

Ready Together Evidence Audit Trail

To make sure the advice in this toolkit is based on evidence, a team at a university was used to review all the relevant information related to community resilience. This meant that the following numbers of sources were searched for, found, reviewed, quality assured and screened. This ensures we only used the sources with scientific quality and rigor.

This audit trail brings together the documented methods from each of the four complementary evidence-review workstreams. The workstreams were not methodologically identical: academic systematic searches, policy/grey-literature searches and leading-practice searches used different sources and screening approaches. The record therefore preserves each protocol separately rather than implying a single uniform search process. For the sources ultimately cited within the Ready Together modules, the separate References document should be used as the record of final included/cited documents; this audit trail records the wider search and screening processes that informed the evidence synthesis.

Search sources and date parameters

Across the workstreams, the evidence review combined structured academic database searching with policy, government, organisational, grey-literature and real-world practice searching. Search dates and filters differed by workstream. The academic strands generally focused on material from 2000 onwards, while the policy/leading-practice strand used a 2004 cut-off for UK policy and official guidance and a 2010 cut-off for press, organisational, grey-literature and real-world case evidence. The workstream-specific parameters are recorded below.

Evidence workstream	Databases / sources documented	Date / language parameters	Audit detail
Collective action, community action and community organising	Academic: PsycINFO, MEDLINE, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, ASSIA, Sociological Abstracts, Social Science Citation Index, IBSS, PILOTS Database, Disaster Lit and PAIS Index. Grey/policy: GOV.UK; Scottish Government; Welsh Government; Northern Ireland Executive; Cabinet Office; Local Resilience Forums; National Emergencies Trust; British Red Cross; IFRC; UNDRR; WHO; OECD; FEMA; Australian Institute for Disaster Resilience; Locality; supplementary Google Scholar.	2000-present. English initially, with the protocol noting that some non-English sources could be relevant. Global scope.	Search concepts covered community organising/action, community/context, resilience/crisis and interventions. Structural/economic moderators were specified for extraction rather than as mandatory search terms. Eligible evidence included peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews, policy reports and evaluations.
Community resilience and societal resilience	Academic: PsycINFO, MEDLINE, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, ASSIA, Sociological Abstracts, Social Science Citation Index, IBSS, Disaster Lit, PILOTS Database and PAIS Index. Grey literature:	2000-present; English. Global, with particular attention to countries with established resilience frameworks or relevant programmes, including the UK, Finland, Singapore, Japan,	The protocol was explicitly interdisciplinary and included academic, policy, programme-evaluation and grey-literature evidence. Search concepts covered resilience, communities,

	GOV.UK, Cabinet Office, UK Resilience Framework, National Risk Register, Local Resilience Forums and devolved governments; UNDRR, WHO, OECD, FEMA, IFRC and Australian Institute for Disaster Resilience; National Emergencies Trust, British Red Cross and community-resilience networks.	Norway, Estonia, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the USA.	emergency/disruption contexts and interventions/programmes.
Social Identity Theory / groups	Documented searches included Scopus, PsycINFO (ProQuest), MEDLINE/PubMed, Web of Science, ASSIA, Sociological Abstracts, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS), PILOTS Database, Disaster Lit/its archive, DR2 and PAIS Index. Social Science Citation Index was treated as already covered within Web of Science.	Predominantly 2000 to August 2026, English/scholarly-journal filters where applicable. Examples in the audit include Scopus searched 11 Aug 2026; Web of Science 2000-11 Aug 2026; ASSIA 2000-11 Aug 2026; IBSS 2000-11 Aug 2026; PAIS 2000-11 Aug 2026.	The audit records 17,072 records merged before deduplication and 8,961 after deduplication. Titles/abstracts were screened, with a more focused set prioritised for detailed review. Thirty-six higher-priority papers were full-text evaluated; 17 fully met the protocol and 6 borderline papers were retained after review to inform mechanisms, giving 23 retained sources in this strand.
Lived experience / leading practice: policy, press and grey literature	Primary sources: GOV.UK, Cabinet Office, UK Parliament, UK Resilience Academy, Local Resilience Forums, local-authority emergency planning/resilience pages, Environment Agency, NHS England and Local Government Association; devolved-government sources; British Red Cross, National Emergencies Trust and relevant voluntary/community emergency organisations; UNDRR, UNDP, United Nations Volunteers, IFRC, OECD and WHO where relevant; BBC News, Reuters, The Guardian, Sky News and relevant local press. Website/Google searching used predefined site-specific queries. Supplementary academic searching could use tools/databases such as Scopus or Web of Science to corroborate or contextualise identified cases.	UK policy/official guidance: 2004-present. Press, organisational, grey-literature and real-world case evidence: 2010-present. English. UK policy was primary, with relevant UK and international real-world examples included where they offered transferable learning.	Two primary evidence streams were used: (A) UK policy and official guidance and (B) real-world examples, press and grey literature, with (C) supplementary academic evidence used case- or theme-specifically. Search phrases, site/source, date and numbers screened were to be recorded. Supplementary academic searches were documented separately from the primary systematic search.

Audit note: individual database filters varied. The summary deliberately reports the documented parameters by workstream rather than assuming one date range or one database list on the whole review.

Inclusion, exclusion and screening criteria

Across the workstreams, evidence was screened using criteria appropriate to the relevant protocol. Potentially relevant material was assessed against the stated eligibility criteria, with duplicate and out-of-scope material removed. The workstream-specific inclusion, exclusion and screening criteria are recorded below. Sources retained through these processes informed the evidence synthesis and development of the Ready Together

content. The separate 'References' document records the sources ultimately cited within the modules and should be referred to for that final cited set.

Workstream-specific audit detail

Collective action, community action and community organising

- Included peer-reviewed articles, systematic reviews, policy reports and evaluations examining community organising and/or community action in relation to crisis preparedness, response or recovery at community, regional, societal or state level.
- Eligible designs included RCTs, quasi-experimental studies, controlled before-after studies, natural experiments, mixed-method evaluations, qualitative studies/case studies, process evaluations, realist evaluations and impact evaluations.
- Excluded interventions unrelated to community organising/action; studies measuring resilience without an organising/action mechanism; and infrastructure-only studies with no community component.
- The protocol specified primary outcomes such as preparedness, response capability, recovery capacity, community functioning and collective efficacy, with secondary outcomes including leadership development, mobilisation, network/coalition strength, sustainability, transferability and civic engagement.

Community resilience and societal resilience

- Included peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews, government and policy reports, programme evaluations and grey literature; qualitative, quantitative and mixed-method evidence was eligible.
- Studies were expected to examine community- or societal-level resilience, include an emergency/disaster/crisis/disruption context, evaluate resilience-building approaches or programmes, and/or examine mechanisms, outcomes or implementation factors.
- Eligible designs included experimental and quasi-experimental studies, natural experiments, qualitative intervention studies, mixed-methods studies, realist and other theory-based evaluations, logic-model/programme-theory studies and process evaluations.
- Excluded individual psychological-resilience interventions without community relevance; unrelated clinical interventions; studies focused only on individual coping; studies unrelated to emergencies/disasters/societal disruption; theoretical/conceptual papers without empirical or intervention data; conference abstracts/protocols without extractable findings; and duplicate publications.

Social Identity Theory / groups

- Searches combined social/shared/collective/group/community identity and related constructs with community populations, resilience/emergency contexts and intervention/evaluation terms.
- After deduplication, titles and abstracts were screened, with higher-priority papers identified for detailed assessment. The audit distinguishes papers closely fitting the protocol from adjacent/mechanism-focused papers.
- Thirty-six higher-priority papers were evaluated in full text. Seventeen fully met the protocol; six borderline papers were retained following review because they were useful for identifying underpinning mechanisms, giving 23 retained sources.
- The audit therefore records both strict protocol fit and explicitly documented judgement for borderline mechanism-relevant evidence rather than treating all retained papers as methodologically identical.

Lived experience / leading practice

- Included English-language sources concerning community or societal resilience that related to preparedness, response, recovery, adaptation or longer-term community capacity.

- Eligible sources included national/local government policy and guidance, Local Resilience Forum material, local-authority publications, recognised emergency/voluntary-sector reports, international organisational reports and reputable news reports containing substantive information about an eligible case.
- Sources needed to provide policy/guidance, empirical evidence, an evaluation or a sufficiently documented real-world example, and to describe community participation, capacity, community-level action, relationships or partnerships where relevant.
- Excluded duplicate sources; personal blogs; social-media posts used as standalone evidence; unsupported opinion/editorial pieces; promotional material without substantive evidence; individual psychological resilience without a community dimension; engineering/infrastructure/ecological resilience without a meaningful community dimension; incidental mentions of community/emergency; and purely theoretical material without relevance to policy, practice or the review questions.
- Screening was two-stage: title/headline and abstract/summary screening, followed by full-text screening of potentially eligible sources. Reasons for full-text exclusion were to be recorded and duplicates removed before synthesis.
- Supplementary academic evidence was used to corroborate, evaluate or contextualise important cases and was identified separately from the primary policy/grey-literature search.
- Following screening, the eligible evidence was synthesised into key themes. Strong representative sources and examples were then purposively selected within these themes to represent the wider evidence in the final content, resulting in 43 core sources being taken forward.

The column on the right shows how many sources of evidence made it through our quality assurance criteria.

In the table below we are showing you the area that we searched for in the column on the left. The column in the middle shows the number of relevant and reviewed sources. The column on the right shows the number of core sources taken forward following the screening, quality assurance and selection processes used within each workstream.

Focus	Total Reviewed	Final Post Screening
Collective Action, Community Action and Community Organising	4422	11
Community Resilience, Societal Resilience	5446	19
Social Identity Theory (Groups)	8961	23
Lived Experience Examples/Leading Practice	729	43

Across all four workstreams, 19,558 sources were reviewed and 96 sources were taken forward to inform the development of the Ready Together Modules. As the evidence was translated into the individual modules, the core evidence base was supplemented with additional sources to support specific content and examples. Together, the core and supplementary evidence resulted in 123 unique sources being cited across the final modules.

The content was then reviewed by experts who have been through over 155 emergencies, as well as practitioner groups and academic experts. After putting it through all those filters and assurance processes, we then created the resources you can access today.