

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Anderson et al. An umbrella review of enablers and barriers for the implementation of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs). Inplasy protocol 202170003. doi: 10.37766/inplasy2021.7.0003

Received: 02 July 2021

Published: 02 July 2021

Corresponding author:
Michael Anderson

M.Anderson5@lse.ac.uk

Author Affiliation:
London School of Economics
and Political Science.

Support: PHIN.

Review Stage at time of this submission: Piloting of the study selection process.

Conflicts of interest:
None declared.

An umbrella review of enablers and barriers for the implementation of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs)

Anderson, M¹; Stokes, A²; Fistein, J³; Porter, I⁴; Valderas, J⁵.

Review question / Objective: We aim to map out key enablers and barriers to patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) implementation in the scientific literature.

Condition being studied: Many procedure and speciality specific PROMS have been developed and implemented, with PROMs most commonly used for patients undergoing surgical procedures, and receiving oncology care. However, PROMs are being increasingly utilised in other settings including palliative care, physical rehabilitation, and mental health settings.

Information sources: Medline, EMBASE, PsychInfo, & Grey literature.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 02 July 2021 and was last updated on 02 July 2021 (registration number INPLASY202170003).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: We aim to map out key enablers and barriers to patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) implementation in the scientific literature.

Rationale: Patient reported outcome measures (PROMS) have grown in popularity over the last three decades. Originally conceived as a research tool to facilitate the measurement of more subjective health outcomes, including

quality of life and self-reported health status, their potential value in clinical practice and as a mechanism to improve healthcare quality and promote patient centred healthcare delivery has been increasingly recognised. A number of challenges in routinely using PROMs in practice have been previously identified, including lack of resources to support implementation, complexity of PROMs questionnaires, difficulty in interpreting PROMs data, and professional resistance. To understand how to overcome challenges and make best use of potential facilitators, we aim to map out enablers and barriers for the implementation of PROMS.

Condition being studied: Many procedure and speciality specific PROMS have been developed and implemented, with PROMs most commonly used for patients undergoing surgical procedures, and receiving oncology care. However, PROMs are being increasingly utilised in other settings including palliative care, physical rehabilitation, and mental health settings.

METHODS

Search strategy: We will search MEDLINE, EMBASE, and PsychInfo using the following search terms: ("patient reported outcome" OR "patient reported outcomes" OR "PROM" OR "PROMS") AND ("implement*" OR "barrier*" OR "facilitat*" OR "enabl*").ab,ti., from January 1st 2000 to December 31st 2020. Two reviewers will independently screen articles to identify relevant reviews, and then review the full text of articles. Any disagreements between these two reviewers will be resolved through consultation with a third reviewer.

Participant or population: Patients and healthcare professionals which are involved in the processes for the collection, submission, or interpretation of PROMs data.

Intervention: Different approaches to implementation of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs).

Comparator: Different approaches to implementation of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs).

Study designs to be included: Systematic literature reviews including scoping reviews, umbrella reviews, realistic reviews, integrative reviews, meta-synthesis, meta-ethnography, and meta-regression.

Eligibility criteria: The inclusion criteria for this review were: 1) systematic literature reviews; 2) a focus on enablers and barriers to the implementation of PROMS in routine medical care; and 3) published in English. We will use no exclusion criteria for type of PROM or medical specialty. We will however exclude narrative reviews, reviews related to the use of PROMS in clinical trials and reviews related to the validation or measurement properties of PROMS.

Information sources: Medline, EMBASE, PsychInfo, & Grey literature.

Main outcome(s): Implementation of patient reported outcome measures (PROMs).

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: Two reviewers will independently assess the risk of bias of each eligible review using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist.

Strategy of data synthesis: Data will be extracted from included reviews using a proforma by a single reviewer and checked by a second reviewer. Information on key enablers and barriers will be summarised thematically according to the theoretical domains framework, an implementation science framework commonly used to understand behaviour change of healthcare professionals.

Subgroup analysis: Not applicable.

Sensitivity analysis: Not applicable.

Language: English.

Country(ies) involved: United Kingdom.

Keywords: Patient reported outcome measures; PROMs; outcome measurement; implementation; theoretical domains framework.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Michael Anderson - MA will conduct title and abstract screening, data extraction, quality assessment, and drafting of manuscript.

Email: M.Anderson5@lse.ac.uk

Author 2 - Adam Stokes - AS will conduct title and abstract screening, data extraction, quality assessment, and drafting of manuscript.

Email: apstokes@gmail.com

Author 3 - Jon Fistein - JF will contribute comments and edits throughout iterative drafts of the manuscript.

Email: jon.fistein@phin.org.uk

Author 4 - Ian Porter - IP will act as a third reviewer to resolved disagreements between the primary and secondary reviewers (MA and AS), and contribute comments and edits throughout iterative drafts of the manuscript.

Email: i.porter@exeter.ac.uk

Author 5 - Jose Valderas - JV will contribute comments and edits throughout iterative drafts of the manuscript.

Email: j.m.valderas@exeter.ac.uk