

Envisioning happy places for all: protocol for a systematic review of transformations in the urban environment for the wellbeing of vulnerable groups

Sara Biscaya, Marica Cassarino, Sina Shahab

Citation

Sara Biscaya, Marica Cassarino, Sina Shahab. Envisioning happy places for all: protocol for a systematic review of transformations in the urban environment for the wellbeing of vulnerable groups. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020182778 Available from:

https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020182778

Review question

1) How do urban planning interventions impact the wellbeing of vulnerable groups?

2) What are vulnerable groups' experiences and perceptions of transformations in the urban environment?

Searches

Using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) standardised guidelines, we will conduct a systematic review of quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods studies that describe either: 1) urban planning interventions that affect the wellbeing of vulnerable groups; or 2) experiences of vulnerable groups of changes in the urban environment that impact their wellbeing.

The searches will be conducted in the online databases Web of Science, Scopus, EBSCO Academic Search Complete, and JSTOR from inception to May 2020. We will also hand-search the reference lists of relevant studies.

The searches will be limited to articles published in English.

Additional search strategy information can be found in the attached PDF document (link provided below).

Types of study to be included

Inclusion criteria:

- Quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods primary studies that involve human participants;
- Reviews of primary research.

Exclusion criteria:

- Policy briefs or reports;
- Opinion papers or commentaries.

Condition or domain being studied

Urban planning interventions/changes and their impact on wellbeing.

Participants/population

Inclusion criteria:

Individuals of all ages that are members of the following vulnerable groups recognised, among others, by the United Nations:

- 1) Women;

- 2) Children;
- 3) People with disabilities;
- 4) Older people.

These groups were identified by the research team as those who would be the most affected by urban planning and design in terms of access and usability.

Exclusion criteria:

Individuals who are not identified as being members of one of the included vulnerable groups.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Inclusion criteria:

- Interventions, activities or initiatives aimed at changing the design of the urban environment;
- Interventions, activities or initiatives aimed at creating new spaces in the urban environment.

Exclusion criteria:

Interventions not directly related to urban planning and design, such as:

- Social interventions;
- Cultural interventions;
- Health interventions;
- Lifestyle interventions.

Comparator(s)/control

It is anticipated that there is very limited availability of controlled studies in this area. However, should controlled studies be found, we would use as a comparator urban areas or groups for which the intervention has not been carried out.

Main outcome(s)

The main outcome of interest is the wellbeing of vulnerable groups.

Wellbeing is here intended with particular focus on psychological wellbeing, particularly in relation to perceived opportunities or challenges for agency (i.e. action) and/or belonging (i.e. feeling part of the community).

* Measures of effect

While we will endeavour to extrapolate a measure of effect size for the main outcome, we anticipate that the heterogeneity in type of populations and interventions will allow only for a narrative review.

Additional outcome(s)

Additional outcomes considered for this review relate closely to psychological wellbeing, and include mental health, happiness, life satisfaction and cognitive wellbeing.

* Measures of effect

While we will endeavour to extrapolate a measure of effect size for the main outcome, we anticipate that the heterogeneity in type of populations and interventions will allow only for a narrative review.

Data extraction (selection and coding)

A two-stage process will be used to assess the results of the literature search.

In stage one, titles and abstracts will be screened independently by the research team (MC, SB and SS).

Before initiating the screening process, the inclusion and exclusion criteria will be piloted by the research team in a sub-sample of ten references.

After the pilot, the title and abstract of the remaining references will be independently screened for eligibility by pairs of reviewers selected out of three reviewers (MC, SB and SS). Reviewers will be assigned to each reference using Rayyan app for systematic reviews (<https://rayyan.qcri.org/>).

In stage two, the selected full-texts will be screened to confirm inclusion in the final review. At each stage, disagreements within each pair of reviewers will be resolved with the intervention of the third reviewer.

A PRISMA flow diagram of progress will be completed for the selection process.

One reviewer will extract data using a tailored data extraction form that will collect information related to the study citation, setting, objectives, data source, and PICOS components (type of population, intervention, comparison, outcomes and study design). Detailed information will be collected in relation to the impact on wellbeing (objective 1) and/or perceptions by vulnerable groups (objective 2).

A second reviewer will then verify the extracted data.

Any disagreements in data extraction will be resolved by consensus. If the disagreement persists, a third author will independently extract the data.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

As we aim to include both quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods studies, we will employ the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) by Hong et al. (2018) to assess the quality of the studies included in the review. Each study will be identified based on its methodology and receive a score for each of five methodological quality criteria. The MMAT is relevant only for empirical studies.

Strategy for data synthesis

We anticipate that the included studies will present heterogeneity in terms of characteristics of the intervention and/or populations of interest. For this reason, included studies will be synthesised narratively.

After data extraction, the research team will decide on the criteria to organise the narrative synthesis, although it is envisaged that this will be carried out by population and/or type of urban planning intervention.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

If sufficient data is available from the included studies, subgroup narrative comparisons will be conducted to compare the experiences of different populations of different types of interventions.

Contact details for further information

Marica Cassarino
mcassarino@ucc.ie

Organisational affiliation of the review

University College Cork

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Dr Sara Biscaya. University of Salford
Dr Marica Cassarino. University College Cork
Dr Sina Shahab. Cardiff University

Type and method of review

Epidemiologic, Intervention, Narrative synthesis, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

11 May 2020

Anticipated completion date

31 July 2020

Funding sources/sponsors

This work has received support from the British Academy Network Seed Funding 2020

Conflicts of interest

Language

English

Country

England, Ireland, Wales

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

City Planning; Environment and Public Health; Environment Design; Happiness; Health Status Disparities; Humans; Mental Health; Public Health; Quality of Life; Urban Health; Urban Population; Vulnerable Populations

Date of registration in PROSPERO

29 April 2020

Date of first submission

28 April 2020

Stage of review at time of this submission

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	No	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions

29 April 2020

PROSPERO

This information has been provided by the named contact for this review. CRD has accepted this information in good faith and registered the review in PROSPERO. The registrant confirms that the information supplied for this submission is accurate and complete. CRD bears no responsibility or liability for the content of this registration record, any associated files or external websites.