

Navigating healthcare: A qualitative study exploring prostate cancer patients' and doctors' experience of consultations using a decision-support intervention

Hacking, B. , Scott, S.E. , Wallace, L.M. , Shepherd, S.C. and Belkora, J.

Author pre-print (submitted version) deposited in CURVE March 2014

Original citation & hyperlink:

Hacking, B. , Scott, S.E. , Wallace, L.M. , Shepherd, S.C. and Belkora, J. (2014) Navigating healthcare: A qualitative study exploring prostate cancer patients' and doctors' experience of consultations using a decision-support intervention. *Psycho-Oncology*, volume (in press). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pon.3466>

Note: Article in press, full citation details will be updated once available.

Publisher statement: This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article: Hacking, B. , Scott, S.E. , Wallace, L.M. , Shepherd, S.C. and Belkora, J. (2014) Navigating healthcare: A qualitative study exploring prostate cancer patients' and doctors' experience of consultations using a decision-support intervention. *Psycho-Oncology*, (in press), which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pon.3466>.

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the submitted version of the journal article, as originally submitted to the journal prior to the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

CURVE is the Institutional Repository for Coventry University

<http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open>

REDRAFT 11/11/13

Navigating healthcare: a qualitative study exploring prostate cancer patients' and doctors' experience of consultations using a decision support intervention.

Hacking. B*¹, Scott. S.E^{1,2}, Wallace. L.M², Shepherd. S.C^{1,2} and Belkora. J.³

1. Clinical Psychology Office, Department of Clinical Oncology, Western General Hospital,
Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
2. Applied Centre for Health and Lifestyles Interventions, Coventry University, Coventry,
England, UK.
3. Institute for Health Policy Studies, University of California, San Francisco, USA

*Corresponding Author: Dr Belinda Hacking. Clinical Psychology Office, Department of
Clinical Oncology, Western General Hospital, Edinburgh. EH4 2XU.

Telephone: (0131) 537 3094. Email: Belinda.Hacking@nhslothian.scot.nhs.uk

Navigating healthcare: a qualitative study exploring prostate cancer patients' and doctors' experience of consultations using a decision support intervention.

Abstract

Background: Men with early prostate cancer face preference-sensitive decisions when choosing among treatments with similar survival outcomes but different procedures, risks, and potential complications. A **decision**-support intervention, 'Decision Navigation' assists men with prostate cancer to prepare a question list (consultation plan) for their doctors, and provides them with a consultation summary and audio-recording. A randomised controlled trial of Decision Navigation showed advantages over usual care on quantitative measures including confidence in decision making and regret.

Objective: To gain a qualitative understanding of patient and doctor perspectives on Decision Navigation.

Methods: Six patients who received 'Decision Navigation' were purposively selected for interview out of 62 RCT participants. All four doctors consulted by Navigated patients were interviewed. Interview data was analyzed using framework analysis.

Results: Patients reported that planning for the consultation helped them to frame their questions, enabling them to participate in consultations and take responsibility for making decisions. They reported feeling more confident in the decisions made, having a written report of the key information and an audio-recording. Patients considered routine information relating to side effects was inadequate. Doctors reported that consultation plans made them aware of patients' concerns, and ensured comprehensive responses to questions posed. Doctors also endorsed implementing Decision Navigation as part of routine care.

Conclusion: Results suggest that Decision Navigation facilitated patients' involvement in treatment decision making. Prostate patients engaging in preference sensitive decision making welcomed this approach to personalised tailored support.

Keywords: Cancer, Prostate, Decisions, Support, Consultations.

Introduction

Men with prostate cancer are presented the opportunity of making ‘preference sensitive decisions’ about their treatment, as no one option is better than the others on all outcomes valued by patients [1]. UK guidance encourages healthcare professionals to support prostate cancer patients in making treatment decisions in line with their personal preferences, and to identify the extent to which patients wish to be involved in treatment decision making [2, 3]. Sharing decisions about treatment options involves a two-way exchange of information by both patient and doctor. When cancer patients are empowered to assume a more active role and make decisions consistent with their preferences, they experience less decision conflict [4], greater satisfaction with the outcome [5] (including prostate cancer [6]) and in some cases, improved treatment adherence [7]. In practice, shared decision making is inconsistently carried out [8, 9]. Doctors’ most cited barrier is time constraints, whilst patients often do not ask questions due to a concern about their perceived lack of knowledge or because they do not feel comfortable questioning their doctor [10-13].

The ‘Decision Navigation’ decision support intervention facilitates patients’ preparation for and involvement in treatment decisions. Navigation integrates three evidence based decision support interventions; decision coaching [11], question listing [15], and the provision of consultation summary letters and audio recordings [16].

Decision Navigation has a strong evidence base applied to cancer consultations, specifically, increasing decision self-efficacy [17] and decision quality [18], reducing barriers to communication [19, 20], increasing question asking by patients during treatment consultations [21] and reducing decisional conflict [17].

Decision Navigation was trialled with newly diagnosed prostate cancer patients in Edinburgh, Scotland in a two-arm randomised controlled trial with a qualitative component to triangulate the results and further understand the intervention in its 'natural context'. Quantitative analysis from patient questionnaires taken at three time points (baseline, post consultation and six months follow up) [22] revealed that Navigated patients (n=62), compared to usual care patients (n=52), had significantly higher scores in decision self-efficacy after the medical consultation and at 6 month follow up, as well as significantly less decisional conflict after medical consultation. Navigated patients also experienced significantly less regret 6 months later. [23].

This paper reports the results of interviews intended to explore patients' and doctors' experiences of this intervention in the real life clinical context of making decisions for newly diagnosed prostate cancer.

Methods

Design: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with six prostate cancer patients who received the Decision Navigation intervention, and all four doctors who participated in the intervention. Evaluation interviews were conducted three months post medical consultation for patients and four weeks after the trial closure for doctors.

The Decision Navigation Intervention

Box 1 below presents the process of the Navigation Intervention.

Patients who were randomised into the Navigation arm met with a Navigator to create a question list known as their ‘consultation plan.’ During this meeting a question prompt sheet (SCOPED) was used by the Navigator to encourage patients to consider the following categories in relation to their cancer and treatment options; their Situation, the Choices available to them, their personal Objectives, preferences and goals, the People involved in supporting them, Evaluating their choices against their objectives and the Decisions that they have made/ need to make, and how involved they wish to be in decisions about their care.

This consultation plan was sent to the patients’ doctor for use in their consultation to facilitate the discussion of treatment options. The Navigator attended this consultation to take notes and audio record, subsequently posting patients a typed summary and a recording (CD) of their meeting.

Box 1: The Navigation Intervention

1. Consultation Planning

- Navigator met with the patient prior to consultation (telephone or face to face)
- Using a question prompt sheet (SCOPED), the patient’s key medical questions, concerns and preferences were identified and developed into a ‘Consultation Plan’ by Navigator, for use in consultation.

2. Medical Consultation with Navigation

- Consultation Plan was integrated into the discussion.
- Navigator accompanied patient, audio-records consultation and types notes.

3. Patients are posted an audio-recording (CD) and personalised typed summary of their medical consultation.

Navigation was delivered by two research assistants, trained in the intervention by author JB.

Patient sample, recruitment and interview procedure

Six 'Navigated' patients were purposively selected in chronological order by the researcher using specific selection criteria; localised prostate cancer and having received **the** full intervention. Patients were invited to participate via **the telephone** three months after the consultation in which a range of treatment options (surgery, radiotherapy, active monitoring) were considered, providing enough time for completion of treatment and reflection on decisions.

All six participants approached agreed to be interviewed and were interviewed over the telephone. All interviews were recorded with the patient's permission and transcribed verbatim. An interview schedule was developed from previous research evidence [17-21] evaluating the impact of Navigation to act as a guide; this is available on request. Interviews explored patients' experiences of Navigation in terms of participation in medical consultations, information received during the consultation, their involvement in decision making and their experiences of the process of Navigation.

Doctor sample, recruitment and interview procedure

All four doctors who consulted Navigated patients were invited to take part in an interview to discuss their experience of Navigation within the clinical context. All doctors agreed to be interviewed at four weeks after the trial's close.

All four doctors were interviewed face to face. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview schedule was adapted to reflect the topics addressed with patients. Interviews explored doctors' perceptions of Navigated patients' participation, involvement in decision making and information exchange within consultations, evaluation of the impact of Navigation materials and experiences regarding the overall clinical relevance and suitability of Navigation.

Analysis

All interview transcripts were anonymised and analysed using framework analysis [24], a matrix-based method for ordering and summarising data [25]. Patient and doctor interview transcripts were analysed separately, using the same method. *A priori* themes, defined by the study's aims and objectives, guided the study analysis **with a flexible approach to integrate** other themes or concepts that emerged *de novo* throughout the analysis.

Four researchers (authors SES, SCS, BH, and an independent researcher) independently read all of the transcripts to **gain familiarity with the data** and met regularly to identify and agree on themes. **To develop a thematic framework the process of constant comparison was applied, taking sections of interview data and comparing them to the emerging themes.** As our samples were small we concentrated on findings which clearly emerged in-depth within all the transcripts. **All researchers agreed on the final thematic framework** which was applied to code the interview data into charted themes and sub themes. **Coding of the data was done independently and then agreed on.** Multiple coding by the four researchers independently and collectively added to the comprehensiveness and rigour of the **identified categories.**

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was granted by Coventry University and by South East Scotland research ethics committee (reference number: 08/F1102/45).

Results

Patient Interviews

All patients interviewed were Caucasian, the age range was 61 –75 years old, **four were living with a partner, and two were not. Three patients were educated to 15 years, one to 18 years and two had university education.** All patients had localized prostate cancer, three patients received radiotherapy, two had surgery, and one was being monitored for his cancer (active monitoring). The mean time of the patient interviews was 23 minutes.

During the analysis **four main themes emerged: Preparing for and participating in Consultations, Gathering and Retaining Sufficient and Individualised Information from Consultations, Deliberating Options and Making Treatment Decisions, Navigator Support.**

1. Preparing for and Participating in Consultations

Patient Preparation for Consultations

All patients described how preparing questions prior to the consultation enabled them to disentangle their thoughts and identify what they wanted to ask.

[Consultation Planning] is good for sorting out your thoughts and coming up with questions you might not have thought about. *Patient 4*

There were certain issues...that coming at it fresh I would not have been thinking about... but obviously as part of the discussion with [Navigator] did come out. *Patient 3*

Participating in Consultations

The consultation plan helped all patients to focus on, and address their questions during the consultation,

We made explicit questions that we had written down so we had this sort of check list we were able to refer to during the consultation which was useful.

Patient 2

I did feel that the [Consultation Plan]...helped the whole experience because I did feel I knew what I was talking about. *Patient 4*

2. Gathering and Retaining Sufficient and Individualised Information from Consultations.

Information Provision during Consultations

The majority of the patients interviewed reported receiving insufficient detail about treatment side effects they subsequently experienced, despite having discussed expected symptoms in the consultation.

In hindsight it might have been a little more helpful to have had you know...maybe a little bit more background as to what you might expect after surgery. *Patient 3*

Despite this, patients reported a satisfactory exchange of personalised information during the consultation, enhanced by the Consultation Plan

The fact that he [doctor] had clearly got...a copy of those concerns/questions...that set out my range of issues that I wanted to explore and the fact that he was already aware of those meant you know, clearly he got some answers ... before I had asked them, which I found very helpful...I didn't feel as though I was trying to tease information out of him. *Patient 3*

Recalling pertinent treatment information

The provision of consultation materials by the Navigator (consultation summary and CD) was reported as beneficial to all patients in assisting their recall of treatment information provided during a difficult consultation.

You never take in all that detail of a meeting like that I don't think and it's helpful having that disc [audio CD] to be able to refer back to. *Patient 4.*

When I was told my preferred treatment wasn't an option, you start going blank and nodding your head and those seconds pass...you know you're not taking information in ... so the [summaries] were useful.' *Patient 2*

3. Deliberating Options and Making Treatment Decisions

All patients reported that the Navigation materials helped them **to** deliberate options.

I think one of the real benefits I found ...was that quite clearly I have done a 360 degree turn and ended up with surgery .It helped to play [CD] back and sit and listen...before we made the final decision. *Patient 3.*

Because of [Navigation] I seem to have gotten to the root of the problem and the decision on the solution. *Patient 5.*

Using the materials enhanced patients' confidence in the decisions reached during the consultation,

Revisiting the consultation through the CD twice gave me a bit of a lift because I felt, well, yes it was positive. It didn't bring doubts into my mind; it brought a positive feeling that we had done the job at the consultation. *Patient*

4

4. Navigator Support

Having a Navigator present in the consultation made all patients feel supported.

I think the consultant did sort of overawe you. It wasn't a one on one basis it was a one on two basis, and that's where I felt the benefits from [Navigator]'s involvement. *Patient 5*

Subsequently, knowing the Navigator had observed the consultation was reassuring as patients were able to refer back to the Navigator immediately following the consultation.

It was helpful to have somebody else there to talk to afterwards about what had been said. *Patient 2*

Having a Navigator to discuss issues with, in combination with the other aspects of the intervention, was supportive during a difficult time.

The ability to chat to somebody else, the questions [consultation plan] and the [audio] recording, I think those are three pretty important issues for someone who, yeah, literally faces the issue of cancer and what they are going to do about it. *Patient 3*

Doctor interviews

The average length of the doctor interviews was 23.3 minutes. All four doctors interviewed were male. Two were consultant urologists, two oncology consultants.

Four main themes emerged from the data: Preparation for the consultations, Discussing Treatments with Patients, Making Treatment Decisions, and Sustainability of Navigation.

1. Preparation for the Consultation

By preparing questions prior to the consultation, Navigated patients appeared more empowered and ready to actively participate in the consultation.

By virtue of the fact that they had thought about it in advance, they were more involved [than usual care patients]. *Doctor 4, Oncologist.*

The consultation plans were beneficial in informing doctors of the patient's current understanding, allowing misunderstandings to be detected and addressed.

The benefit of having the plan is knowing what the patient is thinking, what he has been told and also having prior knowledge of what a confusing picture he may have. *Doctor 2, Urologist.*

The Consultation Plans also clarified the patient's explicit preferences for treatment.

The usefulness is [knowing] what treatment they are leaning towards. Is it because they are biased? Is it because they just following herd instinct? Or because they heard a friend had it and were told it worked well? That pre-warning or prior information is clearly useful. *Doctor 2, Urologist.*

2. Discussing Treatment with Patients

Doctors reviewed the patient's Consultation Plan prior to the consultation. This highlighted a conflict between their own and the patient's priorities for the discussion within the treatment consultation.

What is apparent is that the patient's priorities may be different...they might have right at the top 'what about my holiday in September?' ...whereas right at the top for me is telling them diagnosis, staging, and treatment options...The prioritization is quite surprising. *Doctor 3, Oncologist.*

Doctors reported referring to the Consultation Plan at the end of the consultation to ensure all salient points had been addressed.

I would tend to be guided by the conversation...and then go back and use [Consultation Plan] as a checklist to make sure we've covered everything.

Doctor 1, Urologist.

Keeping to their normal consultation style reassured doctors that all vital treatment information was covered.

I've sort of stuck to my style because ...it's sort of a rhythm I've followed and to change it would risk missing something out. *Doctor 3, Oncologist.*

3. Making treatment decisions together

Doctors felt that preparing for the consultation using Navigation facilitated patient question asking during the consultation, and enhanced decision making.

[Navigation] is allowing the patient, preparing the patient, to know what questions to ask so they can make a satisfactory and better decision. *Doctor 2, Urologist.*

One doctor reported that the active participation of patients in the treatment decision fitted with his values as a doctor.

I would prefer to be challenged by a patient rather than them meekly accepting what I say...I would rather they come in and say 'tell me why I should have this, tell me why I shouldn't have that'. People [need to] come along encouraged...so that they're not coming in beholden with the person opposite. *Doctor 1, Urologist.*

4. Sustainability of Navigation

Impact of Navigation

Doctors reported the presence of the Navigator as being no different than the patient having a family member with them,

‘It’s no different from having a sister, brother or wife’ *Doctor 1, Urologist.*

All described feeling at ease with their consultations being audio-recorded and recognised the benefit of giving patients audio recording of consultations,

‘...they [patients] won’t remember 90% of what’s said.’ *Doctor 1, Urologist.*

Opinions on incorporating Navigation into clinical practice.

Consultants were supportive of implementing Navigation into clinical practice,

[Navigation] should be up there being prioritized with other interventions... I think it’s very useful. *Doctor 3, Oncologist*

Although supportive, clinicians were concerned about the cost involved in providing the service,

Given there’s a salary involved, that unless you have got volunteers...well it will become too expensive. *Doctor 1*

To mitigate such cost clinicians suggested implementation within current roles such as the clinical nurse specialist,

The cancer nurse specialists could make sure...that each patient could have a Dictaphone to take with them.... be given a CD....you could build in all the benefits [of Navigation] within the fabric of the staff we have.’ *Doctor 1, Urologist.*

Discussion

This paper explores doctors' and prostate patients' experiences of Navigation through interviews to gather data beyond the restrictions of the quantitative surveys. As a result, we were better able to ascertain the nature of how Navigation worked in a clinical setting, how it enabled patients to feel more confident in their decisions, as shown in the main RCT [23], and the role of the Navigator in the process.

All patients reported speaking with a Navigator helped them to disentangle, identify and articulate their main concerns, preferences and questions for their medical consultation. The process of doing this prior to the consultation with the support of the Navigator meant patients felt prepared and confident to deliberate with the doctor about their healthcare choices. This was reflected in the interviews with doctors who explained it was useful to know the patients' concerns, preferences and understanding before meeting them. They further identified that through the process of setting their questions beforehand patients were more ready to be involved. This is substantiated by the main RCT findings [23] which show Navigated patients felt significantly more confident in making a decision than their control counterparts. **Navigated** patients subsequently perceived their consultation as tailored to them and their individual situation.

The consultation summary and audio recording (CD) were used by patients to help them recall the clinical information provided. Patients recognised how useful this was and the possibilities of forgetting important information without it. They felt reassured they could return to their decisions made during the consultation using the CD and summary. This is consistent with other 'decision coaching' interventions for prostate

cancer patients [26] suggesting that such interventions should be offered as standard care, particularly in the instance of preference sensitive decisions [11].

It is a challenge for every doctor to engage with both the bio-medical and psycho-social information needs of patients simultaneously [27]. These qualitative results indicate how patients can achieve both needs through Navigation, an intervention which also enables doctors to tailor consultations to the individuals' prioritised concerns. Previous clinical evaluation of Navigation [17] in the US found equivalent results. Namely that Navigation was; endorsed by doctors, helped patients organise and clarify their medical questions, provided doctors with a preview so they could plan in advance how to conduct the consultation, and additionally helped ensure all patients' questions were attended to. Our study further found that doctors were surprised by how patients' priorities were not aligned with their own expectations of the meeting. The consultation plan helped bridge the distance between the patients' and doctors' views and create a shared understanding, a necessary component of shared decision making [18].

When using the model of shared decision making proposed by Charles, Ganfi and Whelan [28] 'At Least Two to Tango' these results appear to facilitate this type of decision making. Within this dynamic we incorporated the Navigator as a coach to prompt question asking and gather information to provide memory aids post consultation. In order for involvement in shared decision making, Charles and colleagues [28] suggest complimentary roles between the doctor and the patient be established, recognising the difficulty for doctors to know how much information a patient wants and why. Patients taking the time with the support of the Navigator to create a question list in addition to the doctor reviewing this list beforehand and using it within the consultation ensured a conducive atmosphere for both in which to share meaningful information to lead to the outcome of a mutually agreed treatment decision.

Reflecting on the treatment decision made the majority of patients reported not feeling prepared for the adverse effects of treatment, despite these having been discussed in general terms. This is in line with existing evidence which states that men with prostate cancer are surprised by the intensity and duration of treatment side effects [29]. This may be due to patients not **processing** the information about potential side effects provided due to embarrassment about incontinence or impotence and anxiety about the impact on social interactions [26], **or not subsequently referring to the memory aids containing this information** .The communication of side effects and how to manage them could therefore be improved.

It is interesting to note for future implementation, that all doctors found the intended use of the consultation plan as an agenda was not possible. It was realised doctors needed to abide by their own rehearsed consultation script to ensure no important safety information was omitted. The consultation plan was therefore integrated as a checklist at the end of the meeting. Nevertheless, all four doctors were unanimous in support of incorporating aspects of Navigation into current practice, specifically the consultation planning and provision of consultation audio recordings. Since the completion of this trial the lead consultant urology surgeon obtained funding to provide consultation audio recordings to newly diagnosed prostate cancer patients in Edinburgh [27]. It is widely recognised that providing patients with consultation audio tapes is underused in oncology [30], despite the evidenced benefits of providing such a resource to patients [16, 30].

The Navigation model was delivered by trained researchers. Elements of Navigation could be provided by usual care clinical staff, or third sector organisations as practised in the USA [31, 32]. The doctors interviewed suggested that clinical nurse specialists could be trained to deliver consultation planning sessions to patients, and coordinate the recording of consultations. This could address the potential governance concerns regarding introducing a

third party into the healthcare system to deliver Navigation. However, there are potential opportunity costs of using time from highly qualified clinical nurse specialists to deliver Navigation, so this may not be a satisfactory solution. Systems implementing Navigation in the USA [31, 32] employ healthcare trainees who gain valuable patient contact experience, along with cancer survivors, as Navigators. Future studies should examine Navigation across a number of different consultations and alternative models of service provision for acceptability, effectiveness, economy and sustainability.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study is the small sample sizes. Our patient sample size was limited by researcher resource constraints, so sampling to saturation of themes was not attempted. Purposive sampling selected men who chose different treatment modalities, **and the** analysis revealed no differences in their experiences of Navigation. Only Caucasian males were interviewed in this study, reflective of the local population. In future studies it would be advisable to examine the impact of Navigation in men of different ethnic groups. All four doctors were interviewed; the maximum number of doctors involved in delivering Navigation to patients. The views from a larger sample of doctors would be welcomed, and could be achieved by employing a multi-centred trial of Navigation

The authors recognise a larger patient sample size would allow for the saturation to reflect the diversity within the population. However, when the patient qualitative findings are considered alongside the quantitative findings of the main RCT [23], they enhance our understanding of the experiences of patients and doctors engaging with Navigation in a clinical setting. Additionally, the similarity between the final themes and findings from other empirical studies [17-21] allows further confidence in our interpretation of the data.

The Navigation intervention is solely patient focused. Doctors were not directly trained nor supported to change their consultation practice. This did not appear to influence the quality of the intervention. The views of the healthcare professionals, such as clinical nurse specialists were not included in the current study as their role is more “on demand” to patients, but future studies could include their perspectives.

Conclusion

The Navigation Intervention was well received by this sample of men with prostate cancer and their doctors. The interviews elicited further understanding of participating in Navigation, particularly in supporting treatment deliberation and facilitating patient-centred communication within consultations. Combined with enhanced preparation for the consultation, patients felt more engaged and better able to participate in decision making. Unlike many decision aids which can require time and new skills for clinicians to use confidently [33], much of the effort of Navigation took place outside the consultation between the patient and the Navigator.

Decision support interventions which optimally tailor information to the individual patient, accommodating for the variety of patient needs, are essential for patient-centred decision making to become more widespread in clinical practice [34].

Implementation of Navigation as usual practice will require exploration of affordable and effective delivery models.

Declarations of Interest: None.

Acknowledgments

Tish Chalmers participated as a Navigator. Lucy Dickinson undertook project management and data collection for the RCT and interviews. Jemma Robinson contributed to data analysis. The Clinical Team working with Prostate Cancer Patients in Edinburgh for their assistance with recruitment and delivery of the intervention.

Funding was provided by Macmillan Cancer Support and NHS Lothian Endowment Funds.

References

1. Cooperberg, M. R., Ramakrishna, N. R., Duff, S. B., Hughes, K. E., Sadownik, S., Smith, J. A. and Tewari, A. K. (2012), Primary treatments for clinically localised prostate cancer: a comprehensive lifetime cost-utility analysis. *BJU International*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.11597.x
2. 'Prostate cancer: diagnosis and treatment' Clinical guidelines, CG58 - National Institute of Clinical Excellence (NICE). Issued: February 2008
3. NHS Scotland Quality Strategy - putting people at the heart of our NHS. Scottish Government (May 2010); ISBN: 9780755993239
4. Stacey.D, Saman.R, Bennett.C. Decision Making in Oncology: A Review of Patient Decision Aids to Support Patient Participation. *Cancer CA Cancer J Clin* 2008; 58: 292-304. DOI: 10.3322/CA.2008.0006.
5. Kremer H, Ironson G, Schneiderman N, Hautzinger M. "It's my body": does patient involvement in decision making reduce decisional conflict? *Medical Decision Making* (2007). 27(5):522-32. DOI: 10.1177/0272989X07306782.

6. Cassileth BR, Soloway MS, Vogelzang NJ, Schellhammer PS, Seidmon WJ, Hait HI, Kennealey GT. Patients' choice of treatment in stage D prostate cancer. *Urology* (1989); 33 (5):57-62. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-4295\(89\)90108-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-4295(89)90108-8)
7. Joosten EA, DeFuentes-Merillas L, de Weert GH ST, van der Staak CP, de Jong CA. Systematic review of the effects of shared decision-making on patient satisfaction, treatment adherence and health status. *Psychother Psychosom* 2008;77:219-26. DOI: 10.1159/000126073.
8. Hubbard. G, Kidd. L., and Donaghy. E. Preferences for involvement in treatment decision making of patients with cancer: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing* (2008).12(4):299-318. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2008.03.004>
9. Gattellari et al., 2001 M. Gattellari, P.N. Butow and M.H.N. Tattersall, Sharing decisions in cancer care. *Social Science & Medicine* (2001); 52; p1865–1878. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00303-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00303-8)
10. Frosch DL, May SG, Rendle KA, Tietbohl C, Elwyn G. Authoritarian doctors and patients' fear of being labeled 'difficult' among key obstacles to shared decision making. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2012;31(5):1030-8. DOI: 10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0576
11. Roter DL. Patient question asking in doctor-patient interaction. *Health Psychol* 1984;3(5):395-409. PMID: 6536496 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]
12. Roter DL. Patient participation in the patient-provider interaction: the effects of patient question asking on the quality of interaction, satisfaction and compliance. *Health Educ Monogr* 1977;5(4):281-315. DOI: 10.1177/109019817700500402
13. Kinnersley P, Edwards A, Hood K, Ryan R, Prout H, Cadbury N, et al. Interventions before consultations to help patients address their information

needs by encouraging question asking: systematic review. *BMJ* 2008;337:a485.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a485>

14. Stacey, D., Murray, M. A., Légaré, F., Sandy, D., Menard, P. and O'Connor, A. (2008), Decision Coaching to Support Shared Decision Making: A Framework, Evidence, and Implications for Nursing Practice, Education, and Policy. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 5: 25–35. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-6787.2007.00108.x
15. Butow PN, Dunn SM, Tattersall MHN, Jones QJ. Patient participation in the cancer consultation: evaluation of a question prompt sheet. *Annals of Oncology* 1994;5:199-204.
16. Pitkethly M, MacGillivray S, Ryan R. Recordings or summaries of consultations for people with cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD001539. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001539.pub2.
17. Belkora JK, Loth MK, Chen DF, Chen JY, Volz S, Esserman LJ. Monitoring the implementation of Consultation Planning, Recording, and Summarizing in a breast care center. *Patient Educ Couns* 2008;73(3):536-43. DOI: 10.1016/j.pec.2008.07.037.
18. Sepucha KR, Belkora JK, Tripathy D, Esserman LJ. Building bridges between physicians and patients: results of a pilot study examining new tools for collaborative decision making in breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18(6):1230-38.
19. Sepucha K, Belkora J, Mutchnick S, Esserman L. Consultation Planning to Help Patients Prepare for Medical Consultations: Effect on Communication and Satisfaction for Patients and Physicians. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2002;20(11):2695-2700. DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2002.10.06

20. Belkora JK, Loth MK, Volz S, Rugo HS. Implementing decision and communication aids to facilitate patient-centered care in breast cancer: a case study. *Patient Educ Couns* 2009;77(3):360-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.pec.2009.09.012
21. Belkora JK, Volz S, Teng A, Pass M, Moore DH, Esserman L. Five years of integrating decision and communication aids into routine breast cancer care: an implementation report. In: *International Shared Decision Making Conference Proceedings*. Maastricht, Netherlands; 2011.
22. Lewin.S., Glenton.C., Oxman. A.D. Use of qualitative methods alongside randomised controlled trials of complex healthcare interventions: methodological study. *BMJ* 2009;339:b3496. doi:10.1136/bmj.b3496
23. Hacking.B., Wallace. L.M., Scott. S.E., Kosmala-Anderson.J., McNeill.S.A., and Belkora. J. Testing the feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness of a 'decision navigation' intervention for early stage prostate cancer patients in Scotland - a randomised controlled trial. *Psychooncology*. 2012 May 9. DOI: 10.1002/pon.3093. [Epub ahead of print]
24. Ritchie, J. and Spencer, E. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman, A. and Burgess, R.G. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge, Chapter 9. (1994).
25. Ritchie. J and Lewis. J. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*, Sage Publications, Chapter 9 (2003)
26. Wirrmann, E and Askham. J. *Implementing patient decision aids in urology*. Picker Institute Europe, 2006.
27. Scott.S. Hacking. B., Wallace. L.M., Belkora. J. and Shepherd. S.C Testing the feasibility, acceptability and effectiveness of a 'decision navigation' intervention for

early stage prostate cancer patients in Scotland - a randomised controlled trial". Beyond the Abstract on UroToday.com (2013) Available from:

http://www.urotoday.com/index.php?option=com_content&Itemid=830&catid=1134&id=56990&lang=en&view=article.

28. Charles, C., Gafin, A., and Whelan, T. Shared decision-making in the medical encounter: What does it mean? (Or it takes at least two to tango). *Soc. Sci. Med.* 1997, 44, 5, 681-692
29. Talcott JA, Rieker P, Clark JA, Propert KJ, Weeks JC, Beard CJ, Wishnow KI, Kaplan I, Loughlin KR, Richie JP, Kantoff PW. Patient-reported symptoms after primary therapy for early prostate cancer: results of a prospective cohort study. *J Clin Oncol.* 1998; 16: 275–283.
30. Tattersall MH, Butow PN. Consultation audio tapes: an underused cancer patient information aid and clinical research tool. *The Lancet Oncology* 2002; 3(7):431-37. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(02\)00790-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(02)00790-8),
31. Belkora.J.K. , Teng. A., Volz.S., Loth.M.K., and Esserman. L.J Expanding the reach of decision and communication aids in a breast care center: A quality improvement study. *Patient Education and Counseling.* Volume 83, Issue 2, May 2011, Pages 234-239. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2010.07.003>
32. Belkora, J., M. Miller, B. Crawford, K. Coyne, M. Stauffer, J. Buzaglo, N. Blakeney, M. Michaels, and M. Golant, *Evaluation of question-listing at the Cancer Support Community.* *Translational Behavioral Medicine.* Volume 3, Issue 2, pp 162-171.
33. Marshall. M., & Bibby. J. Supporting patients to make the best decisions. *BMJ* 2011;342:d2117

34. Feldman-Stewart, D. Brundage, M.D., & Tong C. Information that affects patients' treatment choices for early stage prostate cancer: a review. *Can J Urol.* 2011, 18(6):5998-6006.