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Review question
To examine older (over 60 years) LGBTQI+ people’s perceptions and experiences of using home care services. The review aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the experiences or perceptions of older (over 60 years) LGBTQI+ people in using formal home care services?

2. What impact (if any) do these experiences have on the physical and mental health of those utilising home care services?

3. What are the barriers and facilitators to accessing these services?

Searches
The following six electronic databases will be searched: MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Social Policy and Practice, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA). There are no date restrictions and only peer reviewed articles published in English will be eligible for inclusion.

Reference searching of relevant literature reviews and included articles will be conducted. Experts in the field of research identified from the literature searches will also be contacted to identify other potentially relevant articles missed from the electronic searches.

Types of study to be included
We will include quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods studies.

Condition or domain being studied
The experiences of older (over 60 years) LGBTQI+ people using home care services in the community.

Participants/population
Inclusion: People who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or intersex (LGBTQI+). Older people aged over 60 years old.

Exclusion: Those aged under 60 and non-LGBTQI+ people.
**Intervention(s), exposure(s)**
The experiences of older people receiving home care and the challenges they face has been reported previously. However, the peer reviewed literature describing the perceptions and experiences of older LGBTQI+ people utilising these important social care services remains poorly synthesised and understood. Therefore, this systematic review will examine older (over 60 years) LGBTQI+ people’s perceptions and experiences of using formal home care services in the community.

**Comparator(s)/control**
Not applicable

**Main outcome(s)**
To understand the experiences and perceptions (either positive or negative) of older LGBTQI+ people's use of formal home care services in the community. It is expected that included articles will be mainly, if not entirely, qualitative.

* Measures of effect
Not applicable.

**Additional outcome(s)**
1. Identify perceived impact on the physical and mental health of older LGBTQI+ people utilising home care services.

2. Establishing the barriers and facilitators to older LGBTQI+ people in accessing home care services.

* Measures of effect
Not applicable.

**Data extraction (selection and coding)**

Study screening and selection:
Following duplicate removal, both review authors will independently screen the titles and abstracts to identify studies potentially fitting the inclusion criteria. Both authors will then scrutinise full texts of the selected articles. Where there is uncertainty about inclusion, consensus will be achieved by discussion. All decisions surrounding study selection will be recorded in an excel file.

Data extraction and management:

Data will be extracted using standardised data extraction forms and subsequently entered into standardised tables. Data extraction for quantitative studies will include author details, year of publication and publication type, participant demographics, sample size, results, key findings related LGBTQI+ perceptions and experiences of home care, and the authors’ conclusions. Data extracted for qualitative studies will be the same for those included for quantitative studies but will also include the main themes identified by the study authors. For mixed methods studies both types of forms will be used. We will attempt to obtain missing data by contacting the study authors. Disagreements between individual judgements will be resolved through discussion.

**Risk of bias (quality) assessment**
The quality of included studies will be assessed independently by two members of the research team using the QualSyst review tool. This tool was selected because it permits scoring for both qualitative and quantitative studies. Any differences in ratings will be identified and consensus achieved through discussion amongst the team members. Although no studies will be excluded based on quality scores, quality...
assessment will allow for interrogation of the methodological quality of included studies and the power of the studies.

**Strategy for data synthesis**
Data will be synthesised using a narrative approach. Given the broad research questions and varied study types expected, narrative synthesis is an appropriate choice. Data will be entered into standardised tables which will include the main findings from each included study. For qualitative studies, both study authors will independently read, identify and record themes related the LGBTQI+ experiences of home care services. Both authors will also document any quantitative data relevant to the research questions. Relationships in the data and between groups of studies will then be explored pertaining to the research questions, for example, whether minority subgroups of LGBTQI+ people (e.g. black African gay men) report better or worse experiences of home care services than others (e.g. white gay men).

**Analysis of subgroups or subsets**
Not applicable
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<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data extraction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of bias (quality) assessment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
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