



Background

- There are a number of patient-reported or patient-centred outcome measures in palliative care and increasingly widespread work done to implement outcome measurement in palliative populations (Antunes et al 2013, Hearn & Higginson 1999, Higginson & Carr 2001)
- But there is limited evidence and no review of the impact of the use of PCOMs on clinical practice and outcomes in palliative care populations





Aim of the review

To understand the methods by which PCOMs data is collected, transferred and fed back in palliative care and the effect(s) on process and outcomes of care





























Systematic review of PROMS in oncology Kotronoulas. J Clin Oncol, 2014: 32:1480

- The routine use of PROMs increases the frequency of discussion of patient outcomes during consultations.
- In some studies, PROMs associated with improved symptom control, increased supportive care measures, and improved patient satisfaction.
- Additional effort is required to ensure patient adherence, as well as additional support to clinicians who will respond to patient concerns and issues, with clear system guidelines in place to guide their responses.
- More research is required to support PROM cost-benefit in terms of patient safety, clinician burden, and health services usage.

Systematic review of routine clinical collection of PROMS in oncology

Howell et al Annals of Oncology 26: 1846–1858, 2015

- Identification of PROMs used in routine cancer clinical practice, and sought evidence of impact on patient, provider, and system outcomes, and the implementation factors influencing uptake
- 30 articles included
- PROM use appears to be acceptable to patients, enables earlier detection of symptoms and may improve communication between clinicians and patients
- However, the impact of routine PROMs collection on health outcomes is less clear and high-quality research is still warranted

Systematic review of routine clinical collection of PROMS in oncology

Howell et al Annals of Oncology 26: 1846-1858, 2015

Patient satisfaction:

- 2 RCTs evaluated the effect of PROMs on patient satisfaction; both positive effect but not stat significance
- Among 16 further studies on routine collection of PROMs, 13 studies (81%) reported a positive effect on patient satisfaction
- However, studies were limited by small sample sizes and a lack of comparability in terms of direct outcomes measured.

Systematic review of PROMS in oncology Howell et al Annals of Oncology 26: 1846-1858, 2015 Patient outcomes: 6 studies evaluating impact on overall patient well-being A significant overall effect on HROoL in 1 RCT, whereas 3 RCTs and one sequential cohort) found no significant effect Symptom management: controlled study; when results were generated from a computerized PROM and placed in patients' files, those reporting debilitating physical symptoms were significantly less likely to do so at the next visit (OR = 2.8, P = 0.04). PROMs increase symptom-related actions taken by clinicians; visits where patients reported higher ESAS scores for pain or shortness of breath were significantly associated with higher rates of documentation and action

What can we conclude?

In palliative care: evidence limited BUT what there is suggests that *using PCOMs leads to*:

- More efficient identification of symptoms
- More discussion of HRQoL (and better congruence)
- Professionals addressing symptom needs more often
- Possibly better emotional and psychological wellbeing In oncology: evidence is limited BUT what there is suggests

using PROMS *routinely in clinical practice*:

- Increases the frequency of discussion of pt outcomes
- Probably lead to improved symptom control, increased supportive care measures, & improved pt satisfaction
- Higher rates of action re symptoms and improved physical symptoms





References

- Antunes B, Harding R, Higginson IJ, on behalf of E. Implementing patient-reported outcome measures in palliative care clinical practice: A systematic review of facilitators and barriers. Palliat Med. 2013
- Hearn J, Higginson I. Development and validation of a core outcome measure for palliative care: the palliative care outcome scale. Palliative Care Core Audit Project Advisory Group. Quality in Health Care. 1999;8(4):219-27
- Simon S, Higginson I, Harding R, Daveson B, Gysels M, Deliens L, et al. Enhancing patient-reported outcome measurement in research and practice of palliative and end-of-life care. Support Care Cancer. 2012 20(7):1573-8
- Gwaltney CJ, Shields AL, Shiffman S. Equivalence of Electronic and Paper-and-Pencil Administration of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: A Meta-Analytic Review. Value in Health. 2008;11(2):322-33
- Bennett AV, Jensen RE, Basch E. Electronic patient-reported outcome systems in oncology clinical practice. CA Cancer J Clin. 2012 62(5):337-47
- 6. Gomes B, Higginson IJ. Factors influencing death at home in terminally ill patients with cancer: systematic review. BMJ (Clinical research ed.) 2006 332(7540):515-21
- Etkind SN, Daveson BA, Kwok W, Witt J, Bausewein C, Higginson IJ, et al. Capture Transfer, and Feedback of Patient-Centered Outcomes Data in Palliative Care Populations: Does It Make a Difference? A Systematic Review. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2014.

