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Review question
RQ1: How is help-seeking conceptualised across academic disciplines?
RQ2: What are the key drivers of help-seeking as identified across different academic disciplines?

Searches
For this cross-discipline review searches will be undertaken with the following databases:
1. Academic Search Complete
2. DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals)
3. EThOS (digital theses)
4. IngentaConnect
5. International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)
6. JSTOR
7. MEDLINE (EBSCO)
8. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses
9. PsycARTICLES (EBSCO)
10. PsycINFO (EBSCO)
11. Scopus
12. Social Sciences Citation Index (Web of Science)
13. Web of Science

KEYWORDS SEARCHED
The keywords searched on all databases were as follows:
help OR information OR advice
AND
seek* OR access* OR use OR utili*
AND
health* OR medicine OR medical OR gp OR gps OR “general practi*”
AND
Migrant* OR immigrant* OR refugee* OR transient

FIELDS SEARCHED
On the EBSCO databases (MEDLINE, Academic Source Complete, PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES) the fields searched: abstract and title.
Field searched on Scopus: Title, Abstract and Keywords
Field searched on Web of Science Core Collection: Topic

SEARCH LIMITS
Searches limited to English language materials and to the period 2000-end 2019

Types of study to be included
• Studies that report primary data (quantitative and qualitative studies)
• Focus on actual help-seeking behaviour rather than help-seeking intentions
• Exclude review studies or commentaries

Condition or domain being studied
Help-seeking behaviour for physical symptoms
Participants/population
Inclusion criteria:
• Adults (aged 18+)
• Migrated from any country of origin
• Migrated to any host country
• No limit on time since migration
• Seeking help for a physical health condition or symptom
Exclusion criteria:
• Aged under 18 years
• Utilisation of maternity services
• Utilisation of services for mental health condition or symptom

Intervention(s), exposure(s)
Any help-seeking behaviour for a physical health symptom to access care through a formal healthcare service

Comparator(s)/control
Not applicable.

Main outcome(s)
Identified barriers and facilitators for
• Help-seeking behaviour
• Healthcare service utilisation
* Measures of effect
Not applicable.

Additional outcome(s)
None
* Measures of effect
Not applicable.

Data extraction (selection and coding)
Two researchers will independently screen title, keywords and/or abstracts in order to identify relevant and exclude irrelevant articles. Full-text versions of journal articles that are not excluded at this stage will be obtained and assessed for eligibility by the same two researchers. Discrepancies will be discussed and resolved through discussion, with clear records of how decisions reached

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
Quality assessment will be undertaken using guidelines for qualitative and quantitative papers (Kmet et al., 2004). 20% of the quality checks will also be undertaken by a second researcher as a reliability check. Discrepancies will be discussed and resolved through discussion, with clear records of how decisions reached

Strategy for data synthesis
The findings of qualitative and quantitative studies will be tabulated separately and these tables will be used to guide discussions of the findings. Following this a critical analysis of the findings (both qualitative and quantitative) will be undertaken and utilised to develop an initial cross discipline theory of medical help-seeking. PRISMA guidelines (Moher et al., 2009) will be followed for quantitative data and recommendations for meta-ethnography reviews (Campbell et al., 2011) will guide the synthesis of qualitative data. Two authors will independently read 20% of the included studies and generate an initial list of relevant factors which will be documented in an Excel spreadsheet. This list will be iteratively developed to cover all factors identified in the included studies. All studies will be coded using the resulting spreadsheet and 20% of included studies will be coded by a second researcher. Discrepancies will be discussed and resolved through discussion, with clear records of how decisions reached. Framework analysis (Richie and Spencer, 2003) will be used to analyse the reported barriers and facilitators in the qualitative studies.
Analysis of subgroups or subsets
Meta-analysis of the quantitative data will be undertaken, if the data is suitable (i.e. it is feasible to group factors associated with help-seeking).
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</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>Preliminary searches</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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**Revision note**

There was a delay in starting and so we have revised the search in line with the new institution where the PI is based. This has included changes to the team, contact details, dates to be searched and an expansion of the databases searched. Question, aims and search terms remain unchanged. The review is due to start shortly.

*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.*
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