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Person-centred care as a priority topic

- Cochrane Consumers and Communication priority-setting process (Synnot et al. 2018)
- Interventions to improve person-centred care – one of top 5 priorities
- Update existing Cochrane Review? *Interventions for providers to promote a patient-centred approach in clinical consultations* (Dwamena et al. 2012)
- Committed to stakeholders to co-produce priority reviews
Co-production approach: stakeholder panel

- Explored methods of co-production of systematic reviews (Pollock et al. 2015, 2016)
- Recruited by invitation, plus circulated via an Australian person-centred care network
- 18 stakeholders across Australia
  - 6 health service decision makers or policy makers
  - 6 clinicians
  - 6 consumer representatives
Co-producing the review: our process

- Scoping of update
  - Stakeholder panel meeting 1
- Draft protocol
  - Stakeholder panel meeting 2
- Finalise draft protocol
  - Submit for peer review
  - Stakeholder approval
- Revise protocol
- Publish protocol
- Screening of studies
  - Stakeholder panel meeting 3
- Data extraction and analysis
- Finalise analysis and peer review
- Publish review
  - Stakeholder approval

Key:
- author team
- stakeholder panel
- author team - TBC
- stakeholder panel - TBC

Adapted from:
Pollock et al. (2015)
Systematic Reviews, 4:55.
Stage 1: Deciding topic and review type

Feb ‘17  Scoping of update  Stakeholder panel meeting 1  4 months later

Questions for stakeholders:
1. What are your thoughts/impressions of the current version of the Review?
2. What would you like to see ultimately achieved by undertaking this Cochrane review?
3. Vote for your preferred option for taking this review forward (via anonymous survey):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option A: Limit the update to interventions focusing on ‘partnering with patients’ rather than ‘patient-centred care’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B: Conduct a qualitative review to complement the existing review</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C: Commence a new review on an emerging topic in the field of patient-centred care (suggestions welcome)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2: Drafting and feedback

QES protocol drafted on topic: *Consumers and health providers working in partnership for the promotion of person-centred health services: a co-produced qualitative evidence synthesis*

Stakeholder panel meeting 2 (teleconference)
Examples of feedback:

- **Background**: “Difficult to understand what the review was about until p. 3 (objectives plus included/excluded studies)”
- **Objective**: “A further objective is needed about identifying successful strategies that work for both health professionals and consumers.”
- **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**: “The exclusion rationale for working in partnership for community development was confusing.”
Stage 3: Revising and peer review

- Feb ‘17: Scoping of update
- July ‘17: Draft protocol
- Feb ‘18: Finalise draft protocol, Submit for peer review

Stakeholder panel meeting 1: 4 months later
Stakeholder panel meeting 2: 5 months later

Content specialist peer review
- Feedback received and implemented

Methods peer review
- Submitted to Qualitative and Implementation Methods Group
- Rejected x 2 – not sufficiently linked to a Cochrane effectiveness review
Solutions

Start a new effectiveness review matched to the person-centred care QES
(Lowe et al. forthcoming)

Policy change for future standalone QES in our Network - proposal drafted by Rebecca Ryan, Deputy Co-ed, Cochrane Consumers and Communication and accepted as pilot
**Stage 4: Revising, approving and publishing**

- **February '17**: Scoping of update
- **July '17**: Draft protocol
- **February '18**: Finalise draft protocol, Submit for peer review
- **July '18**: Revise protocol
- **November '18**: Publish protocol

- **Stakeholder panel meeting 1**: 4 months later
- **Stakeholder panel meeting 2**: 5 months later
- **Stakeholder approval**: October '18
Stage 5: Stakeholder involvement in review methods

Face-to-face panel meeting in Melbourne (successful funding application)

- Update stakeholders
- Train stakeholders in how-to-screen
- Do some screening
- Feedback on linked Lowe et al effectiveness protocol
Stage 6: Analysis and drafting of review

Screening of studies

Data extraction and analysis

Stakeholder panel meeting 3

Stakeholder panel meeting 4

Panel meeting 4 (via teleconference)

- Discuss results and their implications
- Ideas for dissemination of review
Final stages: Peer review, approval & publication

Oct ‘18
Screening of studies

Dec ‘18
Data extraction and analysis

Jul ‘19
Finalise analysis and peer review

Dec ‘19
Publish review

Stakeholder panel meeting 3
1 month later

Stakeholder panel meeting 4
6 months later

Stakeholder approval
Nov ‘19

Publication of review
• Stakeholders may assist with dissemination of published review
• Evaluate stakeholders’ experiences of the co-production process
Co-production: an author’s perspective

- Transformative
  - what we started out doing, turned into something very different
  - has changed how we think about the research process
- Organic
  - need to let go of control
  - be flexible
- Pushing the boundaries
  - pushes our boundaries as researchers
  - pushes Cochrane’s policy boundaries
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