategies. [19]

JBI scoping review guidance recommends using basic qualitative content analysis,[6] which is a descriptive approach to analysis and involves a process of open coding to code concepts or characteristics into overall categories. This can applied to any evidence source or study design in any scoping review, it is not limited to primary qualitative studies only. In previous guidance, including JBI, there has been no definitive process described as to what basic qualitative content analysis involves, and it is acknowledged that there are many different analytical approaches that could be undertaken. However, the present describes one approach that could be undertaken by scoping review authors.

A basic qualitative content analysis approach for scoping reviews

Elo and Kyngäs [20] describe three phases of qualitative content analysis for the results of primary qualitative research including *preparation, organizing,* and *reporting*. These phases could also be used to describe a basic process of qualitative analysis within scoping reviews. A fourth '*abstraction*' phase is also described by Elo and Kyngäs [20] however this technique would be beyond the realm of scoping reviews which does not seek to synthesize or re-

interpret evidence. Flowchart 1 shows the process of how to conduct the analyses of qualitative data within a scoping review.

Preparation Phase

Scoping review authors should first determine if there is the need to conduct a basic qualitative content analysis during the protocol stage of their scoping review. If the aim of the review were to explore experiences, or the meaningfulness of an issue, then a qualitative systematic review would be more appropriate.[2] If a basic qualitative content analysis approach is deemed necessary (e.g., as the characteristics of a particular issue, definitions for a concept, or concept are being mapped) then it would be appropriate to use this method within scoping reviews.

Depending on the research question, and the field of research, an inductive or deductive approach will need to be decided upon by the scoping review team during the protocol development stage and subsequently reported within the protocol. These terms will be familiar to qualitative researchers. An inductive approach may be useful where there is a dearth of evidence on the topic, or the goal is to develop or inform a conceptual framework or theory.[20] The deductive approach is typically used to map the data to an established framework or theory within the literature.[20] There may be times however, when a deductive approach is chosen without using a pre-existing framework – (for example, when no suitable framework or theory can be found). In such situations, the review team needs to decide upon a framework during the protocol stage and, ideally, will have consulted on the suitability of the framework.

__

INSERT Flowchart 1: The process of how to conduct the analyses of qualitative data within a scoping review.

__

Organizing phase

The organizing phase during qualitative data analysis within scoping reviews will differ depending on if the scoping review is following an inductive or deductive approach.[20] The first step in the organization stage is for the review authors to familiarize themselves with the data. This includes reading and comprehending all the included evidence sources and understanding how it is relevant to the objective and questions of the scoping review.[20]

Inductive approach

When the authors have become familiar with the sources of evidence and relevant data, review authors can then carry out open coding of the data. A code can be described as a label and can be an initial descriptor that is a few words long. The process of open coding involves reviewing the evidence sources again and listing initial thoughts, possible categories or notes which help describe what is occurring within the data which explains the objective and review question. During this stage, there are no limitations as to how many high-level categories can be listed. This is an initial process that will be refined. Once the open coding process has occurred, the coding framework can be developed. This will involve gathering all the information in the prior stage to develop a coding framework to help describe and answer the review question(s) and allow the organization of extracted data.

At this stage, the coding framework may include higher order categories, or sub-categories. It is also beneficial to provide a definition of these categories and sub-categories to help extractors, but also to show transparency in the decision-making that has occurred throughout this process. The coding framework should be reviewed by all members of the review team. Once the coding framework has been reviewed, extractors are now able to go through the included evidence sources, extract the relevant information, and organize it within the coding framework. Categorization involves exploring the organized extractions and assessing if the initial coding framework adequately answers the review question. It is

common for the categories and sub-categories within the initial coding framework to be changed during this stage to accommodate new understanding of what was stated within the evidence sources. These categories can form a conceptual framework or theory.

Case study of inductive qualitative data extraction and analysis

A scoping review was undertaken with the objective to assess the available literature that documents or utilizes patient journey mapping methodologies and examine their reporting processes.[21] After an extensive searching and selection process, there were 81 included evidence sources within this scoping review. The scoping review authors chose to extract information about why primary authors would use patient journey mapping. The scoping review authors extracted 76 justifications. During the analysis stage, the scoping review team met several times to review each of these justifications. The process of analysis included listing initial thoughts, possible categories or notes (which help describe what is occurring within the data) with the eventual goal to make a smaller list of common justifications why researchers choose patient journey mapping. After meeting several times as a group, 10 categories were identified, such as comprehensiveness of care, how people were navigating the system, patient satisfaction with services and comparing patient experiences with standards of practice. An example of this process of developing categories can be seen in flowchart 2, however, to note, this is not a linear process, and it may be necessary to re-examine the categories and establish whether they could be further refined.

__

INSERT Flow chart 2: Example of the process of developing categories

__

Once the framework had been developed, two scoping review authors individually went through the extracted data and assigned it to a category. These review authors then came

366 together and assessed if there were any discrepancies. Any discrepancies were discussed
367 and a consensus was able to be achieved, however, a third reviewer had agreed to manage
368 any discrepancies that could not be resolved by discussion.

369 *Deductive approach*

370 As described above, in the deductive approach, the framework has already been developed
371 during the protocol stage. Therefore, the review authors can extract data according to that
372 framework, by extracting the verbatim text, which maps to the decided framework and
373 answers the proposed question(s). Once this is completed, the extractions should then be
374 reviewed by the members of the review team to ensure that they reflect the understanding of
375 the framework. An iterative approach would assist during the deductive approach as there
376 may be the scenario where scoping review authors initially utilize a deductive framework,
377 and then recognize that this would not be the best fit for the extracted data and its ability to
378 provide a descriptive map of the available evidence. Therefore, the scoping review authors
379 can switch to an inductive approach during the extraction and analytical steps of a scoping
380 review and document this deviation from the protocol in the final review.

381 **Case study of deductive qualitative data extraction and analysis**

382 A scoping review was conducted to identify barriers and facilitators in the prevention of type
383 two diabetes mellitus and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups.[22] After searching
384 several databases, 125 evidence sources were included. A pre-existing framework had been
385 developed prior to the extraction of the data, which included eight categories: language;
386 economic factors; family and friends; work; social support; religion; culture and knowledge.
387 During extraction, scoping review authors extracted barriers and facilitators and then sorted
388 into pre-arranged categories. Other barriers which did not fit into these pre-arranged
389 categories were found, and they included insufficient time, problems with travelling and
390 insufficient motivation, however these were minimal and the framework did not change.[22]

391 **Including other forms of evidence synthesis and the issue of double counting**

An issue seen within systematic reviews is ensuring that the same data set is not counted across multiple studies. Double counting issues can arise if scoping reviews for numerous reasons such as when you include evidence synthesis and primary articles there is the potential for overlap. There may also be a scenario where multiple evidence synthesis sources are included in the scoping review and the primary article is included within them all; or, there are several reports of one, and, the same primary study. This may become problematic if, for example, the review question is attempting to determine the type and frequency of outcomes being used within a particular field of work, as scoping review authors may count the same outcome from both the original study and any evidence synthesis source that also included the original study, thus skewing the prominence. While there is no formal guidance on how to manage this issue, scoping review authors should be aware of the risk and make efforts to avoid counting the same data items multiple times from different sources. Authors may decide to still include the evidence synthesis within the scoping review to be able to map the available evidence and to report the number of evidence syntheses mapped. Guidance for systematic reviews and overviews (reviews of reviews/umbrella reviews)[23] might also apply. However, scoping review authors should clearly report which other included sources of primary evidence were included within that evidence synthesis. The final scoping review report should clearly state how other types of evidence synthesis were handled in the review and what data were extracted from them and from the primary studies (if appropriate).

Presentation of data (Reporting)

There are a multitude of ways that scoping reviews can present data and answer the proposed review question(s). Scoping reviews commonly include tables that present the available data. Although useful as they can summarize a large amount of information, and show how extraction has occurred, there also needs to be consideration in communicating results from the scoping reviews to the wider community. Further, scoping review results

with many included sources may result in tables that are too large to easily present in the standard fashion of a journal article. There are many creative approaches that scoping reviews can include to convey results to the reader in an understandable way. For example, in Tricco, Lillie [5] they visualised the different terminology of scoping reviews through a word cloud. Kynoch, Ramis [24] used a honeycomb to visualise the outcomes in the included evidence sources and the number of relevant studies. The author team using Power BI developed four further examples of how scoping review results can be visualised. In example 1, the authors have created a world heat map with the size of the circle indicating how many evidence sources were conducted in that country. Example 2; is a tree graph indicating the illness categories seen within the included evidence. Example 3 is using iconography to represent the different types of populations (and how many of each) were included within the evidence sources. Example 4 are waffle charts of the type of methodology used by the evidence sources included within a scoping review.

Alongside any visual presentation, a supporting narrative must be provided about the result. Further consideration for the presentation of scoping review results is the use of interactive resources. While many scoping reviews map the breadth of the evidence in an area, this can be useful to inform future research and as such, a searchable interactive resource would be helpful. An example of this is the searchable interactive map of outcome tools and International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus (ICON) health domains relative to tendinopathy types presented as supplementary files in a scoping review of exercise for tendinopathy. [25]

_____

INSERT Examples 1,2,3 and 4

__

Reporting scoping reviews

The PRISMA-ScR provides a checklist for reporting a scoping review. It has clear guidance on how to report the extraction (called 'data charting'), analysis (called 'data synthesis'), and presentation of data. Items 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20 and 21 are applicable for these sections and should be referred to whilst writing the scoping review report to ensure a transparent and rigorous process. A completed PRISMA-ScR checklist which documents page numbers where each of these actions have been addressed should also be included as a supplementary file to your scoping review report. Because the checklist requires authors to indicate the page that items are checked off against, ensure that these page numbers are accurate in the final proofs of your scoping review if it is to be published otherwise, they will not match up.

The PRISMA-ScR also provides an appendix (titled: PRISMA extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Explanation and Elaboration) that describes each section, which needs to be reported within a scoping review, and a written example of how this can be achieved within a report.

Software

There are many software programs, which can be used to assist in the extraction, analysis and presentation of scoping review data. These include Google Sheets as this allows for real-time editing and can manage version control issues. However, Microsoft Excel is also appropriate and can facilitate basic descriptive analyses. It is also possible to use Microsoft Excel for data extraction followed by data imported and analysed into another statistical program environment to perform descriptive analysis. NVIVO (released in March 2020)[26] is also often used in the extraction, analysis and presentation of qualitative information. Further, data visualisation programs can include Microsoft Power BI, or Tableau. For mapping, EPPI-Mapper[27] and even EndNote[28] are useful tools, amongst others. Having scoping review authors familiar with software use and its application helps facilitate the data extraction, analysis, and presentation of results.

Conclusion

Scoping reviews aim to systematically identify and map the breadth of evidence available on a particular topic, field, concept, or issue within or across particular contexts, and this requires a different analytical approach to systematic reviews. The extraction, analysis, and presentation of results within a scoping review can be challenging due to the variety of evidence sources that scoping reviews can include and the absence of specific guidance for reviewers. This article has partially addressed this gap by providing guidance regarding how to extract, analyse, and present data within scoping reviews. It is hoped that scoping review authors will be able to use this guidance to improve the quality and clarity of published scoping reviews and to make conducting and reporting scoping reviews easier.

References

1. Munn Z, Pollock D, Khalil H, Alexander L, McInerney P, Godfrey CM, et al. What are scoping reviews? Providing a formal definition of scoping reviews as a type of evidence synthesis. JBI Evidence Synthesis. 9000.
2. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2018; 18(1):143.
3. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evidence Synthesis. 9000.
4. Khalil H, Peters MDJ, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Alexander L, McInerney P, et al. Conducting high quality scoping reviews-challenges and solutions. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2021; 130:156-60.
5. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Colquhoun H, Kastner M, et al. A scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2016; 16(1):15.
6. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. JBI Evidence Implementation. 2021; 19(1):3-10.
7. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 2005; 8(1):19-32.
8. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. Implementation Science. 2010; 5(1):69.

9. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2018; 169(7):467-73.
10. Tricco AC, Tetzlaff J, Moher D. The art and science of knowledge synthesis. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2011; 64(1):11-20.
11. Jull JE, Davidson L, Dungan R, Nguyen T, Woodward KP, Graham ID. A review and synthesis of frameworks for engagement in health research to identify concepts of knowledge user engagement. BMC medical research methodology. 2019; 19(1):211-.
12. Robson RC, Pham B, Hwee J, Thomas SM, Rios P, Page MJ, et al. Few studies exist examining methods for selecting studies, abstracting data, and appraising quality in a systematic review. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2019; 106:121-35.
13. Khalil H, Huang C. Adverse drug reactions in primary care: a scoping review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020; 20(1):5.
14. Hoppe D, Karimi L, Khalil H. Mapping the research addressing prescription drug monitoring programs: A scoping review. Drug and Alcohol Review. 2022; 41(4):803-17.
15. Khalil H, Shahid M, Roughead L. Medication safety programs in primary care: a scoping review. JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep. 2017; 15(10):2512-26.
16. Prediger B, Mathes T, Probst C, Pieper D. Elective removal vs. retaining of hardware after osteosynthesis in asymptomatic patients—a scoping review. Systematic Reviews. 2020; 9(1):225.
17. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. Bmj. 2014; 348:g1687.
18. Cooper K, Pavlova A, Alexander L, Swinton P, Brown V, Maclean C, et al. Exercise therapy for the treatment of tendinopathies: A mixed methods evidence synthesis. 2021.
19. Hoppe D, Ristevski E, Khalil H. The attitudes and practice strategies of community pharmacists towards drug misuse management: A scoping review. Journal of Clinical Pharmacy and Therapeutics. 2020; 45(3):430-52.
20. Elo S, Kyngäs H. The qualitative content analysis process. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2008; 62(1):107-15.
21. Davies EL, Pollock D, Graham A, Laing RE, Langton V, Bulto L, et al. Reporting of patient journey mapping in current literature: a scoping review protocol. JBI Evid Synth. 2021.
22. Breuing J, Pieper D, Neuhaus AL, Heß S, Lütkemeier L, Haas F, et al. Barriers and facilitating factors in the prevention of diabetes type 2 and gestational diabetes in vulnerable groups: A scoping review. PLOS ONE. 2020; 15(5):e0232250.
23. Lunny C, Pieper D, Thabet P, Kanji S. Managing overlap of primary study results across systematic reviews: practical considerations for authors of overviews of reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2021; 21(1):140.
24. Kynoch K, Ramis M-A, Crowe L, Cabilan CJ, McArdle A. Information needs and information seeking behaviors of patients and families in acute healthcare settings: a scoping review. JBI Evidence Synthesis. 2019; 17(6):1130-53.
25. Alexander L, Shim J, Harrison I, Moss R, Greig L, Pavlova A, et al. Exercise therapy for tendinopathy: A scoping review mapping interventions and outcomes
2021.
26. Ltd QIP. NVIVO (released in March 2020). 2020.
27. EPPI-Centre DSFa. EPPI-Mapper, Version 2.1.0. In: EPPI-Centre USRI, University College London editor.: https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=2967; 2022.
28. Team TE. EndNote. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate; 2013.