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Review question
What are patients' experiences and perceptions following discharge from hospital and during recovery of Guillain-Barre Syndrome or associated inflammatory neuropathies?

Searches
The following databases will be searched: MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, PsycINFO, EBSCOhost, Academic Search Complete, Humanities International Index, PsycARTICLES, Sociological Abstracts, AMED, Web of Science, the Cochrane Library, Joanna Briggs Institute and PROSPERO. All databases will be searched from inception. Database searches will be supplemented with internet searches (i.e. Google Scholar), and forward and backward citation tracking from the included studies and review articles.

Types of study to be included
Qualitative, individual or group interview, focus group, ethnographic.

Condition or domain being studied
Patients' experiences, perceptions of Guillain-Barre Syndrome (Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy) or an associated inflammatory neuropathy such as Miller-Fisher Syndrome or Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy.

Participants/population
Studies will be included if they involve qualitative analysis, are published in the English language, and are published between January 2000 and June 2018 to ensure relevance to the present day. Primary studies will report experiences from adults (aged 18 and over) with, or recovering from Guillain-Barre Syndrome (Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy) or a related condition such as Miller Fisher Syndrome or Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)
A previous diagnosis of Guillain Barre Syndrome (Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy) or an associated inflammatory neuropathy such as Miller Fisher Syndrome or Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy.

Comparator(s)/control
No comparator

Context
Participants living in the United Kingdom or Republic of Ireland with a previous diagnosis of Guillain Barre Syndrome or an associated inflammatory neuropathy.

Main outcome(s)
Qualitative data: the experiences and views of people post discharge from hospital and returning to the
community after Guillain Barre Syndrome or associated inflammatory neuropathy.

Timing and effect measures

Additional outcome(s)
None

Timing and effect measures

Data extraction (selection and coding)
Titles and/or abstracts of studies retrieved using the search strategy and those from additional sources will be screened independently by two reviewers to identify studies that potentially meet the inclusion criteria outlined above. The full text of these potentially eligible studies will be retrieved and independently assessed for eligibility by two review team members. Any disagreement between them over the eligibility of particular studies will be resolved through discussion with a third reviewer.

A standardised, pre-piloted form will be used to extract data from the included studies for assessment of quality and data synthesis. Extracted information will include: study details (title, authors, date), methods (aims, objectives, research questions, study design, setting, data collection methods, outcomes, data analysis, context in terms of findings and relevant theory), and participants (demographics, inclusion/exclusion criteria, method of recruitment, sample selection and sample size). Two reviewer authors will extract data independently, discrepancies will be identified and resolved through discussion (with third reviewer where necessary). Missing data will be requested from study authors.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
The CASP Qualitative Checklist (2017) will be used to assess risk of bias in included studies, however, quality will not be a sole reason for exclusion. A discussion on the quality of the articles will be included in the final review. Studies will be appraised by two reviewers independently with discrepancies being resolved by a third reviewer.

Strategy for data synthesis
Thematic synthesis, as described by Thomas and Harden (2008 will be used to synthesise qualitative data. This will involve three stages: 1) free line-by-line coding of the findings from primary studies; 2) the organisation of these ‘free codes’ into related areas to construct ‘descriptive’ themes; and 3) the development of ‘analytical’ themes.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets
None
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