

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-037392
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jan-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Sims, Rebecca; Bond University, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine Kazda, Luise; The University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health Michaleff, Zoe; Bond University, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine Glasziou, Paul; Bond University, CREBP Thomas, Rae; Bond University, Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review

Rebecca Sims¹, Luise Kazda², Zoe A Michaleff¹, Paul Glasziou¹, Rae Thomas¹

¹Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond University ²Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

2.

Corresponding author: Rebecca Sims, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond University, 14 University Drive, Robina QLD 4226. Email: <u>rsims@bond.edu.au</u>

Keywords: *labelling; diagnosis; consequences*

Word Count: 1908

BMJ Open

ABSTRACT

Introduction. When health conditions are labelled it is often to classify and communicate a set of symptoms. While diagnostic labelling can provide explanation for an individual's symptoms, it can also impact how individuals and others view those symptoms. Despite existing research regarding the effects of labelling health conditions, a synthesis of these effects has not occurred. We will conduct a systematic scoping review to synthesise the reported consequences and impact of being given a label for a health condition from an individual, societal and health practitioner perspective and explore in what context labelling of health conditions is considered important.

Methods and analysis. The review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology for Scoping Reviews. Searches will be conducted in five electronic databases (PubMed, Embase, PsychINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL). Reference lists of included studies will be screened and forward and backward citation searching of included articles will be conducted. We will include reviews and original studies which describe the consequences for individuals labelled with a non-cancer health condition. We will exclude hypothetical research designs and studies focussed on the consequences of labelling cancer conditions, intellectual disabilities, and/or social attributes. We will conduct thematic analyses for qualitative data and descriptive or meta-analyses for quantitative data where appropriate.

Ethics and Dissemination. Ethical approval is not required for a scoping review. Results will be disseminated via publication in a peer-reviewed journal, conference presentations, and lay-person summaries on various online platforms. Findings from this systematic scooping review will identify gaps in current understanding of how, when, why, and for whom a diagnostic label is important and inform future research.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Synthesis of the consequences of labelling of health conditions individual, practitioner and societal perspectives.
- Provision of real-world perspective of the true consequences of diagnostic labels.
- A broad, systematic search strategy, informed by preliminary public sampling, will be conducted in 5 electronic databases.
- Robust methodology will be used to identify articles for inclusion in this review (i.e. two authors will screen titles, extract data and assess methodological quality for each included article).
- Results of this review will enable the identification of gaps in current understanding of how, when, why, and for whom a diagnostic label is important and inform future research.

reliez oniz

Page

INTRODUCTION

The diagnosis of physical and psychological health conditions is increasing in prevalence.¹⁻⁵ Diagnoses often occur in the context of individuals seeking to identify and treat symptoms. However, diagnoses can also occur as a result of screening tests where individuals have no discernible signs or symptoms of disease (such as when a routine test determines an individual has hypertension),⁶ from unanticipated findings in investigations for other health concerns (such as identifying an anomaly in a person's thyroid when conducting an MRI of the spine),⁷ or, when people are newly diagnosed with a health condition because of changes to diagnostic thresholds or cut-offs for the condition opposed to changes in individual circumstances (such as for gestational diabetes).¹ The value of a diagnosis, particularly in these latter contexts, is not always evident and the risk of over- and mis-diagnosis is significant.¹⁸⁹

Diagnostic labels provide healthcare professionals with a framework from which to organise and interpret clinical symptom presentations, support clinical decision making through directing treatment decisions, and provide information on possible condition course and overall prognosis.^{10 11} Further, diagnostic labels allow clinicians to assume homogeneity amongst members of patient groups, in addition to providing an efficient method for health professionals to communicate.¹²

Despite well-meaning intentions, application of diagnostic labels in real-world practice can be problematic. Diagnostic criteria can often be ambiguous. For example, symptoms of anxiety, such as restlessness, fatigue, or difficulty concentrating, may be explained by diagnoses of anxiety, depressive, or bipolar and related disorders.^{13 14} Similarly, chest pain symptoms may be explained by several alternative diagnostic categories such as inflammatory diseases, musculoskeletal conditions, or coronary diseases.^{15 16} Lastly, non-

specific low back pain is the leading cause of disability worldwide, yet for the majority of people no pathoanatomical cause can be identified.¹⁷

 From the perspective of a patient, a diagnostic label can have a significant impact (negative and positive) on their health outcomes, psychological wellbeing, and behaviour, and can influence how they are viewed and managed by healthcare professionals and are perceived by other members in society (e.g. school, workplace).^{3 5 18} In a cohort of over 33,000 adults', individuals who were aware that they had hypertension reported elevated levels of psychological distress compared to those individuals who had hypertension, however, were unaware of this.³ A study investigating the impact of labelling borderline personality disorder on clinician interpretation of patient symptoms found clinician's prior awareness of a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder, compared to no awareness, resulted in a tendency to frame observations of the individual in terms of the label, and a failure to observe positive behaviours.¹²

Conversely, a diagnostic label may have positive effects on the individual. These include timely referral to necessary healthcare which, in turn, can reduce morbidity and mortality, improve predictions regarding condition progression as well as facilitate access to support, services and resources (for example diagnosis based school funding^{19 20} and social support⁵) and provide an explanation and validation of an individuals' signs and symptoms. A recent study exploring the impact of chronic fatigue syndrome using hypothetical scenarios of a close friend's diagnosis, reported a label of chronic fatigue, compared with no label, elicited higher sympathetic responses from participants, greater potential social support, and greater support for active treatment.⁵

The terms used to describe a diagnostic label have been found to influence an individuals' behaviour, psychological well-being and treatment preferences. Specifically, a diagnostic label that uses medicalised and precise terminology compared with a description

Page 7 of 23

BMJ Open

of symptoms, has been found to result in higher patient anxiety, greater perceived severity of the condition and a patient preference of more invasive treatments.^{18 21-23} This has been evidenced in conditions including gastro-oesophageal reflux disease, polycystic ovary syndrome, bone fracture, and low back pain.^{18 21-23} Similarly, research suggests that patients diagnosed with diabetes demonstrate a propensity to medical interventions, including insulin use, oral medication taking, and blood glucose monitoring, compared to less invasive interventions, such as changes to diet and exercise practices.²⁴ The use of a medicalised label over a descriptive label for a health condition is also suggested to result in increased confidence in the medical professional and greater adoption of sick role behaviour.²⁵ Alternatively, use of descriptive labels for health conditions was found to be associated with greater patient ownership of the condition.²⁵

To date, our understanding of the consequences and impacts of a diagnostic label has been limited to a single perspective (e.g. patient, health care practitioner), single condition (e.g. gastro-oesophageal reflux disease), or restricted to a specific study design (e.g. hypothetical research design) and a comprehensive synthesis of this information across health conditions is lacking.^{26 27} Further, exploring the real world impact of a diagnostic label including benefits and harms has received little attention.^{22 28 29} Therefore, the aims of this systematic scoping review are to systematically review original and synthesised research exploring the consequences of being given a label for a health condition to:

- 1. Identify the range of potential consequences of labelling of health conditions from an individual, societal, and health practitioner viewpoint;
- 2. Explore why, for whom, and in what contexts labelling of health conditions is, or is not, influential; and,
- 3. Evaluate the methods used to study the impact of labelling health conditions.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Scoping reviews are suggested as an alternative to systematic reviews, allowing for a broader examination and synthesis of existing research and identification of research gaps.³⁰ The proposed systematic scoping review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology for Scoping Reviews,³¹ and adhere to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR).³² This approach was selected to allow sufficient documentation of the review process.

Consumer involvement in scoping review design and framework development

A convenience sampling survey was conducted to explore the publics opinion of the consequences of diagnostic label for health conditions. In April 2019, we posted the questions "What are the labelling consequences of being given a health diagnosis? We're working up a list and so far we have: anxiety, relief, more tests, stigma, medico-legal problems. What else?" on two social media platforms, Facebook and Twitter. Responses on Facebook included 14 comments from six individuals, while Twitter responses resulted in 45 comments from 40 individuals. The results of this survey were used to inform the development of the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction form, and an initial qualitative framework (Table 1) that will be used in this scoping review.

Table 1. Coding Framework of Social Media Responses.

Name	Description		Examples
Psychological Impact	Psychological impact of	-	Increased self-understanding
	diagnosis	-	Stigma (internalised stigma
			(self); perceived stigma from
			others)
		-	Increased psychological
			distress (anxiety, depression,
			phobia, worry, fear, stress)

Support		Support gained or loss	-	Support groups: Increased
		as a result of diagnosis		support of others with similar
				diagnosis; network with
				other patients
			-	Others less respectful, more
				withdrawn and judgemental
Development	Education	Seeking to become more	-	Increase in health literacy
		informed on diagnoses,		due to motivation to find
		testing, intervention		about treatment options
	Planning	Forward planning and	-	Ability to plan – even if there
		decision making as a		may not be treatment,
		result of diagnosis		provides opportunity to get
				affairs in order (e.g. wills).
Lifestyle	Behaviour	Behaviour changes as a	-	Change diet
		result of diagnosis	-	Change lifestyle
	Employment	Effect of diagnosis on	-	More Sick days; Time off
		employment		work; absenteeism
	Financial	Effect of diagnosis on	-	Diagnosis provides access to
		finances		funds (e.g. Medicare, NDIS,
				insurance)
Service Use	Testing	Further assessment and <i>C</i>	-	Seeking more investigations
		tests as a result of		Scans and imaging
		diagnosis (including	-	Encourages screening of
		testing of family)		other family members at
				low-risk of the condition
	Treatment	Treatment and	-	Clear Treatment path; clearer
		intervention as a result		treatment protocols
		of diagnosis	-	Side-effects (of medication
				sexual, agitation, suicidality,
				emotional numbing)

Inclusion criteria

Peer reviewed publications including, systematic or literature reviews and original studies which describe the perceived consequences for individuals labelled with a non-cancer health condition will be included. Perceived consequences can be reported from the perspectives of the individuals, their family, friends, and/or carers, or health professionals. As we expect individuals labelled as having a cancer condition will have different experiences to those labelled with general health conditions, studies that focus on these samples are excluded. Similarly, studies that report the consequence of labels for people using hypothetical case scenarios, or individuals with intellectual disabilities and/or social attributes such as race, sexual identity or orientation will also be excluded (see Table 2 for more details).

Table 2.	Incl	usion	Crite	eria

Aspect	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Types of	Original Studies (Cohort, Case-	Protocols (final study to be sourced)
studies	Controlled, Cross-Sectional,	Opinion pieces and commentaries
	Observational, RCT, Focus	Quantitative Cohort, Case-Controlled,
	Groups)*	and Cross-Sectional studies without
	Synthesised Studies (Systematic	comparator
	Reviews)	Hypothetical or vignette based studies
	*Studies utilising qualitative	
	methodologies do not require	
	multiple group comparisons for	
	inclusion.	

Participants	Individuals, no age limit (e.g. adults,	Animal subjects
	children, family, carers, health	
	professionals, general public)	
Condition	Screening and/or labelling of	Labelling of intellectual impairment,
	physical or psychological health	race, ethnicity, sexual identity or
	condition/s	sexual orientation
	Self-reported (e.g. response to	Labelling of cancers and cancer
	questions such as "has your GP ever	related conditions
	told you that you have	Self-reported conditions provided by
	hypertension?")	unqualified professional (e.g.
	Health condition confirmed (e.g.	physiotherapist telling patient they
	medical examination and testing	have hypertension)
	completed as part of the study)	Self-identified conditions (e.g.
		googling of symptoms, no
		confirmation by medical professional)
Outcomes	Consequences, impact, effects of the	Effect of the health condition (e.g.
	health condition label or diagnosis	disease mechanisms/traits)
	Perceived harms and/or benefits	Gene labelling
	(e.g. illness burden)	Food or nutrition labelling
	- Lived experience	Drug effects/effectiveness
	- Psychological impact (e.g.	Intervention effects/effectiveness
	anxiety, quality of life)	(e.g. intervention A vs intervention B)
	- Behaviour change (e.g.	
	participation in employment)	

	- Support (e.g. financial,	
	social support)	
Language	No language limitations	-
Date	No date limitations	-

Search strategy

 A structured search, developed in collaboration with an information specialist, of five electronic databases (PubMed, Embase, PsychINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL) will be conducted to identify relevant publications. Databases will be searched from their inception. Reference lists of included articles will be searched and forward citation searching of included articles will be conducted. The full search strategy to be used is reported in the Supplementary Material.

Study selection

Titles and abstracts of 10% of articles retrieved through electronic and manual searches will be independently screened by two reviewers (RS and LK) for eligibility against the pre-specified inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion and consultation with additional reviewers as required. When interrater reliability of 0.9 or above is achieved for the screened studies, remaining studies will continue to be screened by one reviewer (RS). Articles identified as unclear for inclusion will be reviewed by an additional reviewer as required.

Data extraction

Full text publications will be obtained for any potentially relevant studies and will be screened for inclusion against the same inclusion criteria by one reviewer (RS). Additional

BMJ Open

uncertainties regarding eligibility for inclusion will be resolved through discussion with two other reviewers (RT and PG). Two reviewers (RS and ZAM) will independently extract study meta-data and quantitative data from 10% of included studies using a standardised data extraction form in Microsoft Excel that will be piloted prior to full-text data extraction.

These same reviewers will also extract qualitative data from 10% of studies using NVivo version 12. Conflicts will be resolved by a third party as required. When interrater reliability of 0.9 or above is achieved for extracted data, one reviewer (RS) will continue to extract data for the remaining included studies. Queries will be resolved through discussion with a second reviewer (ZAM). Extracted data will include study characteristics (author, journal, year of publication, study country and setting), participant characteristics (number of participants, age, health condition), and outcomes (consequences, impact, effects of the diagnostic label). For studies with quantitative measures, extracted data will include, but is not limited to, validated and unvalidated measures (for example, Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)³³, or General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)³⁴). For qualitative studies, we will extract reported themes and supporting quotes provided.

Study quality

Study quality will be assessed using appraisal tools appropriate for the designs identified, for example, the McGill Mixed Methods Critical Appraisal Tool (MMAT)³⁵ will be used for original studies and Assessing the Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews, version 2 (AMSTAR-2)³⁶ will be used for systematic reviews. The former critical appraisal tool has been developed for evaluating original studies utilising qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methodologies, while the latter tool was developed for appraising the quality of systematic reviews which include randomised or non-randomised studies. Quality assessment will be conducted independently by two authors (RS and ZAM) for 10% of the included studies. Conflicts will be resolved through discussion or by a third reviewer, as necessary.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

We will present study selection in a flow diagram according to PRISMA-Scr and included studies will be described in a table of characteristics.³² Results will be aggregated as appropriate. Results pertinent to the consequences of labelling of health conditions will be collated to expand those provided in Table 1, with empirical data regarding rate and severity of these consequences also examined. Additionally, a compendium of methods used to elicit consequences of health condition labelling will be developed and methodology appraised. For quantitative studies, extracted data will be tabulated in a descriptive and/or statistical manner depending on the availability of data (i.e. number of studies reporting similar outcome measures or measurement of similar constructs, such as quality of life or symptoms of anxiety) and degree of heterogeneity between studies (e.g. population, clinical conditions). Should data not support a meta-analysis, results from studies which provide quantitative data will be reported in a narrative synthesis and interpreted alongside results from qualitative studies. Qualitative data will be analysed using developed frameworks (see Table 1), and following established protocols for the qualitative analysis of information in the social sciences.³⁷ The characteristics and results of all included studies will be reported in tables and summarised in text.

Ethics and Dissemination

As the current study is a systematic scoping review protocol, ethics is not required. Dissemination of results will be made public via peer-reviewed publications, conference

2	
4	presentations and lay-person summaries on various on-line platforms (e.g. The
5	Conversation)
6 7	
8	
9	
10 11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23 24	
25	
26	
27 28	
29	
30	
31 32	
33	
34	
35 36	
37	
38 39	
40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45	
46 47	
48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53	
54 55	
56	
57	
58 59	
60	

REQUIRED STATEMENTS

Twitter: Rebecca Sims @BecSims90, Luise Kazda @LuiseKazda, Zoe A Michaleff @ZoeMichaleff, Paul Glasziou @PaulGlasziou, Rae Thomas @rthomasEBP Acknowledgements: The authors thank Justin Clark, Senior Research Information Specialist at the Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University for assistance with constructing the search strategy.

Author Contributions: RS, PG, and RT contributed to the conception and design of the protocol, initial public 'survey' and construction of the search terms. RS, LK, and ZAM contributed to screening and data analysis. RS, ZAM, RT, and PG contributed to the drafting of the manuscript and all authors approved the final version.

Funding: RS is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship. RT and ZAM are supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Program grant (#1106452). LK is supported by a Centres of Research Excellence Grant (#1104136). PG is supported by a NHMRC Research Fellowship (#1080042). The funding sources have no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Competing Interests: None declared.

Patient consent for publication: Not required.

 Orcid iDs:
 Rebecca Sims https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1604-8354

 Luise Kazda http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4105-0402
 Zoe A Michaleff https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0360-4956

 Paul Glasziou https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7564-073X
 Rae Thomas http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2165-5917

2	
3	REFERENCES
4	
5	1 Sexton H. Heal C. Banks I. Braniff K. Impact of new diagnostic criteria for gestational
6	dishotos LObstot Cumaceal Res 2019:44:425-21 doi: 10.1111/jog.12544
7	11200000000000000000000000000000000000
8	2. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National Health Survey: First Results, 2017-18. Web site:
9	https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.001. Updated May 27, 2019.
10	Accessed November 30, 2019.
11	3. Hamer M, Batty GD, Stamatakis E, Kivimaki M. Hypertension awareness and
12	psychological distress. Hypertens 2010;56:547-50. doi:
13	10 1161/hypertensionaha 110 153775
14	4 Thombs BD Kwakkenbos I Levis AW Benedetti A Addressing overestimation of the
15	revelence of depression based on self report screening questionnaires. Can Med
10	Arres 12019:100:E44 doi: 10.1502/amoi 170601
17	Assoc J 2018,190.E44. doi: 10.1505/cmaj.1/0691.
10	5. Noble S, Bonner C, Hersch J, Jansen J, McGeechan K, McCaffery K. Could disease
20	labelling have positive effects? An experimental study exploring the effect of the
20	chronic fatigue syndrome label on intended social support. Patient Educ Couns
22	2019;102:486-93. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2018.10.011.
23	6. Walker MJ, Rogers WA. Diagnosis, narrative identity, and asymptomatic disease. <i>Theor</i>
24	Med Bioeth 2017:38:307-21. doi: 10.1007/s11017-017-9412-1.
25	7 Hiremath SB Boto J Regnaud A Etienne L Fitsiori A Vargas MI Incidentalomas in
26	spine and spinal cord imaging <i>Clin Neuroradiol</i> 2019:29:191-213 doi:
27	10 1007/200062 010 00772 5
28	P. Devist J. Cleanicy, D. Is the methlem that everything is a diagnostic? Aust From Dhusisian
29	8. Doust J, Glaszlou P. Is the problem that everything is a diagnosis? Aust Fam Physician
30	2013;42:856-9.
31	9. Brodersen J, Schwartz LM, Heneghan C, O'Sullivan JW, Aronson JK, Woloshin S.
32	Overdiagnosis: what it is and what it isn't. <i>BMJ Evid Based Med</i> 2018;23:1-3. doi:
33	10.1136/ebmed-2017-110886.
34	10. Frances A, First M, Pincus HA, Widiger T, Davis W. An introduction to DSM-IV. Hosp
35	Community Psychiatry 1990;41:493-95.
27	11. Croft P, Altman DG, Deeks JJ, et al. The science of clinical practice: disease diagnosis or
38	patient prognosis? Evidence about "what is likely to happen" should shape clinical
30	practice <i>BMC Med</i> 2015:13:20 doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0265-4
40	12 Lam DC Poplayskava EV Salkovskis PM Hogg LL Panting H An experimental
41	investigation of the import of personality disorder disoragie on alinisians; can we see
42	investigation of the impact of personanty disorder diagnosis on chinicians, can we see
43	past the borderline? Behav Cogn Psychother 2016;44:361-73. doi:
44	10.101//s1352465815000351.
45	13. Allsopp K, Read J, Corcoran R, Kinderman P. Heterogeneity in psychiatric diagnostic
46	classification. Psychiatry Res 2019;279:15-22. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2019.07.005
47	14. American Psychological Association. <i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental</i>
48	Disorders, Fifth Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 2013.
49	15. Christiansen J. Less is more: chest pain pathways in clinical care. <i>Med J Aust</i>
50	2017.207.193-94 doi: 10 5694/mia17 00331
51	16 Sturm C Witte T Musculoskeletal-related chest pain Dar Internist 2017:58:39-46 doi:
52	10. Starm C, while 1. Musculoskeletar related enest pair. Der micritist 2017,50.59 40. doi: $10.1007/c00108.016.0166.7$
53	10.100//S00100-010-0100-2.
54	17. nativity set J, nancock iviJ, Kongsted A, et al. what low back pair is and why we need to $\frac{1}{10}$ and
55 56	pay attention. <i>Lancet</i> 2018;391:2356-67. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30480-x.
50	18. Scherer LD, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Fagerlin A, Tarini BA. Influence of "GERD" label on
58	parents' decision to medicate infants. <i>Pediatr</i> 2013;131:839-45. doi:
59	10.1542/peds.2012-3070.
60	

19. Parliament of Australia. Access to real learning: the impact of policy, funding and culture on students with disability.

 https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Education_and_ Employment/students_with_disability/Report. Published 2016. Accessed November 30, 2019.

- 20. Witham M. Funding the need not the label. Presented at: AARE Conference; 2015; Western Australia, Australia.
- Nickel B, Barratt A, Copp T, Moynihan R, McCaffery K. Words do matter: a systematic review on how different terminology for the same condition influences management preferences. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e014129. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014129.
- 22. Copp T, McCaffery K, Azizi L, Doust J, Mol BWJ, Jansen J. Influence of the disease label 'polycystic ovary syndrome' on intention to have an ultrasound and psychosocial outcomes: a randomised online study in young women. *Hum Reprod* 2017;32:876-84. doi: 10.1093/humrep/dex029.
- 23. O'Keefe M. Do different diagnostic labels for low back pain influence management preferences: an online randomised controlled study. Presented at: Preventing Overdiagnosis Conference; December 5, 2019; Sydney, Australia.
- 24. Kavookjian J, Berger BA, Grimley DM, Villaume WA, Anderson HM, Barker KN. Patient decision making: strategies for diabetes diet adherence intervention. *Res Social Adm Pharm* 2005;1:389-407. doi: 10.1016/j.sapharm.2005.06.006.
- 25. Ogden J, Branson R, Bryett A, et al. What's in a name? An experimental study of patients' views of the impact and function of a diagnosis. *Fam Pract* 2003;20:248-53.
- 26. Macdonald LA, Sackett DL, Haynes RB, Taylor DW. Labelling in hypertension: A review of the behavioural and psychological consequences. *J Chronic Dis* 1984;37:933-42. doi: 10.1016/0021-968190070-5.
- 27. Cotter AR, Vuong K, Mustelin LL, et al. Do psychological harms result from being labelled with an unexpected diagnosis of abdominal aortic aneurysm or prostate cancer through screening? A systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e017565. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017565.
- Betsch TA, Gorodzinsky AY, Finley GA, et al. What's in a name? Health care providers' perceptions of pediatric pain patients based on diagnostic labels. *Clin J Pain* 2017;33:694-98. doi: 10.1097/ajp.00000000000454.
- 29. Lancaster AM. Impact of diagnostic versus emotional disturbance label on preservice teacher expectations of student academic, behavior, and social outcomes [PhD Thesis]. Mississippi: Mississippi State University; 2016.
- 30. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol* 2005;8:19-32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616.
- Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Soares CB, Khalil H, Parker D. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, eds. *Joanna Briggs Institute revier's manual*. The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017.
- 32. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169:467-73.
- 33. Ware JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36): conceptual framework and item selection. *Med care* 1992;30:473-83.
- 34. Goldberg D, Williams P. A User's Guide to the General Health Questionnaire. Windsor, Berks: NFER-Nelson. 1988.
- 35. Hong Q, Fabregues S, Bartlett G, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Educ Inf* 2018;34:285-291. doi: 10.3233/EFI-180221.

3
4
5
6
7
/ 0
ð
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
1/
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
31
24 25
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
ד∠ ⊿ר
45
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
51
52
53
54
55
56

36. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic
reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare
interventions, or both. BMJ 2017;358:j4008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008.

37. Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers.* 2nd ed. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. 2014.

to beet teriew only

Supplementary Material Search Strategies

PubMed

(Health[tiab] OR Illness[tiab] OR Disorder[tiab] OR Condition[tiab] OR Disease[tiab])

AND

((Psychological[ti] OR Label[tiab] OR Labelling[tiab] OR Labeling[tiab]) AND (Diagnosis[tiab] OR Diagnostic[tiab] OR Screening[Mesh] OR Screening[tiab] OR Screened[tiab]))

AND

(Patient[tiab] OR Patients[tiab] OR Individuals[tiab] OR Self[tiab] OR Parent[tiab] OR Family[tiab] OR Adult[tiab] OR Men[tiab] OR Women[tiab])

AND

(Attitude[Mesh] OR Awareness[tiab] OR Stigma[tiab] OR Beliefs[tiab] OR Well-being[tiab] OR Wellbeing[tiab] OR Meaning[tiab] OR Impact[tiab] OR Effect[tiab] OR Effects[tiab] OR Influence[tiab] OR Experience[tiab])

AND

("Systematic review"[tiab] OR "Systematic Review"[pt] OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev"[ta] OR "meta analysis"[pt] OR "meta analysis"[tiab] OR ((Search[tiab] OR Searched[tiab] OR Searches[tiab]) AND (PubMed[tiab] OR Medline[tiab] OR Database[tiab] OR Databases[tiab])) OR "randomized controlled trial"[pt] OR "controlled clinical trial"[pt] OR randomized[tiab] OR randomised[tiab] OR placebo[tiab] OR randomly[tiab] OR trial[tiab] OR groups[tiab] OR "Epidemiologic Studies"[Mesh] OR "case-control studies"[Mesh] OR "Cohort Studies"[Mesh] OR "case control"[tiab] OR Cohort[tiab] OR "Follow up"[tiab] OR Observational[tiab] OR Longitudinal[tiab] OR Prospective[tiab] OR retrospective[tiab] OR "cross sectional"[tiab] OR "Cross-Sectional Studies"[Mesh] OR Investigated[tiab] OR Analysis[tiab] OR Statistics[tiab] OR Data[tiab] OR "statistics and numerical data"[sh] OR "epidemiology"[sh])

NOT

(Animals[Mesh] NOT (Animals[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh]))

NOT

(Injections[Mesh] OR Open-Label[tiab] OR "Product Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Drug Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Affinity Labels"[Mesh] OR "Food Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Isotope Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Staining and Labeling"[Mesh] OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Primed In Situ Labeling"[Mesh] OR Rat[ti] OR Rats[ti] OR Mice[ti] OR Mouse[ti] OR Placebo[ti] OR "Drug effects"[sh] OR Drug[ti] OR Drugs[ti] OR "Food and Drug Administration"[ti] OR "Food labeling"[ti] OR "Calorie labeling"[ti] OR Injection[ti] OR Cigarette[ti])

1	
2	
3	Embase
4	(((Health:ti ah OR Illness:ti ah OR Disorder:ti ah OR Condition:ti ah OR Disease:ti ah)))
5	(((Incatin.ti,ao OK Inness.ti,ao OK Disorder.ti,ao OK Condition.ti,ao OK Disease.ti,ao)))
6	AND
/	((((Psychological:ti OR Label:ti,ab OR Labelling:ti,ab OR Labeling:ti,ab) AND
8	(Diagnosis:ti,ab OR Diagnostic:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR
9	Screened ti ab))))
10	
12	AND
13	(((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR
14	Family:ti,ab OR Adult:ti,ab OR Men:ti,ab OR Women:ti,ab)))
15	AND
16	(((Attitude: ti ab OD Awaranagg: ti ab OD Stigme: ti ab OD Deliafe: ti ab OD Wall being: ti ab
17	(((Autude.u,ao OK Awareness.u,ao OK Sugma.u,ao OK Beneis.u,ao OK weii-being.u,ao
18	OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR
19	Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab)))
20	AND
21	((("Systematic review": ti ab OP "Systematic Periow": it OP "Cochrone Detahase Syst
22	(((Systematic review .it,ab OK Systematic Review .it OK Coentrate Database Syst
25	Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab
24	OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR
26	Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR
27	randomized ti ab OR randomised ti ab OR placebo ti ab OR randomly ti ab OR trial ti ab OR
28	groupsiti ah OD "Enidemiologia Studiog" OD "ease control studiog" OD "Cohort Studiog" OD
29	groups.ii,ab OK Epidemiologic Studies OK case-control studies OK Conort Studies OK
30	"case control":ti,ab OR Cohort:ti,ab OR "Follow up":ti,ab OR Observational:ti,ab OR
31	Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
32	"Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated:ti,ab OR Analysis:ti,ab OR Statistics:ti,ab OR
33	Data:ti ah OR enidemiology:ti ah)))
34	NOT
36	NOT
37	(((Injections OR Open-Label:ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug
38	Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining
39	and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Ratti OR
40	Rate ti OR Mice ti OR Mouse ti OR Placeborti OR "Drug affects by" OR Drug ti OR
41	
42	Drugs:ti OR "Off Label":ti,ab OR Food AND "Drug Administration":ti OR "Food
43	labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti)))
44	
45	
46	
47	
40 40	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	

PsychINFO

((Health.ti,ab OR Illness.ti,ab OR Disorder.ti,ab OR Condition.ti,ab OR Disease.ti,ab)) AND (((Psychological.ti OR Label.ti,ab OR Labelling.ti,ab OR Labeling.ti,ab) AND (Diagnosis.ti,ab OR Diagnostic.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screened.ti,ab))) AND ((Patient.ti,ab OR Patients.ti,ab OR Individuals.ti,ab OR Self.ti,ab OR Parent.ti,ab OR Family.ti,ab OR Adult.ti,ab OR Men.ti,ab OR Women.ti,ab)) AND ((Attitude.ti,ab OR Awareness.ti,ab OR Stigma.ti,ab OR Beliefs.ti,ab OR Well-being.ti,ab OR Wellbeing.ti,ab OR Meaning.ti,ab OR Impact.ti,ab OR Effect.ti,ab OR Effects.ti,ab OR Influence.ti,ab OR Experience.ti,ab)) AND ((Systematic review.ti,ab OR Systematic Review.pt OR Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn OR meta analysis.pt OR meta analysis.ti,ab OR ((Search.ti,ab OR Searched.ti,ab OR Searches.ti,ab) AND (PubMed.ti,ab OR Medline.ti,ab OR Database.ti,ab OR Databases.ti,ab)) OR randomized controlled trial.pt OR controlled clinical trial.pt OR randomized.ti,ab OR randomised.ti,ab OR placebo.ti,ab OR randomly.ti,ab OR trial.ti,ab OR groups.ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR case control.ti,ab OR Cohort.ti,ab OR Follow up.ti,ab OR Observational.ti,ab OR Longitudinal.ti,ab OR Prospective.ti,ab OR retrospective.ti,ab OR cross sectional.ti,ab OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated.ti,ab OR Analysis.ti,ab OR Statistics.ti,ab OR Data.ti,ab OR epidemiology.ti,ab)) NOT

((Injections OR Open-Label.ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat.ti OR Rats.ti OR Mice.ti OR Mouse.ti OR Placebo.ti OR Drug effects.hw OR Drug.ti OR Drugs.ti OR Off Label.ti,ab OR Food and Drug Administration.ti OR Food labeling.ti OR Calorie labeling.ti OR Injection.ti OR Cigarette.ti))

1	
2	
3	Cochrane
4	(((Health:ti,ab OR Illness:ti,ab OR Disorder:ti,ab OR Condition:ti,ab OR Disease:ti,ab)))
6	AND
7	((((Payahological:ti OP Labol:ti ab OP Labolling:ti ab OP Laboling:ti ab) AND
8	((((Fsychological.ii) OK Label.ii,ab) OK Labelling.ii,ab) OK Labelling.ii,ab) AND
9	(Diagnosis:ti,ab OR Diagnostic:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR
10	Screened:ti,ab))))
11	AND
12	(((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR
13	Family ti ah OR Adult ti ah OR Men ti ah OR Women ti ah)))
15	
16	
17	(((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab
18	OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR
19	Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab)))
20	AND
21	((("Systematic review":ti ab OR "Systematic Review":nt OR "Cochrane Database Syst
22	Rev in "OR "mete enelvice" in OR "mete enelvice" it of OR ((Searchiti of OR Searchediti of
24	Rev. jn OK meta analysis .pi OK meta analysis .u,ab OK ((Search.u,ab OK Searched.u,ab
25	OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR
26	Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":pt OR "controlled clinical trial":pt OR
27	randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR
28	groups:ti.ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR
29	"case control": ti ab OR Cohort: ti ab OR "Follow un": ti ab OR Observational: ti ab OR
30 21	Langitudingliti ah OB Pregnantiverti ah OB retragnantiverti ah OB "areag gastional" it ah OB
32	Longitudinal:11,ab OR Prospective:11,ab OR retrospective:11,ab OR "cross sectional":11,ab OR
33	"Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated:ti,ab OR Analysis:ti,ab OR Statistics:ti,ab OR
34	Data:ti,ab OR epidemiology:ti,ab)))
35	NOT
36	(((Injections OR Open-Label:ti.ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug
37	Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining
38	and Labeling "OP "In Site Niele Fuel Labeling" OP "Deine d In Site Labeling" OP Detti OP
39	and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed in Situ Labeling" OR Rat:ti OR
40	Rats:ti OR Mice:ti OR Mouse:ti OR Placebo:ti OR "Drug effects.hw" OR Drug:ti OR
42	Drugs:ti OR "Off Label":ti,ab OR Food AND "Drug Administration":ti OR "Food
43	labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti)))
44	
45	
46	
4/	
40 49	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	

CINAHL

(((TI Health OR AB Health OR TI Illness OR AB Illness OR TI Disorder OR AB Disorder OR TI Condition OR AB Condition OR TI Disease OR AB Disease)))

AND

1 2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51 52

53

54

55 56

57

58

59 60 ((((TI Psychological OR TI Label OR AB Label OR TI Labelling OR AB Labelling OR TI Labeling OR AB Labeling) AND (TI Diagnosis OR AB Diagnosis OR TI Diagnostic OR AB Diagnostic OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screened OR AB Screened))))

AND

(((TI Patient OR AB Patient OR TI Patients OR AB Patients OR TI Individuals OR AB Individuals OR TI Self OR AB Self OR TI Parent OR AB Parent OR TI Family OR AB Family OR TI Adult OR AB Adult OR TI Men OR AB Men OR TI Women OR AB Women)))

AND

(((TI Attitude OR AB Attitude OR TI Awareness OR AB Awareness OR TI Stigma OR AB Stigma OR TI Beliefs OR AB Beliefs OR TI Well-being OR AB Well-being OR TI Wellbeing OR AB Wellbeing OR TI Meaning OR AB Meaning OR TI Impact OR AB Impact OR TI Effect OR AB Effect OR TI Effects OR AB Effects OR TI Influence OR AB Influence OR TI Experience OR AB Experience)))

AND

(((TI "Systematic review" OR AB "Systematic review" OR PT "Systematic Review" OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR PT "meta analysis" OR TI "meta analysis" OR AB "meta analysis" OR ((TI Search OR AB Search OR TI Searched OR AB Searched OR TI Searches OR AB Searches) AND (TI PubMed OR AB PubMed OR TI Medline OR AB Medline OR TI Database OR AB Database OR TI Databases OR AB Databases)) OR PT "randomized controlled trial" OR PT "controlled clinical trial" OR TI randomized OR AB randomized OR TI randomised OR AB randomised OR TI placebo OR AB placebo OR TI randomly OR AB randomly OR TI trial OR AB trial OR TI groups OR AB groups OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR TI "case control" OR AB "case control" OR TI Cohort OR AB Cohort OR TI "Follow up" OR AB "Follow up" OR TI Observational OR AB Observational OR TI Longitudinal OR AB Longitudinal OR TI Prospective OR AB Prospective OR TI retrospective OR AB retrospective OR TI "cross sectional" OR AB "cross sectional" OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR TI Investigated OR AB Investigated OR TI Analysis OR AB Analysis OR TI Statistics OR AB Statistics OR TI Data OR AB Data OR TI epidemiology OR AB epidemiology))) NOT

(((Injections OR TI Open-Label OR AB Open-Label OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR TI Rat OR TI Rats OR TI Mice OR TI Mouse OR TI Placebo OR "Drug effects.hw" OR TI Drug OR TI Drugs OR TI "Off Label" OR AB "Off Label" OR Food AND TI "Drug Administration" OR TI "Food labeling" OR TI "Calorie labeling" OR TI Injection OR TI Cigarette))) **BMJ** Open

BMJ Open

Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-037392.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Jun-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Sims, Rebecca; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Kazda, Luise; The University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health Michaleff, Zoe; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Glasziou, Paul; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Thomas, Rae; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare
Primary Subject Heading :	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT
	·





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2	_	
4	1	
5	2	
0 7 0	3	
8 9	4	Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review
10 11	5	
12	6	
13 14	7	
15 16	8	
17 18	9	
19	10	Rebecca Sims ¹ , Luise Kazda ² , Zoe A Michaleff ¹ , Paul Glasziou ¹ , Rae Thomas ¹
20 21	11	
22 23	12	
24 25	13	
26	14	
27 28	15	¹ Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond University
29 30	16	² Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney
31 32	17	
33	18	
34 35	19	
36 37	20	Corresponding author: Rae Thomas, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond
38	21	University, 14 University Drive, Robina QLD 4226. Email: rthomas@bond.edu.au
39 40	22	
41 42	23	
43 44	24	Keywords: labelling; diagnosis; consequences
45	25	
46 47	26	Word Count: 2063
48 49	27	
50 51	28	
52	29	
53 54	30	
55		
56 57		
58		
59 60		
00		

1

BMJ Open

2	
3	
1	
5	
د د	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
17	
т/ 40	
4ð	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
57	
54 57	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

24

25

ABSTRACT

Introduction. When health conditions are labelled it is often to classify and 2 communicate a set of symptoms. While diagnostic labelling can provide explanation for an 3 individual's symptoms, it can also impact how individuals and others view those symptoms. 4 Despite existing research regarding the effects of labelling health conditions, a synthesis of 5 these effects has not occurred. We will conduct a systematic scoping review to synthesise the 6 7 reported consequences and impact of being given a label for a health condition from an individual, societal and health practitioner perspective and explore in what context labelling 8 9 of health conditions is considered important.

Methods and analysis. The review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology 10 for Scoping Reviews. Searches will be conducted in five electronic databases (PubMed, 11 Embase, PsychINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL). Reference lists of included studies will be 12 screened and forward and backward citation searching of included articles will be conducted. 13 We will include reviews and original studies which describe the consequences for individuals 14 labelled with a non-cancer health condition. We will exclude hypothetical research designs 15 and studies focussed on the consequences of labelling cancer conditions, intellectual 16 disabilities, and/or social attributes. We will conduct thematic analyses for qualitative data 17 and descriptive or meta-analyses for quantitative data where appropriate. 18

Ethics and dissemination. Ethical approval is not required for a scoping review.
Results will be disseminated via publication in a peer-reviewed journal, conference
presentations, and lay-person summaries on various online platforms. Findings from this
systematic scooping review will identify gaps in current understanding of how, when, why,
and for whom a diagnostic label is important and inform future research.

BMJ Open

1		
2 3	1	Strongths and limitations of this study
4	T	Strengths and minitations of this study
5 6 7	2	- The findings of this scoping review will be informed by a broad, comprehensive
8 9	3	search strategy that will be conducted in 5 electronic databases.
10 11 12	4	- We will include both qualitative and quantitative studies which will enhance our
13 14	5	current understanding of the consequences of health condition labelling.
15 16 17	6	- Two reviewers will screen 10% of titles and abstracts, extract data and assess quality
17 18 19	7	of included studies.
20 21	8	- Eligibility will not be limited to specific health conditions, therefore, the
22 23 24	9	consequences identified will be generalisable to health condition labelling more
25 26	10	broadly.
27 28 29	11	- Articles will be limited to peer-reviewed publications and not include grey or theory-
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1 2

BMJ Open

INTRODUCTION

3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
g		
1	ი	
1	1	
1	ว	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	, 8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
2	7	
2	8	
2	9	
3	0	
3	1	
3	2	
3	3	
3	4	
3	5	
3	6	
3	7	
3	8	
3	9	
4	0	
4	1	
4	2	
4	3	
4	4	
4	5	
4	6	
4	7	
4	8	
4	9	
5	0	
5	1	
5	2	
5	3	
5	4	
5	5	
5	6	
5	/	
5	8	
5	y	

60

The diagnosis of physical and psychological health conditions is increasing in
prevalence. ¹⁻⁵ Diagnoses often occur in the context of individuals seeking to identify and
treat symptoms. However, diagnoses can also occur as a result of screening tests where
individuals have no discernible signs or symptoms of disease (such as when a routine test
determines an individual has hypertension), ⁶ from unanticipated findings in investigations for
other health concerns (such as identifying an anomaly in a person's thyroid when conducting
an MRI of the spine), ⁷ or, when people are newly diagnosed with a health condition because
of changes to diagnostic thresholds or cut-offs for the condition opposed to changes in
individual circumstances (such as for gestational diabetes). ¹ The value of a diagnosis,
particularly in these latter contexts, is not always evident and the risk of over- and mis-
diagnosis is significant. ¹⁸⁹

Diagnostic labels provide healthcare professionals with a framework from which to organise and interpret clinical symptom presentations, support clinical decision making through directing treatment decisions, and provide information on possible condition course and overall prognosis.^{10 11} Further, diagnostic labels allow clinicians to assume homogeneity amongst members of patient groups, in addition to providing an efficient method for health professionals to communicate.¹²

Despite well-meaning intentions, application of diagnostic labels in real-world
practice can be problematic. Diagnostic criteria can often be ambiguous. For example,
symptoms of anxiety, such as restlessness, fatigue, or difficulty concentrating, may be
explained by diagnoses of anxiety, depressive, or bipolar and related disorders.^{13 14} Similarly,
chest pain symptoms may be explained by several alternative diagnostic categories such as
inflammatory diseases, musculoskeletal conditions, or coronary diseases.^{15 16} Lastly, non-

BMJ Open

specific low back pain is the leading cause of disability worldwide, yet for the majority of
 people no pathoanatomical cause can be identified.¹⁷

From the perspective of a patient, a diagnostic label can have a significant impact (negative and positive) on their health outcomes, psychological wellbeing, and behaviour, and can influence how they are viewed and managed by healthcare professionals and are perceived by other members in society (e.g. school, workplace).³⁵¹⁸ In a cohort of over 33,000 adults, individuals who were aware that they had hypertension reported elevated levels of psychological distress compared to those individuals who had hypertension, however, were unaware of this.³ A study investigating the impact of labelling borderline personality disorder on clinician interpretation of patient symptoms found clinicians' prior awareness of a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder, compared to no awareness, resulted in a tendency to frame observations of the individual in terms of the label, and a failure to observe positive behaviours.¹²

Conversely, a diagnostic label may have positive effects on the individual. These include timely referral to necessary healthcare which, in turn, can reduce morbidity and mortality, improve predictions regarding condition progression as well as facilitate access to support, services and resources (for example, diagnosis based school funding^{19 20} and social support⁵) and provide an explanation and validation of an individual's signs and symptoms. A recent study exploring the impact of chronic fatigue syndrome using hypothetical scenarios of a close friend's diagnosis reported a label of chronic fatigue, compared with no label, elicited higher sympathetic responses from participants, greater potential social support, and greater support for active treatment.⁵

The terms used to describe a diagnostic label have been found to influence an
individual's behaviour, psychological well-being and treatment preferences. Specifically, a
diagnostic label that uses medicalised and precise terminology compared with a description

Page 7 of 23

1 2

BMJ Open

2	
л Л	
4 5	
S	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
11	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
20	
24	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
37	
25	
22	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
45	
40	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
20	
5/	
58	
59	
60	

of symptoms has been found to result in higher patient anxiety, greater perceived severity of 1 the condition and a patient preference of more invasive treatments.^{18 21-23} This has been 2 evidenced in conditions including gastro-oesophageal reflux disease, polycystic ovary 3 syndrome, bone fracture, and low back pain.^{18 21-23} Similarly, research suggests that patients 4 diagnosed with diabetes demonstrate a propensity to medical interventions, including insulin 5 use, oral medication taking, and blood glucose monitoring, compared to less invasive 6 interventions, such as changes to diet and exercise practices.²⁴ The use of a medicalised label 7 over a descriptive label for a health condition is also suggested to result in increased 8 9 confidence in the medical professional and greater adoption of sick role behaviour.²⁵ Alternatively, use of descriptive labels for health conditions was found to be associated with 10 greater patient ownership of the condition.²⁵ 11 To date, our understanding of the consequences and impacts of a diagnostic label has 12 been limited to a single perspective (e.g. patient, health care practitioner), single condition 13 (e.g. gastro-oesophageal reflux disease), or restricted to a specific study design (e.g. 14 hypothetical research design) and a comprehensive synthesis of this information across health 15 conditions is lacking.^{26 27} Further, exploring the real world impact of a diagnostic label 16 including benefits and harms has received little attention.²² ²⁸ ²⁹ Therefore, the aims of this 17 systematic scoping review are to systematically review original and synthesised research 18 exploring the consequences of being given a label for a health condition to: 19 20 1. Identify the range of potential consequences of labelling of health conditions from an individual, societal, and health practitioner viewpoint; 21 2. Explore why, for whom, and in what contexts labelling of health conditions is, or is not, 22 23 influential; and, 3. Evaluate the methods used to study the impact of labelling health conditions. 24

25

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
3/
38
39
40
41
4Z 42
45 44
44 15
45 46
40 47
47 18
40 40
50
50
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 2

1

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Scoping reviews are suggested as an alternative to systematic reviews, allowing for a 2 broader examination and synthesis of existing research and identification of research gaps.³⁰ 3 The proposed systematic scoping review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology for 4 Scoping Reviews,³¹ and adhere to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and 5 Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR).³² This approach was 6 selected to allow sufficient documentation of the review process. An initial search was 7 conducted in August 2019 to pilot the screening process and data extraction spreadsheet. The 8 9 review is expected to be complete by October 2020.

10

11

Consumer involvement in scoping review design and framework development

A convenience sampling survey was conducted to explore the publics opinion of the 12 consequences of diagnostic label for health conditions. In April 2019, we posted the 13 questions "What are the labelling consequences of being given a health diagnosis? We're 14 working up a list and so far we have: anxiety, relief, more tests, stigma, medico-legal 15 problems. What else?" on two social media platforms, Facebook and Twitter. Responses on 16 Facebook included 14 comments from six individuals, while Twitter responses resulted in 45 17 comments from 40 individuals. The results of this survey were used to inform the 18 development of the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction form, and 19 20 an initial qualitative framework (Table 1) that will be used in this scoping review.

21 Table 1. Coding Framework of Social Media Responses.

Name	Description		Examples
Psychological Impact	Psychological impact of	-	Increased self-understanding
	diagnosis	-	Stigma (internalised stigma
			(self); perceived stigma from
			others)

			-	Increased psychological
				distress (anxiety, depression,
				phobia, worry, fear, stress)
Support		Support gained or loss	-	Support groups: Increased
		as a result of diagnosis		support of others with similar
				diagnosis; network with
				other patients
			-	Others less respectful, more
				withdrawn and judgemental
Development	Education	Seeking to become more	-	Increase in health literacy
		informed on diagnoses,		due to motivation to find
		testing, intervention		about treatment options
	Planning	Forward planning and	-	Ability to plan – even if there
		decision making as a		may not be treatment,
		result of diagnosis		provides opportunity to get
				affairs in order (e.g. wills).
Lifestyle	Behaviour	Behaviour changes as a	-	Change diet
		result of diagnosis	-	Change lifestyle
	Employment	Effect of diagnosis on	-	More Sick days; Time off
		employment		work; absenteeism
	Financial	Effect of diagnosis on	-	Diagnosis provides access to
		finances		funds (e.g. Medicare, NDIS,
				insurance)
Service Use	Testing	Further assessment and	-	Seeking more investigations
		tests as a result of	-	Scans and imaging
		diagnosis (including	-	Encourages screening of
		testing of family)		other family members at
				low-risk of the condition
	Treatment	Treatment and	-	Clear Treatment path; clearer
		intervention as a result		treatment protocols
		of diagnosis	-	Side-effects (of medication
				sexual, agitation, suicidality,
Inclusion criteria

Peer reviewed publications including systematic or literature reviews and original studies which describe the perceived consequences for individuals labelled with a non-cancer health condition will be included. Perceived consequences can be reported from the perspectives of the individuals, their family, friends, and/or carers, or health professionals. As we expect individuals labelled as having a cancer condition will have different experiences to those labelled with general health conditions, studies that focus on these samples are excluded. Similarly, studies that report the consequence of labels for people using hypothetical case scenarios, or individuals with intellectual disabilities and/or social attributes such as race, sexual identity or orientation will also be excluded (see Table 2 for more details).

Table 2. Inclusion Criteria

Aspect	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Types of	Original Studies (Cohort, Case-	Protocols (final study to be sourced)
studies	Controlled, Cross-Sectional,	Opinion pieces and commentaries
	Observational, RCT, Focus	Quantitative Cohort, Case-Controlled,
	Groups)*	and Cross-Sectional studies without
	Synthesised Studies (Systematic	comparator
	Reviews)	Hypothetical or vignette based studies
	*Studies utilising qualitative	
	methodologies do not require	
	multiple group comparisons for	
	inclusion.	

Participants	Individuals, no age limit (e.g. adults,	Animal subjects
	children, family, carers, health	
	professionals, general public)	
Condition	Screening and/or labelling of	Labelling of intellectual impairment,
	physical or psychological health	race, ethnicity, sexual identity or
	condition/s	sexual orientation
	Self-reported (e.g. response to	Labelling of cancers and cancer
	questions such as "has your GP ever	related conditions
	told you that you have	Self-reported conditions provided by
	hypertension?")	unqualified professional (e.g.
	Health condition confirmed (e.g.	physiotherapist telling patient they
	medical examination and testing	have hypertension)
	completed as part of the study)	Self-identified conditions (e.g.
		googling of symptoms, no
		confirmation by medical professional)
Outcomes	Consequences, impact, effects of the	Effect of the health condition (e.g.
	health condition label or diagnosis	disease mechanisms/traits)
	Perceived harms and/or benefits	Gene labelling
	(e.g. illness burden)	Food or nutrition labelling
	- Lived experience	Drug effects/effectiveness
	- Psychological impact (e.g.	Intervention effects/effectiveness
	anxiety, quality of life)	(e.g. intervention A vs intervention B)
	- Behaviour change (e.g.	
	participation in employment)	

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
11	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
22	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
12	
45	
44	
45	
46	
47	
40	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
22	
54	
55	
56	
57	
50	
20	
59	

	- Support (e.g. financial,	
	social support)	
Language	No language limitations	-
Date	No date limitations	-

2 **Search strategy**

1

3 A structured search, developed in collaboration with an information specialist, of five electronic databases (PubMed, Embase, PsychINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL) will be conducted 4 to identify relevant publications. Databases will be searched from their inception. 5 Preliminary searches were conducted in August 2019 and will be updated in June 2020. 6 Reference lists of included articles will be searched and forward citation searching of 7 included articles will be conducted. The full search strategy to be used is reported in the 8 evie 9 Supplementary Material.

10

19

20

21

60

Study selection 11

Titles and abstracts of 10% of articles retrieved through electronic and manual 12 searches will be independently screened by two reviewers (RS and LK) for eligibility against 13 the pre-specified inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion and 14 consultation with additional reviewers as required. When interrater reliability (Kappa) >0.8 15 is achieved for the screened studies, remaining studies will continue to be screened by one 16 reviewer (RS). Articles identified as unclear for inclusion will be reviewed by an additional 17 18 reviewer as required.

BMJ Open

1 Data extraction	
-------------------	--

Full text publications will be obtained for any potentially relevant studies and will be screened for inclusion against the same inclusion criteria by one reviewer (RS). Additional uncertainties regarding eligibility for inclusion will be resolved through discussion with two other reviewers (RT and PG). Two reviewers (RS and ZAM) will independently extract study meta-data and quantitative data from 10% of included studies using a standardised data extraction form in Microsoft Excel that will be piloted prior to full-text data extraction.

These same reviewers will also extract qualitative data from 10% of studies using NVivo version 12. Conflicts will be resolved by a third party as required. When interrater reliability (Kappa) >0.8 is achieved for extracted data, one reviewer (RS) will continue to extract data from a random sample of one-third of the remaining included studies, expanding and amending the coding framework as required. Queries will be resolved through discussion with a second reviewer (ZAM). A second third of the remaining included studies will be randomly selected and reviewed, and data extracted to the coding framework, which will be expanded and amended as necessary. Data saturation will be defined using indicative thematic saturation, which states data saturation as the non-emergence of new codes or themes.³³ Extracted data will include study characteristics (author, journal, year of publication, study country and setting), participant characteristics (number of participants, age, health condition), and outcomes (consequences, impact, effects of the diagnostic label). For qualitative studies, we will extract author reported themes and supporting quotes provided in the published manuscripts and apply these to the coding framework. For studies with quantitative measures, extracted data will include, but is not limited to, author summaries of primary and secondary outcomes from validated and unvalidated measures (for example, Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)³⁴, or General Health Questionnaire (GHQ)³⁵), as identified in the results section of the published study.

Patient and public involvement

This scoping review has no direct patient involvement.

Study quality

Study quality will be assessed using appraisal tools appropriate for the designs identified, for example, the McGill Mixed Methods Critical Appraisal Tool (MMAT)³⁶ will be used for original studies and Assessing the Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews, version 2 (AMSTAR-2)³⁷ will be used for systematic reviews. The former critical appraisal tool has been developed for evaluating original studies utilising qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methodologies, while the latter tool was developed for appraising the quality of systematic reviews which include randomised or non-randomised studies. Quality assessment will be conducted independently by two authors (RS and ZAM) for 10% of the included studies. Conflicts will be resolved through discussion or by a third reviewer, as R necessary.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

We will present study selection in a flow diagram according to PRISMA-Scr and included studies will be described in a table of characteristics.³² Results will be aggregated as appropriate. Results pertinent to the consequences of labelling of health conditions will be collated to expand those provided in Table 1, with empirical data regarding rate and severity of these consequences also examined. Additionally, a compendium of methods used to elicit consequences of health condition labelling will be developed and methodology appraised. For quantitative studies, extracted data will be tabulated in a descriptive and/or statistical manner depending on the availability of data (i.e. number of studies reporting similar outcome measures or measurement of similar constructs, such as quality of life or symptoms

BMJ Open

of anxiety) and degree of heterogeneity between studies (e.g. population, clinical conditions). Should data not support a meta-analysis, results from studies which provide quantitative data will be reported in a narrative synthesis and interpreted alongside results from qualitative studies. Qualitative data will be analysed using developed frameworks (see Table 1), and following established protocols for the qualitative analysis of information in the social sciences.³⁸ The characteristics and results of all included studies will be reported in tables and summarised in text.

Ethics and Dissemination

As the current study is a systematic scoping review protocol, ethics is not required. Dissemination of results will be made public via peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations and lay-person summaries on various on-line platforms (e.g. The Conversation).

1 ว				
2 3 4	1	REQUIRED STATEMENTS		
5 6 7	2	Twitter: Rebecca Sims @BecSims90, Luise Kazda @LuiseKazda, Zoe A Michaleff		
7 8 9	3	@ZoeMichaleff, Paul Glasziou @PaulGlasziou, Rae Thomas @rthomasEBP		
10 11	4	Acknowledgements: The authors thank Justin Clark, Senior Research Information Specialist		
12 13	5	at the Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University for assistance with		
14 15 16	6	constructing the search strategy.		
17 18	7	Author Contributions: RS, PG, and RT contributed to the conception and design of the		
19 20 21	8	protocol, initial public 'survey' and construction of the search terms. RS, LK, and ZAM		
21 22 23	9	contributed to screening and data analysis. RS, ZAM, RT, and PG contributed to the drafting		
24 25	10	of the manuscript and all authors approved the final version.		
26 27	11	Funding: RS is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program		
28 29 30	12	Scholarship. RT and ZAM are supported by a National Health and Medical Research		
31 32	13	Council Program grant (#1106452). LK is supported by a Centres of Research Excellence		
33 34	14	Grant (#1104136). PG is supported by a NHMRC Research Fellowship (#1080042). The		
35 36 37	15	funding sources have no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data		
37 38 39	16	interpretation, or writing of the report.		
40 41	17	Competing Interests: None declared.		
42 43	18	Patient consent for publication: Not required.		
44 45	19	Orcid iDs: Rebecca Sims https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1604-8354		
46 47 48	20	Luise Kazda http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4105-0402		
49 50	21	Zoe A Michaleff https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0360-4956		
51 52	22	Paul Glasziou https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7564-073X		
53 54 55	23	Rae Thomas http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2165-5917		
56 57 58 59 60	24			

1		
2		
3	1	REFERENCES
4 5		
6	2	1. Sexton H, Heal C, Banks J, Braniff K. Impact of new diagnostic criteria for gestational
7	3	diabetes. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 2018;44:425-31. doi: 10.1111/jog.13544.
8	4	2. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National Health Survey: First Results, 2017-18. Web site:
9	5	https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4364.0.55.001. Updated May 27, 2019.
10	6	Accessed November 30, 2019.
11	7	3. Hamer M. Batty GD. Stamatakis E. Kivimaki M. Hypertension awareness and
12	8	psychological distress. <i>Hypertens</i> 2010:56:547-50. doi:
13	9	10 1161/hypertensionaha 110 153775
14 15	10	4 Thombs BD Kwakkenbos L Levis AW Benedetti A Addressing overestimation of the
16	11	prevalence of depression based on self-report screening questionnaires <i>Can Med</i>
17	12	Assoc J 2018:190:E44 doi: 10.1503/cmai.170691
18	13	5 Noble S Bonner C Hersch L Jansen I McGeechan K McCaffery K Could disease
19	1/	labelling have positive effects? An experimental study exploring the effect of the
20	15	chronic fatigue syndrome label on intended social support. Patient Educ Cours
21	16	2010:102:486 03 doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2018.10.011
22	17	6 Walker MI Pagers WA Diagnosis parretive identity and esymptometic disease. Theory
23 24	10	Mod Biosth 2017:28:207 21 doi: 10.1007/s11017.017.0412.1
24	10	7 Hirometh SP. Poto I. Pognaud A. Etionno I. Eitsiori A. Vargas MI. Incidentalomas in
26	19	7. International SD, Boto J, Regilatud A, Etternie L, Fitsion A, Valgas Mi. Incidentationals in
27	20	$10, 1007/_{0}0062, 010, 00772, 5$
28	21	P. Dougt I. Classica D. Is the problem that averything is a diagnosic? Aust Fam Dhusician
29	22	8. Doust J, Glasziou P. Is the problem that everything is a diagnosis? Aust Fum Physician
30	23	2015,42.850-9. O Bradaman I. Sahwarta I.M. Hanashan C. O'Sullivan IW. Arangan IV. Walashin S.
31	24	9. Brodersen J, Schwartz LM, Henegnan C, O Sullivan JW, Aronson JK, Wolosnin S.
32 33	25	Overdiagnosis: what it is and what it isn t. BMJ Evid Based Med 2018;23:1-3. doi:
34	26	10.1136/ebmed-201/-110886.
35	27	10. Frances A, First M, Pincus HA, Widiger I, Davis W. An introduction to DSM-IV. Hosp
36	28	Community Psychiatry 1990;41:493-95.
37	29	11. Croft P, Altman DG, Deeks JJ, et al. The science of clinical practice: disease diagnosis or
38	30	patient prognosis? Evidence about "what is likely to happen" should shape clinical
39	31	practice. BMC Med 2015;13:20. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0265-4.
40 1	32	12. Lam DC, Poplavskaya EV, Salkovskis PM, Hogg LI, Panting H. An experimental
42	33	investigation of the impact of personality disorder diagnosis on clinicians: can we see
43	34	past the borderline? Behav Cogn Psychother 2016;44:361-73. doi:
44	35	10.1017/s1352465815000351.
45	36	13. Allsopp K, Read J, Corcoran R, Kinderman P. Heterogeneity in psychiatric diagnostic
46	37	classification. <i>Psychiatry Res</i> 2019;279:15-22. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2019.07.005
47	38	14. American Psychological Association. <i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental</i>
48 40	39	Disorders, Fifth Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 2013.
49 50	40	15. Christiansen J. Less is more: chest pain pathways in clinical care. <i>Med J Aust</i>
51	41	2017;207:193-94. doi: 10.5694/mja17.00331
52	42	16. Sturm C, Witte T. Musculoskeletal-related chest pain. <i>Der Internist</i> 2017;58:39-46. doi:
53	43	10.1007/s00108-016-0166-z.
54	44	17. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to
55	45	pay attention. <i>Lancet</i> 2018;391:2356-67. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30480-x.
56 57	46	18. Scherer LD, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Fagerlin A, Tarini BA. Influence of "GERD" label on
57 58	47	parents' decision to medicate infants. Pediatr 2013;131:839-45. doi:
59	48	10.1542/peds.2012-3070.
60		

2		
3	1	19 Parliament of Australia Access to real learning, the impact of policy funding and culture
4	2	on students with disability
5	2	https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Education_and
6	2	Employment/students, with disability/Penort Published 2016 Accessed November
/	4 E	20 2010
8	5	50, 2019. 20 Withow M. Eunding the need not the lobal Dresented at: AADE Conference: 2015:
9 10	6	20. Witham M. Funding the need not the label. Presented at: AARE Conference, 2015,
11	/	western Australia, Australia.
12	8	21. Nickel B, Barratt A, Copp T, Moynihan R, McCaffery K. Words do matter: a systematic
13	9	review on how different terminology for the same condition influences management
14	10	preferences. <i>BMJ Open</i> 2017;7:e014129. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014129.
15	11	22. Copp T, McCaffery K, Azızı L, Doust J, Mol BWJ, Jansen J. Influence of the disease
16	12	label 'polycystic ovary syndrome' on intention to have an ultrasound and psychosocial
17	13	outcomes: a randomised online study in young women. <i>Hum Reprod</i> 2017;32:876-84.
18	14	doi: 10.1093/humrep/dex029.
19 20	15	23. O'Keefe M. Do different diagnostic labels for low back pain influence management
20	16	preferences: an online randomised controlled study. Presented at: Preventing
22	17	Overdiagnosis Conference; December 5, 2019; Sydney, Australia.
23	18	24. Kavookjian J, Berger BA, Grimley DM, Villaume WA, Anderson HM, Barker KN.
24	19	Patient decision making: strategies for diabetes diet adherence intervention. Res
25	20	Social Adm Pharm 2005;1:389-407. doi: 10.1016/j.sapharm.2005.06.006.
26	21	25. Ogden J, Branson R, Bryett A, et al. What's in a name? An experimental study of patients'
27	22	views of the impact and function of a diagnosis. Fam Pract 2003;20:248-53.
28	23	26. Macdonald LA, Sackett DL, Havnes RB, Taylor DW. Labelling in hypertension: A
29	24	review of the behavioural and psychological consequences. J Chronic Dis
31	25	1984:37:933-42. doi: 10.1016/0021-968190070-5.
32	26	27 Cotter AR Vuong K Mustelin LL et al Do psychological harms result from being
33	27	labelled with an unexpected diagnosis of abdominal aortic aneurysm or prostate
34	28	cancer through screening? A systematic review <i>BMLOpen</i> 2017;7:e017565 doi:
35	20	10 1136/hmionen_2017_017565
36	20	28 Betsch TA Gorodzinsky AV Finley GA et al What's in a name? Health care providers'
37	21	perceptions of pediatric pain patients based on diagnostic labels. <i>Clin I Pain</i>
20	27	2017:33:694-98 doi: 10.1097/gip.000000000000454
40	22 22	2017,55.074-78. doi: 10.1077/ajp.0000000000000454.
41	22 24	29. Landaster AM. Impuci of diagnostic versus emotional distarbance laber on preservice
42	34 25	Thesial Mississinni: Mississinni State University: 2016
43	35	Inesisj. Mississippi. Mississippi State University, 2010.
44	30	Der Methodal 2005, 8, 10, 22, dai: 10, 1080/1264557022000110616
45	37	Res Melhoaol 2005;8:19-52. dol: 10.1080/150455/052000119010.
46	38	31. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Soares CB, Knalli H, Parker D. In: Aromataris E,
4/	39	Munn Z, eds. Joanna Briggs Institute revier's manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute,
40 70	40	
5 0	41	32. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-
51	42	ScR): checklist and explanation. Ann Intern Med 2018;169:467-73.
52	43	33. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T et al. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its
53	44	conceptualisation and operationalisation. <i>Qual Quant</i> 2018;52:1893-1907.
54	45	doi:10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8.
55	46	34. Ware JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36):
56	47	conceptual framework and item selection. Med care 1992;30:473-83.
57 58	48	35. Goldberg D, Williams P. A User's Guide to the General Health Questionnaire. Windsor,
50 59	49	Berks: NFER-Nelson. 1988.
60		

 version 2018 for mformation professionals and researchers. Educ Inf 2018;34:285-291. doi:10.32374/EF1480221. 37. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healtheare interventions, or both. BMJ 2017;358;14008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008. 38. Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, eds. Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. 2nd ed. London, UF Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 10 11 	2 3 4	1	36. Hong Q, Fabregues S, Bartlett G, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)
 291. doi: 10.3233/EP1-180221. 37. Shee BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. <i>BMJ</i> 2017;358;j4008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008. 38. Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, eds. <i>Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers</i>. 2nd ed. London, UK Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 	5	2	version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. <i>Educ Inf</i> 2018;34:285-
 57. Site De, Weis De, Weis De, Weis A. Site and omised and apprils an oot hysteriate reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both <i>BMJ</i> 2017;358;4008. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4008. 7 38. Ritchie J., Lewis J., McNaughton Nicholls C., Ormston R., eds. <i>Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers</i>. 2nd ed. London, UF Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 10 11 	6	3 1	291. doi: 10.3233/EF1-180221. 37 Shea BL Reeves BC Wells G et al AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic
 a Totewo ministration for the solution for the solution of the soluti	/ 8	4 5	reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare
 38. Ritchiel, J. Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, eds. <i>Qualitative Research</i> Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. 2nd ed. London, UB Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 	9	6	interventions or both <i>BMI</i> 2017:358:j4008 doi: 10.1136/bmj j4008
 Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers. 2nd ed. London, UK Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 10 11 11 10 11 11 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 11 10 11 10 11 10 11 10 11 10 11 11 12 14 10 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 11 10 11 10 11 11 11 12 13 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 11 11 10 11 11 11 11 12 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 10 10 10 11 10 10 11 10 11 11 11 12 14 15 15 16 17 18 19 19 10 11 11 12 14 15 16 17 17 18 19 19 10 <	10	7	38 Ritchie I Lewis I McNaughton Nicholls C Ormston R eds <i>Qualitative Research</i>
3 9 Sage Publications Ltd. 2014. 10 11 11 10 12 10 13 10 14 10 15 11 16 11 17 11 18 10 19 10 10 11 11 10 12 10 13 10 14 10 15 10 16 11 17 11 18 10 19 10 10 10 11 10 12 10 13 10 14 10 15 10 16 10 17 10 18 10 19 10 10 10 11 10 12 10 13 10 14 10	11	, 8	Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers 2nd ed London UK
	12	9	Sage Publications Ltd. 2014.
	13 14		
	15	10	
57 58 59 60	$\begin{array}{c} 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 32\\ 4\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56\\ 56$	11	
58 59 60	57		
60	ох 59		
	60		

Supplementary Material Search Strategies

PubMed

(Health[tiab] OR Illness[tiab] OR Disorder[tiab] OR Condition[tiab] OR Disease[tiab])

AND

((Psychological[ti] OR Label[tiab] OR Labelling[tiab] OR Labeling[tiab]) AND (Diagnosis[tiab] OR Diagnostic[tiab] OR Screening[Mesh] OR Screening[tiab] OR Screened[tiab]))

AND

(Patient[tiab] OR Patients[tiab] OR Individuals[tiab] OR Self[tiab] OR Parent[tiab] OR Family[tiab] OR Adult[tiab] OR Men[tiab] OR Women[tiab])

AND

(Attitude[Mesh] OR Awareness[tiab] OR Stigma[tiab] OR Beliefs[tiab] OR Well-being[tiab] OR Wellbeing[tiab] OR Meaning[tiab] OR Impact[tiab] OR Effect[tiab] OR Effects[tiab] OR Influence[tiab] OR Experience[tiab])

AND

("Systematic review"[tiab] OR "Systematic Review"[pt] OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev"[ta] OR "meta analysis"[pt] OR "meta analysis"[tiab] OR ((Search[tiab] OR Searched[tiab] OR Searches[tiab]) AND (PubMed[tiab] OR Medline[tiab] OR Database[tiab] OR Databases[tiab])) OR "randomized controlled trial"[pt] OR "controlled clinical trial"[pt] OR randomized[tiab] OR randomised[tiab] OR placebo[tiab] OR randomly[tiab] OR trial[tiab] OR groups[tiab] OR "Epidemiologic Studies"[Mesh] OR "case-control studies"[Mesh] OR "Cohort Studies"[Mesh] OR "case control"[tiab] OR Cohort[tiab] OR "Follow up"[tiab] OR Observational[tiab] OR Longitudinal[tiab] OR Prospective[tiab] OR Investigated[tiab] OR Analysis[tiab] OR Statistics[tiab] OR Data[tiab] OR "statistics and numerical data"[sh] OR "epidemiology"[sh])

NOT

(Animals[Mesh] NOT (Animals[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh]))

NOT

(Injections[Mesh] OR Open-Label[tiab] OR "Product Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Drug Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Affinity Labels"[Mesh] OR "Food Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Isotope Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Staining and Labeling"[Mesh] OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Primed In Situ Labeling"[Mesh] OR Rat[ti] OR Rats[ti] OR Mice[ti] OR Mouse[ti] OR Placebo[ti] OR "Drug effects"[sh] OR Drug[ti] OR Drugs[ti] OR "Food and Drug Administration"[ti] OR "Food labeling"[ti] OR "Calorie labeling"[ti] OR Injection[ti] OR Cigarette[ti])

1	
2	
5 4	Embase
5	(((Health:ti,ab OR Illness:ti,ab OR Disorder:ti,ab OR Condition:ti,ab OR Disease:ti,ab)))
6	AND
7	((((Psychological:ti OR Label:ti,ab OR Labelling:ti,ab OR Labeling:ti,ab) AND
8	(Diagnosis:ti.ab OR Diagnostic:ti.ab OR Screening:ti.ab OR Screening:ti.ab OR
9 10	(2 ingression, as off 2 ingression, as off 2 of offining a, as off 2 of 2 of 0 officially as off
10	
12	
13	(((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR
14	Family:ti,ab OR Adult:ti,ab OR Men:ti,ab OR Women:ti,ab)))
15	AND
16 17	(((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab
17	OR Wellbeing:ti.ab OR Meaning:ti.ab OR Impact:ti.ab OR Effect:ti.ab OR Effects:ti.ab OR
19	Influence ti ab OR Experience ti ab)))
20	
21	
22	((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":it OR "Cochrane Database Syst
23	Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab
25	OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR
26	Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR
27	randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR
28	groups:ti.ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR
29	"case control":ti ah OR Cohort:ti ah OR "Follow un":ti ah OR Observational:ti ah OR
30 31	L'angitudingliti al OR Progractivati al OR retragractivati al OR "graces sectional" it al OR
32	Longitudinal: u,ao OK Prospective: u,ao OK retrospective: u,ao OK cross sectional : u,ao OK
33	"Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated:ti,ab OR Analysis:ti,ab OR Statistics:ti,ab OR
34	Data:ti,ab OR epidemiology:ti,ab)))
35	NOT
36	(((Injections OR Open-Label:ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug
37	Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining
39	and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Ratiti OR
40	Rate ti OR Mice ti OR Mouse ti OR Placebo ti OR "Drug effects bw" OR Drug ti OR
41	Dresset OD "Off I shall to a OD Es ad AND "Dress A dreising the OD "Es ad
42	Drugs: ti OR Off Label : ti, ab OR Food AND Drug Administration : ti OR Food
43	labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti)))
44 45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
SQ	

PsychINFO

((Health.ti,ab OR Illness.ti,ab OR Disorder.ti,ab OR Condition.ti,ab OR Disease.ti,ab)) AND (((Psychological.ti OR Label.ti,ab OR Labelling.ti,ab OR Labeling.ti,ab) AND (Diagnosis.ti,ab OR Diagnostic.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screened.ti,ab))) AND ((Patient.ti,ab OR Patients.ti,ab OR Individuals.ti,ab OR Self.ti,ab OR Parent.ti,ab OR Family.ti,ab OR Adult.ti,ab OR Men.ti,ab OR Women.ti,ab)) AND ((Attitude.ti,ab OR Awareness.ti,ab OR Stigma.ti,ab OR Beliefs.ti,ab OR Well-being.ti,ab OR Wellbeing.ti,ab OR Meaning.ti,ab OR Impact.ti,ab OR Effect.ti,ab OR Effects.ti,ab OR Influence.ti,ab OR Experience.ti,ab)) AND ((Systematic review.ti,ab OR Systematic Review.pt OR Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn OR meta analysis.pt OR meta analysis.ti,ab OR ((Search.ti,ab OR Searched.ti,ab OR Searches.ti,ab) AND (PubMed.ti,ab OR Medline.ti,ab OR Database.ti,ab OR Databases.ti,ab)) OR randomized controlled trial.pt OR controlled clinical trial.pt OR randomized.ti,ab OR randomised.ti,ab OR placebo.ti,ab OR randomly.ti,ab OR trial.ti,ab OR groups.ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR case control.ti,ab OR Cohort.ti,ab OR Follow up.ti,ab OR Observational.ti,ab OR Longitudinal.ti,ab OR Prospective.ti,ab OR retrospective.ti,ab OR cross sectional.ti,ab OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated.ti,ab OR Analysis.ti,ab OR Statistics.ti,ab OR Data.ti,ab OR epidemiology.ti,ab))

NOT

((Injections OR Open-Label.ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat.ti OR Rats.ti OR Mice.ti OR Mouse.ti OR Placebo.ti OR Drug effects.hw OR Drug.ti OR Drugs.ti OR Off Label.ti, ab OR Food and Drug Administration.ti OR Food labeling.ti OR Calorie labeling.ti OR Injection.ti OR Cigarette.ti))

1	
2	
3	Cochrane
4	(((Health:ti,ab OR Illness:ti,ab OR Disorder:ti,ab OR Condition:ti,ab OR Disease:ti,ab)))
6	AND
7	((((Psychological:ti OR I abel:ti ab OR I abelling:ti ab OR I abeling:ti ab) AND
8	((((I sychological.if OK Label.it,ab OK Labelling.it,ab OK Labelling.it,ab) AND
9	(Diagnosis:ti,ab OR Diagnostic:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR
10	Screened:ti,ab))))
11	AND
12	(((Patient:ti.ab OR Patients:ti.ab OR Individuals:ti.ab OR Self:ti.ab OR Parent:ti.ab OR
13 14	Family:ti ah OR Adult:ti ah OR Men:ti ah OR Women:ti ah)))
14	A NID
16	
17	(((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab
18	OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR
19	Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab)))
20	AND
21	((("Systematic review": is a OP "Systematic Paview": nt OP "Cochrone Database Syst
22	(((Systematic review .u,ao OK Systematic Review .pt OK Coeffiaite Database Syst
23	Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":pt OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab
25	OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR
26	Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":pt OR "controlled clinical trial":pt OR
27	randomized:ti.ab OR randomised:ti.ab OR placebo:ti.ab OR randomly:ti.ab OR trial:ti.ab OR
28	groups: ti ab OR "Enidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cobort Studies" OR
29	"age control"
30	case control :11,ab OR Conort:11,ab OR Follow up :11,ab OR Observational:11,ab OR
31	Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
32	"Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated:ti,ab OR Analysis:ti,ab OR Statistics:ti,ab OR
34	Data:ti,ab OR epidemiology:ti,ab)))
35	NOT
36	(((Injections OR Open-I abel: ti ab OR "Product I abeling" OR "Drug I abeling" OR "Drug
37	There are U OD "Affinite Labela" OD "Freed Labeline" OD "Latence Labeline" OD "Staining
38	Inerapy OR Allinity Labels OR Food Labeling OR Isotope Labeling OR Staining
39	and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat:ti OR
40	Rats:ti OR Mice:ti OR Mouse:ti OR Placebo:ti OR "Drug effects.hw" OR Drug:ti OR
41	Drugs:ti OR "Off Label":ti,ab OR Food AND "Drug Administration":ti OR "Food
43	labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti)))
44	intering the error encourage the error angle the ergenetic erg
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

CINAHL

(((TI Health OR AB Health OR TI Illness OR AB Illness OR TI Disorder OR AB Disorder OR TI Condition OR AB Condition OR TI Disease OR AB Disease)))

AND

((((TI Psychological OR TI Label OR AB Label OR TI Labelling OR AB Labelling OR TI Labeling OR AB Labeling) AND (TI Diagnosis OR AB Diagnosis OR TI Diagnostic OR AB Diagnostic OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screened OR AB Screened))))

AND

(((TI Patient OR AB Patient OR TI Patients OR AB Patients OR TI Individuals OR AB Individuals OR TI Self OR AB Self OR TI Parent OR AB Parent OR TI Family OR AB Family OR TI Adult OR AB Adult OR TI Men OR AB Men OR TI Women OR AB Women)))

AND

(((TI Attitude OR AB Attitude OR TI Awareness OR AB Awareness OR TI Stigma OR AB Stigma OR TI Beliefs OR AB Beliefs OR TI Well-being OR AB Well-being OR TI Wellbeing OR AB Wellbeing OR TI Meaning OR AB Meaning OR TI Impact OR AB Impact OR TI Effect OR AB Effect OR TI Effects OR AB Effects OR TI Influence OR AB Influence OR TI Experience OR AB Experience)))

AND

(((TI "Systematic review" OR AB "Systematic review" OR PT "Systematic Review" OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR PT "meta analysis" OR TI "meta analysis" OR AB "meta analysis" OR ((TI Search OR AB Search OR TI Searched OR AB Searched OR TI Searches OR AB Searches) AND (TI PubMed OR AB PubMed OR TI Medline OR AB Medline OR TI Database OR AB Database OR TI Databases OR AB Databases)) OR PT "randomized controlled trial" OR PT "controlled clinical trial" OR TI randomized OR AB randomized OR TI randomised OR AB randomised OR TI placebo OR AB placebo OR TI randomly OR AB randomly OR TI trial OR AB trial OR TI groups OR AB groups OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR TI "case control" OR AB "case control" OR TI Cohort OR AB Cohort OR TI "Follow up" OR AB "Follow up" OR TI Observational OR AB Observational OR TI Longitudinal OR AB Longitudinal OR TI Prospective OR AB Prospective OR TI retrospective OR AB retrospective OR TI "cross sectional" OR AB "cross sectional" OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR TI Investigated OR AB Investigated OR TI Analysis OR AB Analysis OR TI Statistics OR AB Statistics OR TI Data OR AB Data OR TI epidemiology OR AB epidemiology))) NOT

(((Injections OR TI Open-Label OR AB Open-Label OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR TI Rat OR TI Rats OR TI Mice OR TI Mouse OR TI Placebo OR "Drug effects.hw" OR TI Drug OR TI Drugs OR TI "Off Label" OR AB "Off Label" OR Food AND TI "Drug Administration" OR TI "Food labeling" OR TI "Calorie labeling" OR TI Injection OR TI Cigarette)))

53

54

55 56

57

58

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-037392.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Aug-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Sims, Rebecca; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Kazda, Luise; The University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health Michaleff, Zoe; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Glasziou, Paul; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare Thomas, Rae; Bond University Faculty of Health Sciences and Medicine, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare
Primary Subject Heading :	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Public health
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

review only

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2		
4	1	
5	2	
6 7	3	
8	4	Consequences of health condition labelling: protocol for a systematic scoping review
9 10 11	5	
12	6	
13	7	
14 15 16	8	
16 17	9	
18 19	10	Rebecca Sims ¹ , Luise Kazda ² , Zoe A Michaleff ¹ , Paul Glasziou ¹ , Rae Thomas ¹
20 21	11	
22 23	12	
24	13	
25 26	14	
27 28	15	¹ Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond University
29 30	16	² Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney
31	17	
32 33	18	
34 35	19	
36	20	Corresponding author: Rae Thomas, Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare (IEBH), Bond
37 38	21	University, 14 University Drive, Robina QLD 4226. Email: <u>rthomas@bond.edu.au</u>
39 40	22	
41	23	
42 43	24	Keywords: labelling; diagnosis; consequences
44 45	25	
46	26	Word Count: 2179
47	27	
49 50	28	
51 52	29	
53 54	30	
55 56		
57		
58		
59 60		
00		

BMJ Open

2	
3	1
4 5	
5 6 7	2
7 8	3
9 10 11	4
11 12 13	5
14 15	6
16 17	7
18 19	
20	8
21	9
23 24 25	10
25 26 27	11
27 28	12
29 30	12
31	13
32 33	14
34 35	15
36 37	15
38 39	16
40 41	17
41	18
43 44	-
45 46	19
47 48	20
49 50	21
51 52	22
53 54	23
55 56	_
57 58	24
59 60	25
~~	

ABSTRACT

Introduction. When health conditions are labelled it is often to classify and
communicate a set of symptoms. While diagnostic labelling can provide explanation for an
individual's symptoms, it can also impact how individuals and others view those symptoms.
Despite existing research regarding the effects of labelling health conditions, a synthesis of
these effects has not occurred. We will conduct a systematic scoping review to synthesise the
reported consequences and impact of being given a label for a health condition from an
individual, societal and health practitioner perspective and explore in what context labelling
of health conditions is considered important.

Methods and analysis. The review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology for Scoping Reviews. Searches will be conducted in five electronic databases (PubMed, Embase, PsychINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL). Reference lists of included studies will be screened and forward and backward citation searching of included articles will be conducted. We will include reviews and original studies which describe the consequences for individuals labelled with a non-cancer health condition. We will exclude hypothetical research designs and studies focussed on the consequences of labelling cancer conditions, intellectual disabilities, and/or social attributes. We will conduct thematic analyses for qualitative data and descriptive or meta-analyses for quantitative data where appropriate.

Ethics and dissemination. Ethical approval is not required for a scoping review.
Results will be disseminated via publication in a peer-reviewed journal, conference
presentations, and lay-person summaries on various online platforms. Findings from this
systematic scooping review will identify gaps in current understanding of how, when, why,
and for whom a diagnostic label is important and inform future research.

1		
2 3		
4	1	Strengths and limitations of this study
5 6 7	2	- A broad, comprehensive search strategy will be conducted in 5 electronic databases.
8 9	3	- We will include both qualitative and quantitative studies which will enhance our
10 11 12	4	current understanding of the consequences of health condition labelling.
13 14	5	- Two reviewers will screen 10% of titles and abstracts, extract data and assess quality
15 16 17	6	of included studies.
17 18 19	7	- Eligibility will not be limited to specific health conditions, therefore, the
20 21	8	consequences identified will be generalisable to health condition labelling more
22 23 24	9	broadly.
25 26	10	- Articles will be limited to peer-reviewed publications and not include grey or theory-
27 28	11	based literature.
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	12	

BMJ Open

~		
3		
4		
_		
2		
6		
7		
, ~		
8		
9		
1	~	
I	0	
1	1	
1	r	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
	_	
1	5	
1	6	
	-	
I	/	
1	8	
1	ი	
1	2	
2	0	
2	1	
<u> </u>	<u>.</u>	
2	2	
2	3	
ົ	1	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
_	2	
2	7	
2	8	
2	2	
2	9	
3	0	
2	1	
S	I.	
3	2	
ર	3	
_		
3	4	
3	5	
2	<i>c</i>	
5	o	
3	7	
2	0	
S	0	
3	9	
Δ	n	
	2	
4		
4	2	
л	2	
+	5	
4	4	
4	5	
	2	
4	6	
4	7	
Л	Q	
4	0	
4	9	
5	ი	
-	2	
5	1	
5	2	
, ,	2	
C	3	
5	4	
5	5	
ר ק	2	
5	6	
5	7	
, ,	0	
C	ð	
5	9	

INTRODUCTION
The diagnosis of physical and psychological health conditions is increasing in
prevalence. ¹⁻⁵ Diagnoses often occur in the context of individuals seeking to identify and
treat symptoms. However, diagnoses can also occur as a result of screening tests where
individuals have no discernible signs or symptoms of disease (such as when a routine test
determines an individual has hypertension) ⁶ , from unanticipated findings in investigations for
other health concerns (such as identifying an anomaly in a person's thyroid when conducting
an MRI of the spine), ⁷ or, when people are newly diagnosed with a health condition because
of changes to diagnostic thresholds or cut-offs for the condition opposed to changes in
individual circumstances (such as for gestational diabetes). ¹ The value of a diagnosis,
particularly in these latter contexts, is not always evident and the risk of over- and mis-
diagnosis is significant. ¹⁸⁹

Diagnostic labels provide healthcare professionals with a framework from which to organise and interpret clinical symptom presentations, support clinical decision making through directing treatment decisions, and provide information on possible condition course and overall prognosis.^{10 11} Further, diagnostic labels allow clinicians to assume homogeneity amongst members of patient groups, in addition to providing an efficient method for health professionals to communicate.¹²

Despite well-meaning intentions, application of diagnostic labels in real-world
practice can be problematic. Diagnostic criteria can often be ambiguous. For example,
symptoms of anxiety, such as restlessness, fatigue, or difficulty concentrating, may be
explained by diagnoses of anxiety, depressive, or bipolar and related disorders.^{13 14} Similarly,
chest pain symptoms may be explained by several alternative diagnostic categories such as
inflammatory diseases, musculoskeletal conditions, or coronary diseases.^{15 16} Lastly, non-

BMJ Open

specific low back pain is the leading cause of disability worldwide, yet for the majority of
 people no pathoanatomical cause can be identified.¹⁷

From the perspective of a patient, a diagnostic label can have a significant impact (negative and positive) on their health outcomes, psychological wellbeing, and behaviour, and can influence how they are viewed and managed by healthcare professionals and are perceived by other members in society (e.g. school, workplace).³⁵¹⁸ In a cohort of over 33,000 adults, individuals who were aware that they had hypertension reported elevated levels of psychological distress compared to those individuals who had hypertension, however, were unaware of this.³ A study investigating the impact of labelling borderline personality disorder on clinician interpretation of patient symptoms found clinicians' prior awareness of a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder, compared to no awareness, resulted in a tendency to frame observations of the individual in terms of the label, and a failure to observe positive behaviours.¹²

Conversely, a diagnostic label may have positive effects on the individual. These include timely referral to necessary healthcare which, in turn, can reduce morbidity and mortality, improve predictions regarding condition progression as well as facilitate access to support, services and resources (for example, diagnosis based school funding^{19 20} and social support⁵) and provide an explanation and validation of an individual's signs and symptoms. A recent study exploring the impact of chronic fatigue syndrome using hypothetical scenarios of a close friend's diagnosis reported a label of chronic fatigue, compared with no label, elicited higher sympathetic responses from participants, greater potential social support, and greater support for active treatment.⁵

The terms used to describe a diagnostic label have been found to influence an
individual's behaviour, psychological well-being and treatment preferences. Specifically, a
diagnostic label that uses medicalised and precise terminology compared with a description

Page 7 of 24

1 2

BMJ Open

2	
л Л	
4 5	
S	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
11	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
20	
24	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
37	
25	
22	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
<u>4</u> 5	
75 76	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
60	

of symptoms has been found to result in higher patient anxiety, greater perceived severity of 1 the condition and a patient preference of more invasive treatments.^{18 21-23} This has been 2 evidenced in conditions including gastro-oesophageal reflux disease, polycystic ovary 3 syndrome, bone fracture, and low back pain.^{18 21-23} Similarly, research suggests that patients 4 diagnosed with diabetes demonstrate a propensity to medical interventions, including insulin 5 use, oral medication taking, and blood glucose monitoring, compared to less invasive 6 interventions, such as changes to diet and exercise practices.²⁴ The use of a medicalised label 7 over a descriptive label for a health condition is also suggested to result in increased 8 9 confidence in the medical professional and greater adoption of sick role behaviour.²⁵ Alternatively, use of descriptive labels for health conditions was found to be associated with 10 greater patient ownership of the condition.²⁵ 11 To date, our understanding of the consequences and impacts of a diagnostic label has 12 been limited to a single perspective (e.g. patient, health care practitioner), single condition 13 (e.g. gastro-oesophageal reflux disease), or restricted to a specific study design (e.g. 14 hypothetical research design) and a comprehensive synthesis of this information across health 15 conditions is lacking.^{26 27} Further, exploring the real world impact of a diagnostic label 16 including benefits and harms has received little attention.²² ²⁸ ²⁹ Therefore, the aims of this 17 systematic scoping review are to systematically review original and synthesised research 18 19 exploring the consequences of being given a label for a health condition to: 20 1. Identify the range of potential consequences of labelling of health conditions from an 21 individual, societal, and health practitioner viewpoint; 2. Explore why, for whom, and in what contexts labelling of health conditions is, or is not, 22 23 influential; and,

3. Evaluate the methods used to study the impact of labelling health conditions. 24

25

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
3/
38
39
40
41
42 12
45 44
44 15
45 46
40 47
47 18
40 40
50
50
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

1 2

1

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Scoping reviews are suggested as an alternative to systematic reviews, allowing for a 2 broader examination and synthesis of existing research and identification of research gaps.³⁰ 3 The proposed systematic scoping review will adhere to the Joanna Briggs Methodology for 4 Scoping Reviews,³¹ and adhere to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and 5 Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR).³² This approach was 6 selected to allow sufficient documentation of the review process. An initial search was 7 conducted in August 2019 to pilot the screening process and data extraction spreadsheet. The 8 9 review is expected to be complete by October 2020.

10

11

Consumer involvement in scoping review design and framework development

A convenience sampling survey was conducted to explore the publics opinion of the 12 consequences of diagnostic label for health conditions. In April 2019, we posted the 13 questions "What are the labelling consequences of being given a health diagnosis? We're 14 working up a list and so far we have: anxiety, relief, more tests, stigma, medico-legal 15 problems. What else?" on two social media platforms, Facebook and Twitter. Responses on 16 Facebook included 14 comments from six individuals, while Twitter responses resulted in 45 17 comments from 40 individuals. The results of this survey were used to inform the 18 development of the search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction form, and 19 20 an initial qualitative framework (Table 1) that will be used in this scoping review.

21 Table 1. Coding Framework of Social Media Responses.

Name	Description		Examples
Psychological Impact	Psychological impact of	-	Increased self-understanding
	diagnosis	-	Stigma (internalised stigma
			(self); perceived stigma from
			others)

			-	Increased psychological
				distress (anxiety, depression,
				phobia, worry, fear, stress)
Support		Support gained or loss	-	Support groups: Increased
		as a result of diagnosis		support of others with similar
				diagnosis; network with
				other patients
			-	Others less respectful, more
				withdrawn and judgemental
Development	Education	Seeking to become more	-	Increase in health literacy
		informed on diagnoses,		due to motivation to find
		testing, intervention		about treatment options
	Planning	Forward planning and	-	Ability to plan – even if there
		decision making as a		may not be treatment,
		result of diagnosis		provides opportunity to get
				affairs in order (e.g. wills).
Lifestyle	Behaviour	Behaviour changes as a	-	Change diet
		result of diagnosis	-	Change lifestyle
	Employment	Effect of diagnosis on	-	More Sick days; Time off
		employment		work; absenteeism
	Financial	Effect of diagnosis on	-	Diagnosis provides access to
		finances		funds (e.g. Medicare, NDIS,
				insurance)
Service Use	Testing	Further assessment and	-	Seeking more investigations
		tests as a result of	-	Scans and imaging
		diagnosis (including	-	Encourages screening of
		testing of family)		other family members at
				low-risk of the condition
	Treatment	Treatment and	-	Clear Treatment path; clearer
		intervention as a result		treatment protocols
		of diagnosis	-	Side-effects (of medication
				sexual agitation suicidality
				sexual, agriation, suicidanty,

Inclusion criteria

Peer reviewed publications including systematic or literature reviews and original studies which describe the perceived consequences for individuals labelled with a non-cancer health condition will be included. Perceived consequences can be reported from the perspectives of the individuals, their family, friends, and/or carers, or health professionals. As we expect individuals labelled as having a cancer condition will have different experiences to those labelled with general health conditions, studies that focus on these samples are excluded. Similarly, studies that report the consequence of labels for people using hypothetical case scenarios, or individuals with intellectual disabilities and/or social attributes such as race, sexual identity or orientation will also be excluded (see Table 2 for ex xx more details).

Table 2. Inclusion Criteria

Aspect	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
		•
Types of	Original Studies (Cohort, Case-	Protocols (final study to be sourced)
studies	Controlled, Cross-Sectional,	Opinion pieces and commentaries
	Observational, RCT, Focus	Quantitative Cohort, Case-Controlled,
	Groups)*	and Cross-Sectional studies without
	Synthesised Studies (Systematic	comparator
	Synthesised Studies (Systematic	comparator
	Reviews)	Hypothetical or vignette based studies
	*Studies utilising qualitative	
	methodologies do not require	
	multiple group comparisons for	
	inclusion	

Participants	Individuals, no age limit (e.g. adults,	Animal subjects
	children, family, carers, health	
	professionals, general public)	
Condition	Screening and/or labelling of	Labelling of intellectual impairment,
	physical or psychological health	race, ethnicity, sexual identity or
	condition/s	sexual orientation
	Self-reported (e.g. response to	Labelling of cancers and cancer
	questions such as "has your GP ever	related conditions
	told you that you have	Self-reported conditions provided by
	hypertension?")	unqualified professional (e.g.
	Health condition confirmed (e.g.	physiotherapist telling patient they
	medical examination and testing	have hypertension)
	completed as part of the study)	Self-identified conditions (e.g.
		googling of symptoms, no
		confirmation by medical professional)
Outcomes	Consequences, impact, effects of the	Effect of the health condition (e.g.
	health condition label or diagnosis	disease mechanisms/traits)
	Perceived harms and/or benefits	Gene labelling
	(e.g. illness burden)	Food or nutrition labelling
	- Lived experience	Drug effects/effectiveness
	- Psychological impact (e.g.	Intervention effects/effectiveness
	anxiety, quality of life)	(e.g. intervention A vs intervention B)
	- Behaviour change (e.g.	
	participation in employment)	

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
0	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
יב רכ	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
37	
25	
22	
30	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
<u>18</u>	
10	
49 50	
50	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

	- Support (e.g. financial,	
	social support)	
Language	No language limitations	-
Date	No date limitations	-

2 Search strategy

1

3 A structured search, developed in collaboration with an information specialist, of five electronic databases (PubMed, Embase, PsycINFO, Cochrane, CINAHL) will be conducted 4 to identify relevant publications. Databases will be searched from their inception. 5 6 Preliminary searches were conducted in August 2019 and will be updated in June 2020. Reference lists of included articles will be searched and forward citation searching of 7 included articles will be conducted. The full search strategy to be used is reported in the 8 jt. 9 Supplementary Material.

10

19

20

60

11 **Study selection**

Titles and abstracts of 10% of articles retrieved through electronic and manual 12 searches will be independently screened by two reviewers (RS and LK) for eligibility against 13 14 the pre-specified inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion and consultation with additional reviewers as required. When interrater reliability (Kappa) >0.8 15 is achieved for the screened studies, remaining studies will continue to be screened by one 16 reviewer (RS). Articles identified as unclear for inclusion will be reviewed by an additional 17 18 reviewer as required.

BMJ Open

Data extraction and framework revision and validation

Full text publications will be obtained, and the reference list reviewed. Any relevant studies found in the reference list will be screened (RS) for inclusion against the same inclusion criteria. Additional uncertainties regarding eligibility for inclusion will be resolved through discussion with other reviewers (RT or PG). Two reviewers (RS and ZAM) will independently extract study data from 10% of included qualitative studies and 10% of included quantitative studies using a standardised data extraction form that will be piloted prior to use. Conflicts will be resolved by a third party as required. Once interrater reliability (Kappa) >0.8 is achieved for extracted data, one reviewer (RS) will undertake the remaining data extraction in a staged process, with this detailed below in the *extraction* sections. The same staged process will be used when extracting data from quantitative and qualitative studies. Queries will be resolved through discussion with a second reviewer (ZAM).

The methods used to extract and synthesise the results of qualitative and quantitative
studies are based on the meta-analytic techniques described by Sandelowski, Barroso and
Voils,³³ Thomas and Harden,³⁴ and Timulak.³⁵ Extracted data will include study
characteristics (author, journal, year of publication, study country and setting), participant
characteristics (number of participants, age, health condition), and quantitative or qualitative
outcomes (consequences, impact, effects of the diagnostic label).

Qualitative data extraction

Data for thematic analysis will be extracted from the published study and include the authors abstracted themes and relevant, supporting quotes, reported in the primary study. Direct quotes will not be extracted in isolation to ensure data "retains its meaning" and is not interpreted or extracted out of context of the primary study. This qualitative meta-analysis

 technique has been described by Sandelowski, Barroso and Voils,³³ Thomas and Harden,³⁴ and Timulak.³⁵

Quantitative data extraction

For studies with quantitative outcomes, extracted data will include, the text and
numerical data from the results section reporting primary outcomes.³⁶ Examples of potential
quantitative measures include the Short Form Health Survey (SF-36),³⁷ General Health
Questionnaire (GHQ),³⁸ or work absenteeism.

8 Qualitative data analysis

9 The coding framework developed from social media responses will be iteratively 10 revised using eligible studies retrieved by the electronic database search. Qualitative data 11 will initially be extracted from a random sample of one-third of included qualitative studies 12 and mapped to the coding framework. This framework will be expanded as additional 13 themes emerge. A second third of included qualitative studies will be randomly selected, 14 data extracted and mapped to the updated coding framework until data thematic saturation 15 has been achieved. If new themes are still emerging at this point, the remaining third of 16 qualitative studies will be analysed against the developed framework. Data saturation will be 17 defined using indicative thematic saturation, which states data saturation as the non-18 emergence of new codes or themes that will result in expansion or revision of the coding 19 framework.³⁶

Quantitative data analysis

21 Quantitative data will be summarised narratively.³³ For example, we will collate data 22 from studies that used the SF-36, GHQ, or absenteeism and summarise the findings reported 23 in the results section. Unlike the large volume of expected qualitative studies, fewer 24 quantitative studies with comparators are expected. Therefore, outcomes from all of the

4

5

6

7

1 2 **BMJ** Open

3	
4	
5	
2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
20	
20	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
50	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
10	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
10	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
51	
54	
22	
56	
57	
58	
59	

included quantitative studies will be extracted and, if possible, tabulated by condition and 1 2 outcomes.

Patient and public involvement

This scoping review has no direct patient involvement.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

8 We will present study selection in a flow diagram according to PRISMA-Scr and included studies will be described in a table of characteristics.³² Results will be aggregated as 9 appropriate. Results pertinent to the consequences of labelling of health conditions will be 10 11 collated to expand those provided in Table 1, with empirical data regarding rate and severity of these consequences also examined. Additionally, a compendium of methods used to elicit 12 consequences of health condition labelling will be developed and methodology appraised. 13 For quantitative studies, extracted data will be tabulated in a descriptive and/or statistical 14 manner depending on the availability of data (i.e. number of studies reporting similar 15 16 outcome measures or measurement of similar constructs, such as quality of life or symptoms of anxiety) and degree of heterogeneity between studies (e.g. population, clinical conditions). 17 Should data not support a meta-analysis, results from studies which provide quantitative data 18 19 will be reported in a narrative synthesis and interpreted alongside results from qualitative studies. Qualitative data will be analysed using developed frameworks (see Table 1), and 20 following established protocols for the qualitative analysis of information in the social 21 sciences.³⁹ The characteristics and results of all included studies will be reported in tables 22 and summarised in text. 23

24

60

Ethics and Dissemination

As the current study is a systematic scoping review protocol, ethics is not required.

to beet terien only

3 Dissemination of results will be made public via peer-reviewed publications, conference

4 presentations and lay-person summaries on various on-line platforms (e.g. The

5 Conversation).

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

1			
2 3 4	1		REQUIRED STATEMENTS
5 6	2	Twitter: Rel	becca Sims @BecSims90, Luise Kazda @LuiseKazda, Zoe A Michaleff
/ 8 9	3	@ZoeMichal	eff, Paul Glasziou @PaulGlasziou, Rae Thomas @rthomasEBP
10 11	4	Acknowledg	ements: The authors thank Justin Clark, Senior Research Information Specialist
12 13	5	at the Institut	e for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University for assistance with
14 15 16	6	constructing	the search strategy.
17 18	7	Author Cont	ributions: RS, PG, and RT contributed to the conception and design of the
19 20	8	protocol, initi	al public 'survey' and construction of the search terms. RS, LK, and ZAM
21 22 22	9	contributed to	o screening and data analysis. RS, ZAM, RT, and PG contributed to the drafting
23 24 25	10	of the manus	cript and all authors approved the final version.
26 27	11	Funding: RS	S is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program
28 29 20	12	Scholarship.	RT and ZAM are supported by a National Health and Medical Research
30 31 32	13	Council Prog	ram grant (#1106452). LK is supported by a Centres of Research Excellence
33 34	14	Grant (#1104	136). PG is supported by a NHMRC Research Fellowship (#1080042). The
35 36	15	funding sources have no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data	
37 38 39	16	interpretation, or writing of the report.	
40 41	17	Competing Interests: None declared.	
42 43	18	Patient cons	ent for publication: Not required.
44 45	19	Orcid iDs:	Rebecca Sims https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1604-8354
46 47 48	20		Luise Kazda http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4105-0402
49 50	21		Zoe A Michaleff https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0360-4956
51 52	22		Paul Glasziou https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7564-073X
53 54 55	23		Rae Thomas http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2165-5917
56 57 58 59 60	24		

2		
3	1	REFERENCES
4	-	
5	r	1 Sexton H. Heal C. Banks I. et al. Impact of new diagnostic criteria for gestational diabetes
6	2	LObstat Cymacol Pas 2018:44:425 21 doi: 10 1111/jog 12544
7		J Obsiel Oynuecol Res 2018,44.425-51. doi: 10.1111/j0g.15544.
8	4	2. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National Health Survey. First Results, $2017-18$. Web site.
9 10	5	$\underline{\text{nttps://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs(a).nst/mt/4364.0.55.001}. \text{ Updated May 27, 2019.}$
10	6	Accessed November 30, 2019.
12	7	3. Hamer M, Batty GD, Stamatakis E, Kivimaki M. Hypertension awareness and
13	8	psychological distress. <i>Hypertens</i> 2010;56:547-50. doi:
14	9	10.1161/hypertensionaha.110.153775.
15	10	4. Thombs BD, Kwakkenbos L, Levis AW, Benedetti A. Addressing overestimation of the
16	11	prevalence of depression based on self-report screening questionnaires. Can Med
17	12	Assoc J 2018;190:E44. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.170691.
18	13	5. Noble S. Bonner C. Hersch J. Jansen J. McGeechan K. McCaffery K. Could disease
19	14	labelling have positive effects? An experimental study exploring the effect of the
20	15	chronic fatigue syndrome label on intended social support <i>Patient Educ Couns</i>
21	16	2010:102:486-03 doi: 10.1016/i.pec.2018.10.011
22	17	6 Walker ML Degars WA Diagnosis parrative identity and examptematic disease. Theorem
23	1/	Mod Dis ed. 2017;29:207 21. doi: 10.1007/s11017.017.0412.1
24 25	18	Med Bloein 2017, 58:507-21. doi: 10.1007/S11017-017-9412-1.
25	19	7. Hiremath SB, Boto J, Regnaud A, Etienne L, Fitsiori A, Vargas MI. Incidentalomas in
20	20	spine and spinal cord imaging. Clin Neuroradiol 2019;29:191-213. doi:
28	21	10.1007/s00062-019-00773-5.
29	22	8. Doust J, Glasziou P. Is the problem that everything is a diagnosis? <i>Aust Fam Physician</i>
30	23	2013;42:856-9.
31	24	9. Brodersen J, Schwartz LM, Heneghan C, O'Sullivan JW, Aronson JK, Woloshin S.
32	25	Overdiagnosis: what it is and what it isn't. BMJ Evid Based Med 2018;23:1-3. doi:
33	26	10.1136/ebmed-2017-110886.
34	27	10. Frances A. First M. Pincus HA. Widiger T. Davis W. An introduction to DSM-IV. Hosp
35	28	Community Psychiatry 1990.41.493-95
36	29	11 Croft P Altman DG Deeks II et al. The science of clinical practice: disease diagnosis or
3/ 20	30	nation prognosis? Evidence about "what is likely to happen" should shape clinical
30	31	practice BMC Med 2015:13:20 doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0265-4
40	27	12 Lam DC Ponlayskava EV Salkovskis PM Hogg LL Panting H An experimental
41	22	investigation of the impact of personality disorder diagnosis on aliniaians; can we see
42	22	not the horderline? Below Com Druch other 2016:44:261, 72, doi:
43	34 25	past the boldenme? Benav Cogn Psycholner 2010,44.501-75. doi:
44	35	10.1017/\$1552405815000551.
45	36	13. Allsopp K, Read J, Corcoran R, Kinderman P. Heterogeneity in psychiatric diagnostic
46	37	classification. <i>Psychiatry Res</i> 2019;2/9:15-22. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2019.005.
47	38	14. American Psychological Association. <i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental</i>
48	39	Disorders, Fifth Edition. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association, 2013.
49 50	40	15. Christiansen J. Less is more: chest pain pathways in clinical care. Med J Aust
50 51	41	2017;207:193-94. doi: 10.5694/mja17.00331
52	42	16. Sturm C, Witte T. Musculoskeletal-related chest pain. Der Internist 2017;58:39-46. doi:
53	43	10.1007/s00108-016-0166-z.
54	44	17. Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, et al. What low back pain is and why we need to
55	45	pay attention. Lancet 2018:391:2356-67. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(18)30480-x
56	46	18. Scherer LD, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, Fagerlin A, Tarini BA, Influence of "GERD" label on
57	47	parents' decision to medicate infants <i>Pediatr</i> 2013:131:839-45 doi:
58	48	10 1542/neds 2012-3070
59	-10	10.15 12/pod0.2012 5070.
60		

1		
2		
3 4	1	19. Parliament of Australia. Access to real learning: the impact of policy, funding and culture
5	2	on students with disability.
6	3	https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Education_and_
7	4	Employment/students_with_disability/Report. Published 2016. Accessed November
8	5	30, 2019.
9	6	20. Witham M. Funding the need not the label. Presented at: AARE Conference; 2015;
10	7	Western Australia, Australia.
11	8	21. Nickel B, Barratt A, Copp T, Moynihan R, McCaffery K. Words do matter: a systematic
12	9	review on how different terminology for the same condition influences management
14	10	preferences. BMJ Open 2017;7:e014129. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014129.
15	11	22. Copp T, McCaffery K, Azizi L, Doust J, Mol BWJ, Jansen J. Influence of the disease
16	12	label 'polycystic ovary syndrome' on intention to have an ultrasound and psychosocial
17	13	outcomes: a randomised online study in young women. Hum Reprod 2017;32:876-84.
18	14	doi: 10.1093/humrep/dex029.
19 20	15	23. O'Keefe M. Do different diagnostic labels for low back pain influence management
20 21	16	preferences: an online randomised controlled study. Presented at: Preventing
21	17	Overdiagnosis Conference; December 5, 2019; Sydney, Australia.
23	18	24. Kavookjian J, Berger BA, Grimley DM, Villaume WA, Anderson HM, Barker KN.
24	19	Patient decision making: strategies for diabetes diet adherence intervention. Res
25	20	Social Adm Pharm 2005;1:389-407. doi: 10.1016/j.sapharm.2005.06.006.
26	21	25. Ogden J, Branson R, Bryett A, et al. What's in a name? An experimental study of patients'
27	22	views of the impact and function of a diagnosis. Fam Pract 2003;20:248-53.
28	23	26. Macdonald LA, Sackett DL, Haynes RB, Taylor DW. Labelling in hypertension: A
29 30	24	review of the behavioural and psychological consequences. J Chronic Dis
31	25	1984:37:933-42. doi: 10.1016/0021-968190070-5.
32	26	27. Cotter AR, Vuong K, Mustelin LL, et al. Do psychological harms result from being
33	27	labelled with an unexpected diagnosis of abdominal aortic aneurysm or prostate
34	28	cancer through screening? A systematic review <i>BMJ Open</i> 2017;7:e017565 doi:
35	29	10 1136/bmionen-2017-017565
36	30	28 Betsch TA Gorodzinsky AY Finley GA et al What's in a name? Health care providers'
37 38	31	perceptions of pediatric pain patients based on diagnostic labels <i>Clin J Pain</i>
39	32	2017:33:694-98 doi: 10.1097/aip.00000000000454
40	33	29 Lancaster AM Impact of diagnostic versus emotional disturbance label on preservice
41	34	teacher expectations of student academic behavior and social outcomes [PhD]
42	35	Thesis] Mississippi: Mississippi State University: 2016
43	36	30 Arksey H. O'Malley I. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework Int I Soc
44	37	Res Methodol 2005:8:19-32 doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616
45 46	38	31 Peters M Godfrey C McInerney P Soares CB Khalil H Parker D In: Aromataris E
40 47	20	Munn 7 eds Joanna Briggs Institute revier's manual The Joanna Briggs Institute
48	10	2017
49	40 //1	32 Tricco AC Lillie F. Zarin W. et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-
50	41	ScR): checklist and explanation Ann Intern Med 2018:160:467-73
51	42	33 Sandelowski M Barroso I Voils CI Using qualitative metasummary to synthesize
52	43	auglitative and quantitative descriptive findings. Res. Nurs. Health 2007:30:00-111
53	44	doi: 10.1002/nur 20176
54 55	45 16	34 Thomas I Harden A Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in
56	40 ∕17	systematic reviews RMC Mod Ros Mothodol 2008.8.45 doi: 10.1186/1471_2288_8_
57	 /\Q	45
58	70	10.
59		
60		

- 35. Timulak L. Meta-analysis of qualitative studies: a tool for reviewing qualitative research findings in psychotherapy. *Psychother Res* 2009;19:591-600. doi: 10.1080/10503300802477989.
 36. Saunders B. Sim J. Kingstone T. et al. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its
 - 36. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, et al. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its
 conceptualization and operationalization. *Qual Quant* 2018;52:1893-907. doi:
 10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8.
 - 37. Ware J, Sherbourne C. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992;30:473-83.
 - 9 38. Goldberg D, Williams P. A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire. Windsor,
 10 Berks: NFER-Nelson. 1988.
 - 39. Ritchie J, Lewis J, McNaughton Nicholls C, Ormston R, eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. 2nd ed. London, UK:
 Sage Publications Ltd. 2014.

or of the text of the second

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
1	
2	
3	Supplementary Material
4 5	Search Strategies
5	PubMed
7	(Health[tiab] OR Illness[tiab] OR Disorder[tiab] OR Condition[tiab] OR Disease[tiab])
8	(
9	AND
10	
11	((Psychological[ti] OR Label[tiab] OR Labelling[tiab] OR Labeling[tiab]) AND
12	(Diagnosis[tiab] OR Diagnostic[tiab] OR Screening[Mesh] OR Screening[tiab] OR
13	Screened[tiab]))
14	A NID
16	AND
17	(Patient[tiab] OR Patients[tiab] OR Individuals[tiab] OR Self[tiab] OR Parent[tiab] OR
18	Family[tiab] OR Adult[tiab] OR Men[tiab] OR Women[tiab])
19	
20	AND
21	
22	(Attitude[Mesh] OR Awareness[tiab] OR Stigma[tiab] OR Beliefs[tiab] OR Well-being[tiab]
23 74	OR Wellbeing[tiab] OR Meaning[tiab] OR Impact[tiab] OR Effect[tiab] OR Effects[tiab] OR
25	Influence[tiab] OR Experience[tiab])
26	
27	AND
28	("Systematic review"[tiab] OR "Systematic Review"[pt] OR "Cochrane Database Syst
29	Rev"[ta] OR "meta analysis"[nt] OR "meta analysis"[tiab] OR ((Search[tiab] OR
30 21	Searched[tish] OP Searches[tish]) AND (PubMed[tish] OP Medline[tish] OP Database[tish]
37	OP Detabagg[tiab])) OP "randomized controlled trial"[nt] OP "controlled clinical trial"[nt]
33	OR Databases[trab])) OR Tandonized controlled that [pt] OR controlled childran that [pt]
34	OR randomized[tiab] OR randomised[tiab] OR placebo[tiab] OR randomly[tiab] OR
35	trial[tiab] OR groups[tiab] OR "Epidemiologic Studies"[Mesh] OR "case-control
36	studies"[Mesh] OR "Cohort Studies"[Mesh] OR "case control"[tiab] OR Cohort[tiab] OR
37	"Follow up" [tiab] OR Observational [tiab] OR Longitudinal [tiab] OR Prospective [tiab] OR
38	retrospective[tiab] OR "cross sectional"[tiab] OR "Cross-Sectional Studies"[Mesh] OR
39 40	Investigated[tiab] OR Analysis[tiab] OR Statistics[tiab] OR Data[tiab] OR "statistics and
41	numerical data"[sh] OR "epidemiology"[sh])
42	
43	NOT

(Animals[Mesh] NOT (Animals[Mesh] AND Humans[Mesh]))

NOT

(Injections[Mesh] OR Open-Label[tiab] OR "Product Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Drug Labeling" [Mesh] OR "Affinity Labels" [Mesh] OR "Food Labeling" [Mesh] OR "Isotope Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Staining and Labeling"[Mesh] OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling"[Mesh] OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" [Mesh] OR Rat[ti] OR Rats[ti] OR Mice[ti] OR Mouse[ti] OR Placebo[ti] OR "Drug effects"[sh] OR Drug[ti] OR Drugs[ti] OR "Food and Drug Administration"[ti] OR "Food labeling"[ti] OR "Calorie labeling"[ti] OR Injection[ti] OR Cigarette[ti])

(((() sychological.th OK Eabel.it,ab OK Eabeling.it,ab OK Eabeling.it,ab OK Eabeling.it,ab OR (Diagnosis:ti,ab OR Diagnostic:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screened:ti,ab)))) AND (((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR Family:ti,ab OR Adult:ti,ab OR Men:ti,ab OR Women:ti,ab))) AND (((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab))) AND ((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":it OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR "case control":ti,ab OR Placebo:ti,ab OR "coss sectional":ti,ab OR
AND (((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR Family:ti,ab OR Adult:ti,ab OR Men:ti,ab OR Women:ti,ab))) AND (((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab))) AND ((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":it OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
(((Patient:1,ab OK Patients:1,ab OK Individuals:1,ab OK Self:1,ab OK Patient:1,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab OR Patient:1,ab OR Melline:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Patient:1,ab OR Patient:1
(((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab))) AND ((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":it OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR "case control":ti,ab OR Cohort:ti,ab OR "Follow up":ti,ab OR Observational:ti,ab OR Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":it OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":it OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR "case control":ti,ab OR Cohort:ti,ab OR "Follow up":ti,ab OR Observational:ti,ab OR Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":it OR "controlled clinical trial":it OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR "case control":ti,ab OR Cohort:ti,ab OR "Follow up":ti,ab OR Observational:ti,ab OR Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR
Data:ti,ab OR epidemiology:ti,ab)))
(((Injections OR Open-Label:ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat:ti OR Rats:ti OR Mice:ti OR Mouse:ti OR Placebo:ti OR "Drug effects.hw" OR Drug:ti OR
Drugs:ti OR "Off Label":ti,ab OR Food AND "Drug Administration":ti OR "Food labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti)))

PsychINFO ((Health.ti,ab OR Illness.ti,ab OR Disorder.ti,ab OR Condition.ti,ab OR Disease.ti,ab)) AND (((Psychological.ti OR Label.ti,ab OR Labelling.ti,ab OR Labeling.ti,ab) AND (Diagnosis.ti,ab OR Diagnostic.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screening.ti,ab OR Screened.ti,ab))) AND ((Patient.ti,ab OR Patients.ti,ab OR Individuals.ti,ab OR Self.ti,ab OR Parent.ti,ab OR Family.ti,ab OR Adult.ti,ab OR Men.ti,ab OR Women.ti,ab)) AND ((Attitude.ti,ab OR Awareness.ti,ab OR Stigma.ti,ab OR Beliefs.ti,ab OR Well-being.ti,ab OR Wellbeing.ti,ab OR Meaning.ti,ab OR Impact.ti,ab OR Effect.ti,ab OR Effects.ti,ab OR Influence.ti,ab OR Experience.ti,ab)) AND ((Systematic review.ti,ab OR Systematic Review.pt OR Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn OR meta analysis.pt OR meta analysis.ti,ab OR ((Search.ti,ab OR Searched.ti,ab OR Searches.ti,ab) AND (PubMed.ti,ab OR Medline.ti,ab OR Database.ti,ab OR Databases.ti,ab)) OR randomized controlled trial.pt OR controlled clinical trial.pt OR randomized.ti,ab OR randomised.ti,ab OR placebo.ti,ab OR randomly.ti,ab OR trial.ti,ab OR groups.ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR case control.ti,ab OR Cohort.ti,ab OR Follow up.ti,ab OR Observational.ti,ab OR Longitudinal.ti,ab OR Prospective.ti,ab OR retrospective.ti,ab OR cross sectional.ti,ab OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated.ti,ab OR Analysis.ti,ab OR Statistics.ti,ab OR Data.ti,ab OR epidemiology.ti,ab)) NOT ((Injections OR Open-Label.ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat.ti OR Rats.ti OR Mice.ti OR Mouse.ti OR Placebo.ti OR Drug effects.hw OR Drug.ti OR Drugs.ti

OR Off Label.ti, ab OR Food and Drug Administration.ti OR Food labeling.ti OR Calorie labeling.ti OR Injection.ti OR Cigarette.ti))

Cochrane

(((Health:ti,ab OR Illness:ti,ab OR Disorder:ti,ab OR Condition:ti,ab OR Disease:ti,ab))) AND

((((Psychological:ti OR Label:ti,ab OR Labelling:ti,ab OR Labeling:ti,ab) AND (Diagnosis:ti,ab OR Diagnostic:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screening:ti,ab OR Screened:ti,ab))))

AND

(((Patient:ti,ab OR Patients:ti,ab OR Individuals:ti,ab OR Self:ti,ab OR Parent:ti,ab OR Family:ti,ab OR Adult:ti,ab OR Men:ti,ab OR Women:ti,ab)))

AND

(((Attitude:ti,ab OR Awareness:ti,ab OR Stigma:ti,ab OR Beliefs:ti,ab OR Well-being:ti,ab OR Wellbeing:ti,ab OR Meaning:ti,ab OR Impact:ti,ab OR Effect:ti,ab OR Effects:ti,ab OR Influence:ti,ab OR Experience:ti,ab)))

AND

(((("Systematic review":ti,ab OR "Systematic Review":pt OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR "meta analysis":pt OR "meta analysis":ti,ab OR ((Search:ti,ab OR Searched:ti,ab OR Searches:ti,ab) AND (PubMed:ti,ab OR Medline:ti,ab OR Database:ti,ab OR Databases:ti,ab)) OR "randomized controlled trial":pt OR "controlled clinical trial":pt OR randomized:ti,ab OR randomised:ti,ab OR placebo:ti,ab OR randomly:ti,ab OR trial:ti,ab OR groups:ti,ab OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR "case control":ti,ab OR Cohort:ti,ab OR "Follow up":ti,ab OR Observational:ti,ab OR Longitudinal:ti,ab OR Prospective:ti,ab OR retrospective:ti,ab OR "cross sectional":ti,ab OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR Investigated:ti,ab OR Analysis:ti,ab OR Statistics:ti,ab OR Data:ti,ab OR epidemiology:ti,ab)))

NOT

(((Injections OR Open-Label:ti,ab OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR Rat:ti OR Rats:ti OR Mice:ti OR Mouse:ti OR Placebo:ti OR "Drug effects.hw" OR Drug:ti OR Drugs:ti OR "Off Label":ti,ab OR Food AND "Drug Administration":ti OR "Food labeling":ti OR "Calorie labeling":ti OR Injection:ti OR Cigarette:ti))) 1 2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51 52

53

54

55 56

57

58

59 60

CINAHL

(((TI Health OR AB Health OR TI Illness OR AB Illness OR TI Disorder OR AB Disorder OR TI Condition OR AB Condition OR TI Disease OR AB Disease)))

AND

((((TI Psychological OR TI Label OR AB Label OR TI Labelling OR AB Labelling OR TI Labeling OR AB Labeling) AND (TI Diagnosis OR AB Diagnosis OR TI Diagnostic OR AB Diagnostic OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screening OR AB Screening OR TI Screening OR AB Screening)))

AND

(((TI Patient OR AB Patient OR TI Patients OR AB Patients OR TI Individuals OR AB Individuals OR TI Self OR AB Self OR TI Parent OR AB Parent OR TI Family OR AB Family OR TI Adult OR AB Adult OR TI Men OR AB Men OR TI Women OR AB Women)))

AND

(((TI Attitude OR AB Attitude OR TI Awareness OR AB Awareness OR TI Stigma OR AB Stigma OR TI Beliefs OR AB Beliefs OR TI Well-being OR AB Well-being OR TI Wellbeing OR AB Wellbeing OR TI Meaning OR AB Meaning OR TI Impact OR AB Impact OR TI Effect OR AB Effect OR TI Effects OR AB Effects OR TI Influence OR AB Influence OR TI Experience OR AB Experience)))

AND

(((TI "Systematic review" OR AB "Systematic review" OR PT "Systematic Review" OR "Cochrane Database Syst Rev.jn" OR PT "meta analysis" OR TI "meta analysis" OR AB "meta analysis" OR ((TI Search OR AB Search OR TI Searched OR AB Searched OR TI Searches OR AB Searches) AND (TI PubMed OR AB PubMed OR TI Medline OR AB Medline OR TI Database OR AB Database OR TI Databases OR AB Databases)) OR PT "randomized controlled trial" OR PT "controlled clinical trial" OR TI randomized OR AB randomized OR TI randomised OR AB randomised OR TI placebo OR AB placebo OR TI randomly OR AB randomly OR TI trial OR AB trial OR TI groups OR AB groups OR "Epidemiologic Studies" OR "case-control studies" OR "Cohort Studies" OR TI "case control" OR AB "case control" OR TI Cohort OR AB Cohort OR TI "Follow up" OR AB "Follow up" OR TI Observational OR AB Observational OR TI Longitudinal OR AB Longitudinal OR TI Prospective OR AB Prospective OR TI retrospective OR AB retrospective OR TI "cross sectional" OR AB "cross sectional" OR "Cross-Sectional Studies" OR TI Investigated OR AB Investigated OR TI Analysis OR AB Analysis OR TI Statistics OR AB Statistics OR TI Data OR AB Data OR TI epidemiology OR AB epidemiology))) NOT

(((Injections OR TI Open-Label OR AB Open-Label OR "Product Labeling" OR "Drug Labeling" OR "Drug Therapy" OR "Affinity Labels" OR "Food Labeling" OR "Isotope Labeling" OR "Staining and Labeling" OR "In Situ Nick-End Labeling" OR "Primed In Situ Labeling" OR TI Rat OR TI Rats OR TI Mice OR TI Mouse OR TI Placebo OR "Drug effects.hw" OR TI Drug OR TI Drugs OR TI "Off Label" OR AB "Off Label" OR Food AND TI "Drug Administration" OR TI "Food labeling" OR TI "Calorie labeling" OR TI Injection OR TI Cigarette)))