

The Partnerships for East Coast Communities consortium¹ is reviewing evidence on actions to help East Anglia's coastal communities in three areas:

- 1. Opportunities for good work;**
- 2. The green economy;**
- 3. Protecting and renewing the East Anglian coast's cultural and environmental heritage.**

We have no preconception of what these actions might be, and examples can cut across two or more areas. Of particular interest are studies that evaluate the effects of actions on health and wellbeing in coastal communities.

We actions focused on 'good work' as actions that aim to improve one or more of the following, for example:

- workers' involvement in decisions about how work is to be done, when it is to be done or what is to be done
- clarity of what is to be achieved at work
- the chance to use a variety of skills at work
- good working relationships with colleagues and/or customers
- job security
- safe work
- attainable goals and work demands or goals that do not conflict with one and other
- reasonable working hours and work-life balance
- meaningful work

We define actions focused on the green economy as actions focused on providing employment opportunities that are environmentally and/or culturally sustainable through for example:

- employment opportunities in green energy production;
- making existing employment more environmentally and/or culturally sustainable;

We define actions focused on protecting and renewing the coast as actions focused on:

- actions focused on protecting or making resilient natural environments and cultural artefacts;
- actions focused on restoring natural environments and cultural artefacts to a previous state;
- actions focused on making natural environments and cultural artefacts more accessible to a range of stakeholders;
- employment opportunities in protecting or making resilient natural environments and cultural artefacts;
- employment opportunities in environmental or cultural heritage;

¹ Partnerships for East Coast Communities is an initiative led by the County Councils of Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk and the Universities of Suffolk, Essex and East Anglia.

Objectives

Our objectives are to:

- a) To develop describe the range of actions investigated for East Anglian coastal communities in the literature in the three areas of the review ;
- b) To identify the effects of these interventions, whether intended or unintended, including effects on the health and wellbeing of coastal communities;
- c) To develop understanding of how these interventions may be best implemented in an East Anglian context.

Components

The review will have three main components:

1. Peer-reviewed systematic reviews, other reviews and meta-analyses of coastal communities in respect of good work, green economy, cultural heritage, environmental heritage and health. This review will be embedded in the second component of the review.
2. Peer-reviewed evaluations of specific actions in respect of good work, green economy, cultural heritage, environmental heritage in coastal communities. Only studies of specific actions or initiatives will be included. Observational studies will be excluded. Qualitative and quantitative studies are admissible, as are a wide range of evaluation methodologies. The review will be confined to literature from coastal communities in the UK and other coastal countries in North-Western Europe (i.e. Republic of Ireland, France, Belgium, Netherlands).
3. A review of the grey literature from the UK. A specific call for evidence from studies – whether peer-reviewed or not – will be issued specifically for studies of East Anglian communities.

A separate protocol has been developed for each component.

Systematic Review Protocol and Review of Reviews Protocols – Actions to help East Anglia’s coastal communities

The authors of this protocol are: Kevin Daniels and Helen Fitzhugh.

Kevin Daniels is the guarantor. Kevin Daniels led the development of the protocol. Helen Fitzhugh contributed to the development of other elements of this protocol. Both have read, commented on and approved this protocol.

This review is not an up-date of a previous review, it is not an amendment of a previously published protocol.

The review is being carried out as part of a larger research programme under the Economic and Social Research Council Local Policy Innovation Partnerships scheme, where our research team's focus is on East Anglian coastal communities. We are supported by Economic and Social Research Council grant number ES/Y000080/1. We have followed procedures developed in our earlier work for the What Works Wellbeing Centre, and followed the recommendations on systematic reviews for procedures for data selection, extraction, evidence grading and the use of PICOS and PRISMA-P procedures in developing systematic review protocols.

This protocol outlines the search process for the review.

An initial scoping of existing systematic reviews, conceptual reviews and meta-analyses, to be conducted as part of this systematic review.

The review process will aim to identify research relevant to all of the questions as well as identifying potential gaps that suggest the need for further research.

PROCESS

The review proceeded through the following stages:

1. Defining broad objectives.

These were defined through the team’s application for funding.

2. Define specific objectives.

3. Define inclusion criteria and databases

4. Define search terms

These were defined through consultation between members of the review team and wider management group.

5. Run dummy searches

The intention here is to use refine search methods. If a prohibitively large number of studies are identified given resources constraints, we will introduce restrictions.

6. Run searches for existing systematic reviews and meta-analyses

7. Run searches for primary empirical studies

8. Sift titles and abstracts

Titles will be reviewed by a members of the team and assessed as to whether they meet inclusion criteria, if it’s not possible to determine this by title alone then reviewers will use the abstract, if there is still some doubt then the paper will be retained for the time being.

9. Run inter-rater consistency checks

Once the inclusion/exclusion criteria were fully defined and settled, searches were run. Prior to full sifting of full papers, KD and HF read through 50 abstracts and their decisions compared. Differences between the reviewers were discussed to ensure consistency of interpretation all reviewers. In this stage, of the 17 papers put through by HF, 15 were also put through by KD. Discrepancies were easily resolved (e.g. one paper was an introduction to a special issue, the other was a review paper).

10. Sift full papers

Reviewers will assess the full papers for relevance to the research question. If on reviewing the full paper it's found it does not meet the inclusion criteria it will be rejected.

11. Run inter-rater consistency checks

KD and HF sampled 10 papers and decisions compared to ensure consistency of interpretation.

12. Remove duplicates

This pertains to papers from the same sample or intervention. Data from multiple sources are to be synthesised as one study.

13. Conduct reviews for effects and context/process factors

Prior to full reading of papers, data extraction sheets were developed by KD and HF. Data extraction sheets were then used to summarise the characteristics and findings from each paper. Each paper was then read by one member of the review team. Two of each reviewers' papers were read by another member of the team ensure consistency of interpretation. Key findings from the papers in respect the process of implementation and also effects of the intervention were extracted and compiled into evidence tables.

Our approach therefore will be to summarise the evidence in narrative format only. Given the breadth of topics covered in this review, the literature will be too heterogenous to apply meta-analysis.

15. Compile evidence statements

Members of the review team met to agree on evidence statements that summarised findings in the review tables.

Members of the review team met to agree on the quality of the evidence underpinning each evidence statement. To do this, we used the NESTA standards of evidence grading, summarised below as:

1. There is a logical reason why an intervention/action should have an impact (e.g. programme theory, theory of change);
2. There is some evidence an intervention/action has an effect in a given group (e.g. in panel analysis, pre-post test design);
3. There is an evidence an intervention/action has an effect in a given group from randomised control or non-equivalent control group control group designs with a reasonably large sample size;
4. There is evidence an intervention/action has an effect on the basis of independent evaluation and there is documented implementation guidance;
5. There is evidence the intervention can be scaled up and is financially viable, evidenced by, for example, multiple replications.

23. Write up draft review

24. Publicise findings via website and social media

Elements of the review were written up during the review process. Once the final evidence statements had been decided upon, and statements made on the quality of evidence and certainty of findings, draft recommendations were drawn up.

SEARCH TERMS AND INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA

The acronym PICOS (population, intervention, comparators, outcome, study design) is typically used as a way of understanding the different aspects a research question for a review should specify and as a way of developing search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria. For this review this can be summarized as follows.

Population: Interested in capturing research about interventions to change opportunities for good work, the green economy and protecting and renewing cultural and environmental heritage in East Anglian coastal communities or similar coastal communities, where similarity is defined by similar institutional or geographic circumstances.

Intervention: Focussing on the effects (intended, unintended, beneficial, harmful) of interventions in coastal communities in the focal areas of the review, and factors that may affect the implementation of those interventions. Therefore, we will seek to review studies that have investigated a range of interventions in coastal communities.

Comparison: Looking at a range of interventions, their effects and implementation, but not intending to make a priori comparisons between specific interventions or sub-populations. We will require extracted studies to report on changes (or not) in a range of outcomes relevant to intervention, with changes in health, wellbeing and/or economic performance of particular interest.

Outcomes: Outcomes are those assessed by study authors. We will develop a taxonomy of outcomes.

Study Designs: Studies, qualitative or quantitative, that include a longitudinal element will be included. Studies with retrospective measurement of changes will be included.

Other.

Any peer reviewed empirical research published in an English language peer reviewed journal that meets the other inclusion criteria as specified above. This includes qualitative and quantitative approaches. The rationale for this being that we will also engage in a search of the grey literature. Articles not containing empirical research will be excluded. A call for evidence will be issued which may pick up grey literature. We will also contact relevant professional practice/policy experts who may commission grey literature or be aware of grey literature in the form of policy/professional practice reports, as well as search the websites of these professional practice/policy organisations – for example Voluntary Sector Norfolk, Suffolk Chambers of Commerce, South East Local Economic Partnership. In the initial search phase the research team will also seek to identify existing systematic and other reviews that are relevant.

According to the research questions and aims outlined above, search terms have been developed (set out below). The research team will consult with other members of the project management group. We will restrict our search to research published in the last 10 years from the date of the initial search. The rationale is that more recent research will use more rigorous methodologies and recent data, but will also incorporate important findings from previous research. In respect of subject areas, studies in meteorology or astrophysics are unlikely to be relevant to this particular review for example. Therefore, we will apply subject area filters. Given our focus on the East Anglia coast, we will also apply geographical area filters for coastal areas. We will restrict our review to

studies conducted in the UK, Ireland, France, Belgium and the Netherlands, given these have similar coastal contexts, either socially, economically and/or geographically.

Search terms.

Population/Sampling keywords:= (coast*)

Intervention keywords = (occupation* OR work) OR (*heritage) OR (environment*_sustain* OR green-econom* OR environ*_resilien*)

Outcome keywords = not defined.

Study design/Methods keywords = (experiment OR randomised_control_trial OR randomized_control_trial OR case_study OR longitudinal OR panel* OR evaluat*)

In addition, an initial search for existing narrative and systematic reviews and meta-analyses will be carried out using the terms (*best_evidence_review * OR systematic_review * OR meta-analys* OR narrative_review OR theory OR theoretical_frame* OR theoretical_model OR concept*_review OR concept*_frame* OR concept*_model*).

For the review of empirical studies only, we restricted the searches to the following geographical areas: France, Belgium, Netherlands, Ireland, UK, England, Scotland, Wales.

For the review of empirical studies only, we restricted the searches to the following subject areas deemed most relevant to the review: Archaeology; climate change; environmental sciences; archaeometry; hospitality; leisure; tourism and sport; water resources; sustainability science; economic theory; modelling and simulation; safety and maintenance; education and educational research; political science; management; anthropology; human geography; modern history; medieval and early modern history; supply chain and logistics; healthcare policy; music; 20th century history; economics; political philosophy; operations and management science; mapping and topography; health literacy and telemedicine; nutrition and dietetics; transportation; knowledge engineering and representation; agricultural policy; homelessness and human trafficking; social reform; telecommunications; law; art; social psychology; sociology.

We placed no restrictions on the review of reviews in terms of geographic area or subject, reasoning that reviews would have general coverage.

Databases

Initial search to target: Web of Science. Given the time frame for reporting, we decided to limit our search to the most comprehensive database.

Documenting the search process

In order to ensure that the search process is transparent and replicable, the resources searched and dates when searched will be recorded along with numbers of results returned.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Is the study an empirical study in coastal communities in the UK, Ireland, France, Belgium and the Netherlands

Yes - include

No – exclude

Is the study an empirical study in coastal communities of actions targeted at one or more of the following:

1. *Opportunities for good work;*
2. *The green economy;*
3. *Protecting and renewing the coast's cultural and environmental heritage.*

Yes - include

No – exclude

Does the paper use longitudinal methods and assess some form of intervention design using empirical means?

Yes – quantitative approach – include

Yes – qualitative approach – include

Yes – mixed methods – include

Yes – retrospective analysis of change

No - exclude

Does the paper or related studies on the same intervention reports on the amount of change in indicators of outcomes as defined by the study's authors?

Yes – quantitative approach – include

Yes – qualitative approach – include

Yes – mixed methods - include

No - exclude

Grey Literature Review Protocol – **Actions to help East Anglia’s coastal communities**

A grey literature review will complement the systematic review outlined above. To supplement the review, there will be a call for evidence issued to civil society and business groups in the counties of Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk. The review will be focused on interventions and evaluations conducted from 2017-2023 inclusive to ensure contemporary relevance and address time and other resource constraints.

Largely, the review will mirror the review of the scientific peer-reviewed literature outlined and will cover:

1. **Opportunities for good work;**
2. **The green economy;**
3. **Protecting and renewing the East Anglian coast’s cultural and environmental heritage**

If policy documents are uncovered by the review, these will be consulted for specific interventions proposed.

The authors of this protocol are: Kevin Daniels and Helen Fitzhugh.

Kevin Daniels is the guarantor. Kevin Daniels led the development of the protocol. Helen Fitzhugh contributed to the development of other elements of this protocol. Both have read, commented on and approved this protocol.

This review is not an up-date of a previous review, it is not an amendment of a previously published protocol.

The review is being carried out as part of a larger research programme under the Economic and Social Research Council Local Policy Innovation Partnerships scheme, where our research team's focus is on East Anglian coastal communities. We are supported by Economic and Social Research Council grant number ES/Y000080/1. We have followed procedures developed in our earlier work for the What Works Wellbeing Centre, and followed the recommendations on systematic reviews for procedures for data selection, extraction, evidence grading and the use of PICOS and PRISMA-P procedures in developing systematic review protocols.

This protocol outlines the search process for the grey literature review.

The review process will aim to identify research relevant to all of the questions as well as identifying potential gaps that suggest the need for further research.

PROCESS

The review proceeded through the following stages:

1. Defining broad objectives.

These were defined through the team’s application for funding.

2. Define specific objectives.

3. Define inclusion criteria and databases

4. Define search terms

These were defined through consultation between members of the review team and wider management group.

5. Run searches for relevant reports and studies

6. Sift titles and abstracts

Titles will be reviewed by a members of the team and assessed as to whether they meet inclusion criteria, if it's not possible to determine this by title alone then reviewers will use the abstract, if there is still some doubt then the paper will be retained for the time being.

7. Inter-rater consistency checks

Given time constraints and that consistency checks were applied to review of the peer-reviewed literature, inter-rater consistency checks were not applied to the review of the grey literature.

8. Sift full papers

Reviewers will assess the full papers for relevance to the research question. If on reviewing the full paper it's found it does not meet the inclusion criteria it will be rejected.

9. Run inter-rater consistency checks

Given time constraints and that consistency checks were applied to review of the peer-reviewed literature, inter-rater consistency checks were not applied to the review of the grey literature.

10. Remove duplicates

This pertains to papers from the same sample or intervention. Data from multiple sources are to be synthesised as one study.

11. Conduct reviews for effects and context/process factors

Prior to full reading of papers, data extraction sheets were developed by KD and HF. Data extraction sheets were then used to summarise the characteristics and findings from each report. Each paper was then read by one member of the review team. Two of each reviewers' reports were read by another member of the team ensure consistency of interpretation. Key findings from the papers in respect the process of implementation and also effects of the intervention were extracted and compiled into evidence tables.

Our approach therefore will be to summarise the evidence in narrative format only.

12. Compile evidence statements

Members of the review team met to agree on evidence statements that summarised findings in the review tables.

Members of the review team met to agree on the quality of the evidence underpinning each evidence statement. To do this, we used the NESTA standards of evidence grading as per the review of the peer-reviewed literature.

13. Write up draft review

14. Publicise findings via website and social media

Elements of the review were written up during the review process. Once the final evidence statements had been decided upon, and statements made on the quality of evidence and certainty of findings, draft recommendations were drawn up.

SEARCH TERMS AND INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA

The acronym PICOS (population, intervention, comparators, outcome, study design) is typically used as a way of understanding the different aspects a research question for a review should specify and as a way of developing search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria. For this review this can be summarized as follows.

Population: Interested in capturing research about interventions to change opportunities for good work, the green economy and protecting and renewing cultural and environmental heritage in East Anglian coastal communities.

Intervention: Focussing on the effects (intended, unintended, beneficial, harmful) of interventions in coastal communities in the focal areas of the review, and factors that may affect the implementation of those interventions. Therefore, we will seek to review studies that have investigated a range of interventions in coastal communities.

Comparison: Looking at a range of interventions, their effects and implementation, but not intending to make a priori comparisons between specific interventions or sub-populations. We will require extracted studies to report on changes (or not) in a range of outcomes relevant to intervention, with changes in health, wellbeing and/or economic performance of particular interest.

Outcomes: Outcomes are those assessed by study authors. We will develop a taxonomy of outcomes.

Study Designs: Studies, qualitative or quantitative, that include a longitudinal element will be included. Studies with retrospective measurement of changes will be included.

Other.

Any empirical research published as a report that meets the other inclusion criteria as specified above. This includes qualitative and quantitative approaches. Reports not containing empirical research will be excluded, but may be consulted for relevant background information. A call for evidence will be issued which may pick up grey literature.

According to the research questions and aims outlined above, search terms have been developed (set out below). The research team will consult with other members of the project management group. We will restrict our searchers to reports published 2017-2023 inclusive to ensure contemporary relevance and address time and other resource constraints and reports concerned with coastal communities in Essex, Suffolk or Norfolk.

Search terms

Population/Sampling keywords:= (coast*) AND (East Anglia* OR Essex OR Suffolk OR Norfolk)

Intervention keywords = (occupation* OR work) OR (*heritage) OR (environment*_sustain* OR green-econom* OR environ*_resilien*)

Outcome keywords = not defined.

Study design/Methods keywords = not defined

Databases

Initial search to target: Google Scholar. Given the time frame for reporting, we decided to limit our search to the most comprehensive database. We will search only the first 500 hits on Scholar. We will also search the following websites for reports:

South East and New Anglia Local Economic Partnerships
Essex, Suffolk and Norfolk Chambers of Commerce
Voluntary Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex
Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Council
North Norfolk Council
Great Yarmouth Council
East Suffolk Council
Tendring Council
Colchester Council
Maldon Council
Rochford Council
Castle Point Council
Thurrock Council
Southend Council

Documenting the search process

In order to ensure that the search process is transparent and replicable, the resources searched and dates when searched will be recorded along with numbers of results returned.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Is the study an empirical study in coastal communities in Essex, Suffolk or Norfolk

Yes - include

No – exclude

Is the study an empirical study in coastal communities of actions targeted at one or more of the following:

4. *Opportunities for good work;*
5. *The green economy;*
6. *Protecting and renewing the coast's cultural and environmental heritage.*

Yes - include

No – exclude

Does the paper use longitudinal methods and assess some form of intervention design using empirical means?

Yes – quantitative approach – include

Yes – qualitative approach – include

Yes – mixed methods – include

Yes – retrospective analysis of change

No - exclude

Does the paper or related studies on the same intervention reports on the amount of change in indicators of outcomes as defined by the study's authors?

Yes – quantitative approach – include

Yes – qualitative approach – include

Yes – mixed methods - include

No – exclude