



2013 International Shared Decision Making Conference

@isd2013
#isd2013
isd2013.org

20. ▲ Expert Panel Feedback: An Important Step in the Development of Patient Decision Aids

Ping Yein Lee^a, Yew Kong Lee^b, Ee Ming Khoo^b, Wah Yun Low^b, Khatijah Lim Abdullah^b, Wei Seng Chen^c, Abdul Samad Azah^d, Akmal Syahidatul^b, Chirk Jenn Ng^b

^a Universiti Putra Malaysia

^b University of Malaya

^c Klinik Alam Medic

^d Klinik Kesihatan Pantai

BACKGROUND

In the development of a patient decision aid (PDA), a systematic approach is important to ensure the PDA contains information that is balanced, adequate and understandable to help patients make an informed decision. The International Patient Decision Aids Standard committee recommends gathering expert panel feedback as one of the steps.

OBJECTIVE

To describe the process of expert panel selection and their feedback in the development of a PDA.

METHODS

A group of stakeholders involved in diabetes management were invited to be part of the expert panel. They were asked to provide feedback on a PDA that aimed to assist patients with type 2 diabetes to decide for or against insulin initiation. The experts reviewed the PDA and completed a self-administered questionnaire, which included feedback on the content, format, acceptability and feasibility of the PDA. Subsequently, a meeting was held to discuss and refine the PDA.

RESULTS

The expert panel consisted of 10 members, comprising family medicine specialists (n=1), general practitioners (n=1), diabetes educators (n=2), endocrinologist (n=2), policy makers (n=2) and patients (n=2). The panel agreed unanimously that the PDA would serve as a tool to assist patients in making decisions about starting insulin as there was no decision support tool in Malaysia. However, there was disagreement on the information given in the PDA. Some members felt that the PDA did not emphasise on choosing insulin injection as a better option; others felt that there should be more balanced information on each option. The panel found the risk communication table (a pictorial representation of the pros and cons of each option) rather confusing and suggested replacing it with simple text. Most members felt that the information in the PDA was adequate but more pictures and diagrams would help patients to understand the content better. Subsequently, the research team refined the PDA according to the feedback from the expert panel before pilot testing.

CONCLUSION

In the development of a PDA, the involvement of a multidisciplinary expert panel was crucial for the improvement of the PDA before its implementation.

43. ■ How to measure Patients' perceived organizational justice?

Diana Perez-Arechaederra^a, Elena Briones^b, Luis Garcia^c, Allan Lind^d, Sara Mora^e, Carmen Patino^f, Angel Maderuelo^g, Emiliano Rodriguez^c

^a Centrum Católica. Peru

^b Universidad de Cantabria. Spain

^c Unidad de Investigación de la Alamedilla. Spain.

^d Duke University. USA.

^e Universidad de Salamanca. Spain

^f Universidad de Salamanca. Spain.

^g Gerencia Atención Primaria de Salamanca. Spain.

Although health care is a sensitive topic when we talk about fairness, scarce research has been done considering justice perceptions of health care customers. Here the construction and validation of a scale that measures the perceived organizational justice of health care customers is presented. The Perceived Justice in Care Services Scale (PJustCS) was created and validated to be used in its English version and Spanish version (Percepción de Justicia en el Ámbito Sanitario, PJustAS). Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Multigroup CFA were performed using SEM approach. Those analyses with each sample yielded similar results. The final instrument has 22 items that measure four justice dimensions: distributive, procedural, interactional and informational. The Multigroup CFA showed the invariance of the structural model between samples. The validation of the measures indicates significant positive relations with patients' satisfaction, patients' trust in the health professional and patients' global justice perceptions. We can conclude that this scale can be used in its two different versions. Those differ in their language (English and Spanish) and in their assessment of different health systems (American, private vs. Spanish, public). Factor structure and factor covariances are equivalent between samples, supporting the distinction of four dimensions (i.e., distributive, procedural, interactional e informational). Those results also guarantee the comparability of the scores between contexts and the possibility of studying each dimension separately. Given the importance of perceiving justice on organizational results, considering this variable in cross cultural research in health care has the potential to improve policies and performance of systems far apart. The assessment of their patients' perceptions is a good way to delve deeper on the psychosocial dynamics that take place in health care settings.