Cochrane in CORR

Cochrane in CORR®: Decision Aids for People Facing Health Treatment or Screening Decisions

Kim Madden MSc, Ydo V. Kleinlugtenbelt MD

Importance of the Topic

Orthopaedic clinicians must take into account the patient's own values and preferences when making diagnoses or treatment decisions. Consider the scenario in which a surgeon and a patient

must together decide between internal fixation and arthroplasty in a 50-year-old laborer with a displaced femoral neck fracture. Each treatment, with its advantages and disadvantages, must be weighed in the context of the patient's values. In this instance, that might mean the patient's willingness to endure a greater risk of reoperation in order to

preserve his native femoral head (by undergoing internal fixation), which might make it more likely for him to continue to work at his physical job.

Approaches to decision-making in settings like this include clinician-driven decisions (decisions based on the surgeon's best judgment), and decisions made in tandem with the patient (shared decision-making). In shared decision-making, the surgeon acts as an expert on the facts, and the patient acts as an expert on his or her own values [3]. Patient-oriented decision aids can help patients understand the risks and benefits of all available treatment/diagnosis options by providing impartial evidence-based information in plain language [2]. The goal is to engage patients in their own healthcare decisions in order to better align treatment choices with patients' preferences [10]. However, the degree to which shared decision-making is possible or helpful, whether it can or should be

A note from the Editor-in-Chief:

We are pleased to present the next installment of Cochrane in CORR®, our partnership between CORR®, The Cochrane Collaboration®, and McMaster University's Evidence-Based Orthopaedics Group. In this column, researchers from McMaster University and other institutions will provide expert perspective on an abstract originally published in The Cochrane Library that we think is especially important.

(Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L, Wu JHC. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD001431. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub4](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub4)).

The authors certify that they, or any members of their immediate families, have no funding or commercial associations (eg, consultancies, stock ownership, equity interest, patent/licensing arrangements, etc.) that might pose a conflict of interest in connection with the submitted article.

All ICMJE Conflict of Interest Forms for authors and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*® editors and board members are on file with the publication and can be viewed on request.

The opinions expressed are those of the writers, and do not reflect the opinion or policy of *CORR*® or the Association of Bone and Joint Surgeons®.

Cochrane Reviews are regularly updated as new evidence emerges and in response to feedback, and The Cochrane Library (<http://www.thecochranelibrary.com>) should be consulted for the most recent version of the review.

This Cochrane in *CORR*® column refers to the abstract available at: DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD008241.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008241.pub2).

K. Madden MSc (✉)
Department of Clinical Epidemiology & Biostatistics, McMaster University, 293 Wellington Street North, Suite 110, Hamilton, ON L8L 8E7, Canada
e-mail: maddenk@mcmaster.ca

Y. V. Kleinlugtenbelt MD
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery,
Deventer Ziekenhuis, Deventer,
Netherlands

Cochrane in CORR

implemented for all patients in all settings (or even most patients in most settings), and whether it is likely to improve either clinical outcomes or patient satisfaction remain controversial.

This Cochrane review of 115 randomized controlled trials (34,444 patients) found that decision aids improved not only communication between clinicians and patients, but also patients' knowledge about the procedure or diagnosis, the accuracy of patients' perceptions (particularly regarding probabilities), and patient comfort with the chosen option [9]. Decision aids also helped patients choose options that are matched with their values.

Upon Closer Inspection

Although a high-quality, well-conducted Cochrane review, it is premature to conclude that clinicians should implement shared decision-making for all patients with all conditions. The authors report that the risk of bias was unclear in many studies; particularly for blinding, selective reporting, attrition bias, allocation bias, and selection bias. They also found many underpowered analyses with a high degree of heterogeneity, limiting the usefulness of their findings. It remains unclear how shared decision-making affects the length of

the consultations, and there is little evidence regarding the cost-effectiveness of decision aids.

This type of research is inherently limited; patients are less likely to admit that they are unsatisfied with the procedure if they participated in the decision-making process. It may be easier to criticize the choice when only the surgeon made the decision, creating the potential for bias.

Although decision aids improved patients' knowledge of a procedure or diagnosis, there is little evidence that decision aids actually improve patients' health outcomes. The Cochrane review authors agree that future studies should evaluate "preference-based outcomes," which depend on patient preferences like satisfaction with clinical outcomes [9].

Going one step further, the effectiveness of any shared decision-making program depends on the quality of the decision aid, surgeons' willingness to use them, and both parties' skill in using the decision aids effectively [8]. There are also several barriers to implementing such programs, like negative physician perceptions [5], some patients' unwillingness to make a decision [7], time constraints and financial concerns [6], as well as educational and cultural differences [4]. These barriers should be addressed in future research.

Take-home Messages

The Cochrane review found no evidence of harms associated with implementing shared decision-making programs. In fact, decision aids generally made patients feel more comfortable with the decision-making process. Although there are benefits of improved patient comfort and improved patient-clinician consultations, there is a lack of high-quality evidence suggesting improved clinical outcomes due to decision aids. We still need more research, ideally high-quality randomized trials, to determine whether decision aids positively affect long-term patient-important outcomes and for which clinical decisions and patient populations these decision aids are most useful and effective. Such trials would be challenging but feasible with the right infrastructure and sufficient planning. Additionally, few of the included studies were done in orthopaedic populations, so further evidence is needed in our own specialty. A number of decision aids have been developed for orthopaedic populations, for example a decision board for choosing hemi-arthroplasty or THA [1], but they the majority have not been comprehensively evaluated in an evidence-based manner.

Cochrane in CORR

Appendix

Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions (Review)

Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L, Wu JHC

Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L, Wu JHC.

Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions.

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD001431.

DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub4.

www.cochranelibrary.com

Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions (Review)
Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WILEY

[Intervention Review]

Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions

Dawn Stacey¹, France Légaré², Nananda F Col³, Carol L Bennett⁴, Michael J Barry⁵, Karen B Eden⁶, Margaret Holmes-Rovner⁷, Hilary Llewellyn-Thomas⁸, Anne Lyddiatt⁹, Richard Thomson¹⁰, Lyndal Trevena¹¹, Julie HC Wu⁴

¹School of Nursing, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. ²Centre de Recherche du CHU de Québec (CRCHUQ) - Hôpital St-François d'Assise, Québec, Canada. ³Center of Excellence in Neuroscience and Department of Medicine, University of New England, Biddeford, ME, USA. ⁴Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada. ⁵Informed Medical Decisions Foundation, Boston, MA, USA. ⁶Department of Medical Informatics and Clinical Epidemiology, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, Oregon, USA. ⁷Center for Ethics and Humanities in the Life Sciences, Michigan State University College of Human Medicine, East Lansing, Michigan, USA. ⁸The Dartmouth Center for Health Policy & Clinical Practice, The Geisel School of Medicine at Dartmouth, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, USA. ⁹Ingersoll, Canada. ¹⁰Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. ¹¹The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Contact address: Dawn Stacey, School of Nursing, University of Ottawa, 451 Smyth Road, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. dstacey@uottawa.ca.

Editorial group: Cochrane Consumers and Communication Group.

Publication status and date: Edited (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 1, 2014.

Review content assessed as up-to-date: 30 June 2012.

Citation: Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L, Wu JHC. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD001431. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub4.

Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Decision aids are intended to help people participate in decisions that involve weighing the benefits and harms of treatment options often with scientific uncertainty.

Objectives

To assess the effects of decision aids for people facing treatment or screening decisions.

Search methods

For this update, we searched from 2009 to June 2012 in MEDLINE; CENTRAL; EMBASE; PsycINFO; and grey literature. Cumulatively, we have searched each database since its start date including CINAHL (to September 2008).

Selection criteria

We included published randomized controlled trials of decision aids, which are interventions designed to support patients' decision making by making explicit the decision, providing information about treatment or screening options and their associated outcomes, compared to usual care and/or alternative interventions. We excluded studies of participants making hypothetical decisions.

Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions (Review)
Copyright © 2014 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WILEY

Cochrane in CORR

Data collection and analysis

Two review authors independently screened citations for inclusion, extracted data, and assessed risk of bias. The primary outcomes, based on the International Patient Decision Aid Standards (IPDAS), were:

- A) 'choice made' attributes;
- B) 'decision-making process' attributes.

Secondary outcomes were behavioral, health, and health-system effects. We pooled results using mean differences (MD) and relative risks (RR), applying a random-effects model.

Main results

This update includes 33 new studies for a total of 115 studies involving 34,444 participants. For risk of bias, selective outcome reporting and blinding of participants and personnel were mostly rated as unclear due to inadequate reporting. Based on 7 items, 8 of 115 studies had high risk of bias for 1 or 2 items each.

Of 115 included studies, 88 (76.5%) used at least one of the IPDAS effectiveness criteria: A) 'choice made' attributes criteria: knowledge scores (76 studies); accurate risk perceptions (25 studies); and informed value-based choice (20 studies); and B) 'decision-making process' attributes criteria: feeling informed (34 studies) and feeling clear about values (29 studies).

A) Criteria involving 'choice made' attributes:

Compared to usual care, decision aids increased knowledge (MD 13.34 out of 100; 95% confidence interval (CI) 11.17 to 15.51; $n = 42$). When more detailed decision aids were compared to simple decision aids, the relative improvement in knowledge was significant (MD 5.52 out of 100; 95% CI 3.90 to 7.15; $n = 19$). Exposure to a decision aid with expressed probabilities resulted in a higher proportion of people with accurate risk perceptions (RR 1.82; 95% CI 1.52 to 2.16; $n = 19$). Exposure to a decision aid with explicit values clarification resulted in a higher proportion of patients choosing an option congruent with their values (RR 1.51; 95% CI 1.17 to 1.96; $n = 13$).

B) Criteria involving 'decision-making process' attributes:

Decision aids compared to usual care interventions resulted in:

- a) lower decisional conflict related to feeling uninformed (MD -7.26 of 100; 95% CI -9.73 to -4.78; $n = 22$) and feeling unclear about personal values (MD -6.09; 95% CI -8.50 to -3.67; $n = 18$);
- b) reduced proportions of people who were passive in decision making (RR 0.66; 95% CI 0.53 to 0.81; $n = 14$); and
- c) reduced proportions of people who remained undecided post-intervention (RR 0.59; 95% CI 0.47 to 0.72; $n = 18$).

Decision aids appeared to have a positive effect on patient-practitioner communication in all nine studies that measured this outcome. For satisfaction with the decision ($n = 20$), decision-making process ($n = 17$), and/or preparation for decision making ($n = 3$), those exposed to a decision aid were either more satisfied, or there was no difference between the decision aid versus comparison interventions. No studies evaluated decision-making process attributes for helping patients to recognize that a decision needs to be made, or understanding that values affect the choice.

C) Secondary outcomes

Exposure to decision aids compared to usual care reduced the number of people of choosing major elective invasive surgery in favour of more conservative options (RR 0.79; 95% CI 0.68 to 0.93; $n = 15$). Exposure to decision aids compared to usual care reduced the number of people choosing to have prostate-specific antigen screening (RR 0.87; 95% CI 0.77 to 0.98; $n = 9$). When detailed compared to simple decision aids were used, fewer people chose menopausal hormone therapy (RR 0.73; 95% CI 0.55 to 0.98; $n = 3$). For other decisions, the effect on choices was variable.

The effect of decision aids on length of consultation varied from 8 minutes shorter to 23 minutes longer (median 2.55 minutes longer) with 2 studies indicating statistically-significantly longer, 1 study shorter, and 6 studies reporting no difference in consultation length. Groups of patients receiving decision aids do not appear to differ from comparison groups in terms of anxiety ($n = 30$), general health outcomes ($n = 11$), and condition-specific health outcomes ($n = 11$). The effects of decision aids on other outcomes (adherence to the decision, costs/resource use) were inconclusive.

Cochrane in CORR

Authors' conclusions

There is high-quality evidence that decision aids compared to usual care improve people's knowledge regarding options, and reduce their decisional conflict related to feeling uninformed and unclear about their personal values. There is moderate-quality evidence that decision aids compared to usual care stimulate people to take a more active role in decision making, and improve accurate risk perceptions when probabilities are included in decision aids, compared to not being included. There is low-quality evidence that decision aids improve congruence between the chosen option and the patient's values.

New for this updated review is further evidence indicating more informed, values-based choices, and improved patient-practitioner communication. There is a variable effect of decision aids on length of consultation. Consistent with findings from the previous review, decision aids have a variable effect on choices. They reduce the number of people choosing discretionary surgery and have no apparent adverse effects on health outcomes or satisfaction. The effects on adherence with the chosen option, cost-effectiveness, use with lower literacy populations, and level of detail needed in decision aids need further evaluation. Little is known about the degree of detail that decision aids need in order to have a positive effect on attributes of the choice made, or the decision-making process.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Decision aids to help people who are facing health treatment or screening decisions

Identifying and making a decision about the best health treatment or screening option can be difficult for patients. Decision aids can be used when there is more than one reasonable option, when no option has a clear advantage in terms of health outcomes, and when each option has benefits and harms that patients may value differently. Decision aids may be pamphlets, videos, or web-based tools. They make the decision explicit, describe the options available, and help people to understand these options as well as their possible benefits and harms. This helps patients to consider the options from a personal view (e.g., how important the possible benefits and harms are to them) and helps them to participate with their health practitioner in making a decision.

The updated review, with searches updated in June 2012, includes 115 studies involving 34,444 participants. Findings show that when patients use decision aids they: a) improve their knowledge of the options (high-quality evidence); b) feel more informed and more clear about what matters most to them (high-quality evidence); c) have more accurate expectations of possible benefits and harms of their options (moderate-quality evidence); and d) participate more in decision making (moderate-quality evidence). Patients who used decision aids that included an exercise to help them clarify what matters most to them, were more likely to reach decisions that were consistent with their values. However, the quality of the evidence was moderate for this outcome, meaning that further research may change these findings. Decision aids reduce the number of patients choosing prostate specific antigen testing and elective surgery when patients consider other options. They have a variable effect on most other actual choices. Decision aids improve communication between patients and their health practitioner. More detailed decision aids are better than simple decision aids for improving people's knowledge and lowering decisional conflict related to feeling uninformed and unclear about their personal values. Decision aids do not worsen health outcomes and people using them are not less satisfied. More research is needed to evaluate adherence with the chosen option, the associated costs, use with patients who have more limited reading skills, and the level of detail needed in a decision aid.

Cochrane in CORR

References

1. Alolabi N, Alolabi B, Mundi R, Karanicolas PJ, Adachi JD, Bhandari M. Surgical preferences of patients at risk of hip fractures: hemiarthroplasty versus total hip arthroplasty. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2011; 12:289.
2. Cohen M. Engaging patients in understanding and using evidence to inform shared decision making. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2017;100:2–3.
3. Coulter A, Parsons S, Askham J. Where are the patients in decision-making about their own care? Available at <http://www.who.int/management/general/decisionmaking/WhereArePatientsinDecisionMaking.pdf>. Accessed January 9, 2017.
4. Joseph-Williams N, Elwyn G, Edwards A. Knowledge is not power for patients: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of patient-reported barriers and facilitators to shared decision making. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2014;94:291–309.
5. Kanzaria HK, Brook RH, Probst MA, Harris D, Berry SH, Hoffman JR. Emergency physician perceptions of shared decision-making. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2015;22:399–405.
6. Légaré F, Ratté S, Gravel K, Graham ID. Barriers and facilitators to implementing shared decision-making in clinical practice: update of a systematic review of health professionals' perceptions. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2008;73:526–535.
7. Levinson W, Kao A, Kuby A, Thisted RA. Not all patients want to participate in decision making. A national study of public preferences. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2005;20:531–535.
8. Mariani E, Vernooij-Dassen M, Koopmans R, Engels Y, Chattat R. Shared decision-making in dementia care planning: Barriers and facilitators in two European countries. *Aging Ment Health*. [Published online ahead of print November 21, 2016]. DOI: [10.1080/13607863.2016.1255715](https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2016.1255715).
9. Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, Holmes-Rovner M, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lyddiatt A, Thomson R, Trevena L, Wu JH. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;1:CD001431.
10. Vranceanu AM, Cooper C, Ring D. Integrating patient values into evidence-based practice: Effective communication for shared decision-making. *Hand Clin*. 2009;25:83–96.