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ABSTRACT

Introduction Literature reviews represent an important type of study for the various professions in healthcare. The consideration and inclusion of grey literature is gaining importance in all types of reviews. However, searching for grey literature is challenging for different reasons and the search is often insufficiently transparently reported in reviews. The aim of this protocol is to describe our planned methodical approach for a scoping review with a specific focus on grey literature related to the topic of consulting according to §7a of the German Social Law, Book XI (SGB XI) for people with dementia and their relatives in Germany.

Methods and analysis We will use the following search strategies: (1) search in the German electronic databases, for example, Livivo and GeroLit (via GBV), (2) google search engines, (3) targeted websites, for example, Alzheimer’s association and (4) contact experts, for example, stakeholders of private care insurance companies who provide consulting according to §7a SGB XI. Additionally, we will conduct a search in the academic electronic databases MEDLINE (via PubMed) and CINAHL (via EBSCO). For included grey literature, we will conduct a backward citation tracking via reference lists. For included scientific articles, we will conduct a backward (via reference lists) and forward (via Google scholar) citation tracking. Each strategy will be conducted by one reviewer. Screening of the identified potentially relevant records will be conducted in Covidence by two reviewers independently. Results will be charted in a table and illustrated descriptively.

Ethics and dissemination There are no ethical concerns with conducting a scoping review. We will discuss our results regarding consulting according to §7a SGB XI for people with dementia and their relatives with a variety of stakeholders in Germany. We will disseminate the thematic results and the methodological reflection of our search approach in the form of articles in peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed journals.

INTRODUCTION

Literature reviews are important for health-related professions such as nursing and medicine, and health service research among others. This is because they can provide a quick overview of current (scientific) knowledge on broad or even specific research questions.1,2 In recent years, different types of methodological approaches have been established for conducting reviews depending on a wide variety of research questions. Examples include systematic reviews and rapid reviews for the (rapid) evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions,1-3-4 scoping reviews and evidence maps for mapping of the current research landscape related to a broad question,5-15 realist reviews for the analysis of the underlying theory of programmes or interventions and the evidence for the (rapid) evaluation of the effectiveness of interventions,16-19 or intervention works, is effective or not,16 and integrative reviews with a focus on the analysis and synthesis of qualitative as well as quantitative studies.18-19 More review types are described in the publications by Grant and Booth.20 All the above-mentioned review types require a transparent, systematic and reproducible search. These requirements are linked to and must be fulfilled by a specific procedure based on considering (methodological) frameworks,2,5,21-22 reporting guidelines (guidance and reporting)23-25 and can be supported by the optional use of computer...
software such as Covidence (screening, extraction and critical appraisal process with, for example, the Risk of Bias Tool). \textsuperscript{1} 26-27\textsuperscript{28}  

The consideration of grey literature is becoming increasingly important in almost all types of reviews.\textsuperscript{1} 29 According to Adams et al.,\textsuperscript{30} grey literature can be classified in different shades. The classification depends on expertise (the degree to which the authority of the producer of literature can be determined) and outlet control (the degree to which literature is published in relation to explicit and transparent criteria). These dimensions (expertise/outlet control) move between the known and unknown. The greater the degree of unknowing, the more shaded the literature appears. The first grey level, which has high outlet control and high credibility, is, for example, books, magazines and government reports. The second level with moderate outlet control and moderate credibility includes, for example, annual reports and such as (evaluation) reports\textsuperscript{36} or practice articles\textsuperscript{37} are not listed in the common academic electronic databases such as MEDLINE (via PubMed) but, for example, on national websites of insurance companies, federal ministries, consulting agencies, university or research institutes\textsuperscript{36} or national electronic databases listing grey literature such as Livivo, GeroLit (via GBV) or SSOAR (via GESIS).\textsuperscript{33} Searching for grey literature requires a different approach regarding the use of data sources for the identification of literature of interest. This also appears to be different internationally;\textsuperscript{32} therefore, in this protocol, we describe our planned methodological approach for our ‘grey-shaded’ scoping review.

**METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

For our planned scoping review, starting in November 2021 and scheduled to end in February 2022, we have defined the following research questions:

1. Which consulting concepts and structures for people with dementia and their relatives have been developed and/or provided since the implementation of §7a SGB XI in Germany?  
   a. Which concepts and structures are currently being discussed as supportive for those who seek consulting?

2. How does digitalisation support consulting in the context of §7a SGB XI for people with dementia and their relatives?  
   a. What implications does this have on providing consulting?

3. How do people with dementia and their relatives experience consulting according to §7a SGB XI?  
   a. What care needs do they articulate during consulting?

For our planned scoping review, we consider the framework of Arksey and O’Malley,\textsuperscript{21} which was further developed by Levac et al.,\textsuperscript{22} Peters et al.\textsuperscript{8} and The Joanna Briggs Institute.\textsuperscript{29} As a result, we consider the following steps: (1) defining and aligning the objective/s and question/s, (2) developing and aligning the inclusion criteria with the objective/s and question/s, (3) describing the planned approach to evidence searching, selection, data extraction and presentation of the evidence, (4) searching for the evidence, (5) selecting the evidence, (6) extracting the evidence, (7) analysing the evidence, (8) presenting the results and (9) summarising the evidence in relation to the purpose of the review, drawing conclusions and noting any implications of the findings.\textsuperscript{21} Whenever applicable, we follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-AnalysisProtocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines\textsuperscript{24} (online supplemental table 1) to report this protocol.

**Inclusion criteria**

For the reporting of our inclusion and exclusion criteria of our scoping review, we consider the ‘PCC’ (Population, Concept of Interest and Context) mnemonic
described by The Joanna Briggs Institute and supplemented it with the aspects ‘types of evidence sources’ and ‘others’ (table 1).

**Search strategies**

Owing to the questions of our scoping review, the focus is on published studies, analyses and evaluations of a national healthcare service (§7a SGB XI) implemented in Germany. As a result, we focus on grey literature and consider the described approach by Godin et al and have developed a grey literature search plan with an additional strategy for the search in academic electronic databases to minimise the publication bias. This search plan includes the following search strategies: (1) grey literature databases, (2) Google search engines, (3) targeted websites, (4) contacting experts and (5) additional searching in academic electronic databases.

**Strategy 1: grey literature databases**

To identify relevant German electronic databases listing grey literature, we used the descriptions of Nordhausen and Hirt. As a result, we will consider the following specific German electronic databases: Livivo, GeroLit (via GBV) and SSOAR (via GESIS). As search strings, we will use a simplified form (eg, focusing on fewer combinations and reducing the search terms) of the search string we created for searching in academic electronic databases to minimise the publication bias. This search string includes the following search strategies: (1) grey literature databases, (2) Google search engines, (3) targeted websites, (4) contacting experts and (5) additional searching in academic electronic databases.

**Strategy 2: Google search engines**

Despite the description of Godin et al, no customising of the search engines will be carried out in the second strategy. Owing to country-specific factors and the associated technical requirements, we will search in Google and Google scholar using the anonymous function in our web browser (safari) to ensure that our search is not overly influenced by the individual search history of the reviewer (CM). We

---

**Table 1** Inclusion and exclusion criteria

| Criteria           | Definition                                                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Population         | ► People with symptoms of dementia (with or without a dementia diagnosis)  |
|                    | ► Relatives of people with symptoms of dementia (with or without a dementia diagnosis) |
| Concept of Interest| ► Consulting according to §7a SGB XI related to the care of people with dementia (with or without a dementia diagnosis)  |
|                    | ► Consulting about care is not integrated in the nursing process          |
| Context            | ► Germany                                                                  |
| Types of evidence sources | ► Focus on grey literature in the form of (evaluation) reports, practice articles and theses |
|                    | ► Literature published in peer-reviewed journals                          |
| Others             | ► Languages: German or English                                             |
|                    | ► Year: publications from the year 2009                                    |
Imported records in Covidence and screened independently by two reviewers against the inclusion criteria. Full texts will be checked for duplicates at the end of the search process. The full text of the potential relevant records will be identified records through our electronic database searches, we will provide a backward and forward citation tracking via reference lists and Google scholar. Additional citation tracking
For the identified grey literature, we will provide a backward citation via reference lists. For the identified literature through our academic electronic database searches, we will provide a backward and forward citation tracking via reference lists and Google scholar. Source of evidence selection
Identified records through our electronic database searches (strategies 1 and 5) will be imported in Covidence and automatically checked for duplicates. Titles and abstracts of records will be screened by two reviewers independently against the inclusion criteria. Full texts will also be independently screened for inclusion by two reviewers and exclusion reasons for full texts will also be recorded. During the screening process, disagreements between the votes of the two reviewers will be resolved through a discussion between them or if no consensus can be reached with all co-authors.

For the search strategies 2–3, we will create an Excel spreadsheet to record the executing search strategy, including information for name of resource, searcher, date, used search string nd number of potentially relevant records. For the strategies 2–4, potentially relevant records will be collected in a common EndNote V.20 file stored in a shared NextCloud folder and automatically checked for duplicates at the end of the search process. The full text of the potential relevant records will be imported in Covidence and screened independently by two reviewers against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Exclusion reasons for full texts will be recorded. Voting conflicts will be discussed between the two reviewers and if no agreement can be reached, they will be discussed with all co-authors.

Our inclusion criteria will be pilot-tested in the first 25 records and will be adjusted if necessary. Adjustment will be required if discrepancies between the two reviewers are greater than 25%. If adjustments for inclusion criteria will be made during the screening process, we will report them in our following publications. We will use the PRISMA flowchart to report the process of the selection.

Data extraction
For the data extraction process, we will use the template from The Joanna Briggs Institute (table 2). Data extraction will be performed by one researcher and randomly checked by another. The data extraction will be provided by one researcher and randomly checked by another. The data extraction will be performed in an iterative process according to the description of the Joanna Briggs Institute, which means that after two extracted studies, the template will be checked to see if all relevant data are represented or if adjustments are needed.

Analysis and presentation of the results
The extracted data are presented and described in the form of a table and descriptively based on the questions.

Patient and public involvement
We will involve stakeholders to discuss our thematic results of our review with the aim to develop a strategy for further the development of consulting regarding care according to §7a SGB XI for people with dementia and their relatives in Germany.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION
There are no ethical concerns for our review. We will present our thematic results to a variety of stakeholders in Germany. Additionally, our thematic results and our methodological reflection of the search process will be presented at (inter)national conferences and published in journals for practitioners and peer-reviewed journals. Finally, we will address any possible gaps in the current research landscape and incorporate them into possible future projects.

Table 2 Data charting framework

| Domains            | Description (Content)                                      |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| General information| - Author                                              |
|                    | - Year                                                  |
|                    | - Publication type (eg, report)                          |
|                    | - Aim of the publication (eg, evaluation)                |
|                    | - Study design (eg, process evaluation)                  |
| Participants       | - Characteristics of the participants (eg, population and age) |
| Intervention       | - Consulting according to §7a SGB XI (eg, concept, content, target population, structures and delivery) |
| Results            | - Effectiveness (eg, outcomes of the consulting)         |
|                    | - Experiences (eg, of people with dementia and relatives) |
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