Citation

Michelle Strong, Ledric Sherman, Margaret Foster. A review of the application of social network analysis in predicting depression in adult populations.. PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020202479 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020202479

Review question
How is social network analysis predictive of depressive symptoms in adults?

Searches
APA PsycINFO (EBSCO), MEDLINE Complete (EBSCO), Academic Search Complete (EBSCO), Embase (Ovid), SocIndex (EBSCO)

june 17, 2020

Types of study to be included
Study types to be included are cross-sectional or cohort studies

Condition or domain being studied
Depression is a mood disorder characterized by persistent sadness and loss of interest. The condition has a multifaceted etiology including biological and psychosocial factors such as an altered immunological profile, hormonal imbalance, exposure to catastrophic events, levels of daily hassles, experience of various types of stress, and genetic and epigenetic factors. Depression is a cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide; the WHO said depression is a leading cause of disability worldwide and burden of disease. Potential outcomes of depression include negative impacts on physical, emotional, social, and economical health. There are various types of depression such as Major Depression, Persistent Depressive Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, Seasonal Affective Disorder (SAD), Psychotic Depression, Peripartum (Postpartum) Depression, Premenstrual Dysphoric Disorder (PMDD), 'Situational' Depression, and Atypical Depression. Current treatment options are generally psychotherapy, medication, or a combination of both strategies.

Participants/population
Studies to be included in the review will investigate the adult population (ages 18 to 55); there is no gender or racial/ethnic population specification.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)
The exposure being measured is the social network. For inclusion in the systematic review, studies must use more than one social network analysis measure (such as size, centrality, transitivity, etcetera). Studies using social network indexes or scales that collect general network data will not be included (for example the Social Network Index or the Lubben Social Network Scale).

Comparator(s)/control
This is not relevant for this study.

Main outcome(s)
For inclusion in the systematic review, studies must have measured depression or depressive symptoms at some point in the study using a validated tool (such as the CES-D, BDI, EQ-5D, HAM-D, MADRS).

Measures of effect

This may be reported differently for different studies and therefore there is no one measure specified. However, odds ratios and relative risks are most likely to be reported.

Additional outcome(s)
Not applicable

Measures of effect

Not applicable

Data extraction (selection and coding)
The research team includes a systematic review librarian to aid in conducting searches and two reviews that will independently screen and sort articles based on inclusion and exclusion criteria. Any disagreement regarding inclusion will be decided via discussion between the two reviews. Covidence is an online tool that streamlines the systematic review process—this site will be used for data extraction, quality assessment, and screening and sorting articles. Information on the following items will be extracted: country or region and setting the of study; population demographics; study design, duration, funding and conflicts of interest; if the study addressed specific comorbidities; methods of recruitment, sampling and data collection; how depression was measured; the SNA measures analyzed; and the outcomes of the study, typically in the form of odds ratios or relatives risks.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
The quality assessment will follow protocol and use tools from the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) and will be recorded in a form in Covidence. Each reviewer will complete the quality assessment form in Covidence independently. If any disagreements arise, the reviews will discuss to resolve the disagreement.

Strategy for data synthesis
A narrative synthesis will be used to synthesize the data from the included studies. This will involve systematically and comprehensively assessing the results of each study, highlighting the important characteristics, and investigating the similarities and differences between the findings from the different studies, as well as exploring any patterns of the data. The reasons for any similarities and differences in the findings will be explored systematically, with possible explanations for the patterns of results considered in a logical way for each of the included studies.

In addition, a descriptive summary and explanation of the characteristics of the included studies will also be presented.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets
not applicable

Contact details for further information
Michelle Strong
mrbstrong@tamu.edu

Organisational affiliation of the review
Texas A&M University

Review team members and their organisational affiliations
Mrs Michelle Strong. Texas A&M University
Dr Ledric Sherman. Texas A&M University
Professor Margaret Foster. Texas A&M University

Type and method of review
Prognostic, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date
17 June 2020

Anticipated completion date
01 December 2020

Funding sources/sponsors
Not applicable

Conflicts of interest

Language
English

Country
United States of America

Stage of review
Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status
Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms
MeSH headings have not been applied to this record

Date of registration in PROSPERO
13 November 2020

Date of first submission
13 October 2020

Stage of review at time of this submission

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

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.
The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add publication details in due course.

Versions
13 November 2020