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Purpose: Women with breast cancer desire more information about their disease, in part, to be involved in making treatment decisions (TDs). Patient involvement responds to patients' desires for autonomy and addresses ethical concerns about rights to make TDs. However, several researchers have reported that patients' actual experiences in TDM did not match their preferences. The study objectives are to 1) understand the meaning of involvement in TDM from the perspectives of women with early stage breast cancer (ESBC); 2) identify stages/ steps of TDM used by women and their physicians during the treatment consultation(s); and 3) identify the behaviors of women and physicians that facilitate or impede women's involvement in TDM. Methods: A qualitative approach with interviews and video-stimulated recall was used. In Phase 1, interviews with 19 women with ESBC were held to understand the concept of involvement in TDM. In Phase 2, surgical (n=6) or medical oncology (MO) consultations (n=15) with new ESBC patients were videotaped. Subsequently, women and medical oncologists or surgeons separately viewed their consultation. Interviews were taped, transcribed, and analyzed. Findings: Phase 1: Most women wanted high quality information soon after diagnosis but many felt isolated and uninformed until the surgical or the MO visit. In Phase 2, most women described an iterative TDM process where they made a preliminary treatment decision prior to the consultation, often based upon experiences of family or friends. Clinicians described many behaviours used to facilitate the patient’s involvement in TDM. While women reported some of these behaviours, they also reported fewer or different behaviours than clinicians. Significance: The information from this study will be useful to patients and physicians for promoting patient involvement. It can be used to develop and evaluate training programs for both physicians and patients to involve patients with cancer in decisions about their care.
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Introduction

This report summarizes the research accomplishments of the final year of the Predoctoral Traineeship Award, from July 1 2007 to June 30 2008. The training studentship is a doctoral degree in Health Research Methodology at McMaster University in Hamilton, Canada.

The overall goal of the thesis proposal is to improve the opportunity for patient involvement in treatment decision making (TDM) for women with early stage breast cancer (ESBC). The specific objectives are 1) to describe the meaning of involvement in TDM from the perspectives of women with ESBC, 2) to identify the processes or stages of TDM used by women and their physicians and 3) to identify the behaviors of women and their physicians that facilitate or impede women’s involvement in TDM. In this report, the results of Task 3 (Objective 3) from the Statement of Work will be summarized. The third task was to complete patient and physician recruitment, data collection and analysis for the Phase 3 patient and clinician focus groups.

Statement of Work Phase 3: (Focus Groups of Patients): Recruitment, Data Collection, and Analysis (Months 25-30)

Patient Recruitment: A process for patient recruitment was developed in Phase 1. A similar process was developed for use in Phase 3. Briefly, the PI reviewed the purpose of the Phase 3 focus groups with medical oncologists. The clinical features of all new patients were reviewed and those who appeared to meet the inclusion criteria (refer to the Phase 3 Eligibility Form in the Appendices) were identified by the PI. Prior to each eligible patient’s scheduled visit, the oncologist was asked for his or her permission to approach the patient about the study. If the clinician agreed, then the patient was approached by the oncologist or the primary nurse. If the patient expressed interest in the study, then a research assistant explained the purpose of the study and obtained consent. The setting for the study was a regional cancer centre (Juravinski Cancer Centre (JCC)) in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Recruitment of a Focus Group Facilitator: A focus group facilitator who was familiar with breast cancer patients and focus group methodology was identified. Two meetings were held with the facilitator to review the schedule for the group and the group interview guide.

Data Collection

Initially, twelve women agreed to participate in the focus group interview. Unfortunately, during the week of the focus group, nine women cancelled. Reasons for cancellation included feeling unwell due to chemotherapy, problems with child care or a conflict with another meeting. After discussion with my supervisory committee, a decision was made to cancel the patient focus
group and to suspend further recruitment to the focus group. The rationale for this decision was that similar problems related to chemotherapy were likely to occur in the future and secondly, the approaching winter weather could make traveling hazardous for some women. My supervisory committee also advised me not to proceed with the physician focus group. The rationale for this decision was that most of the medical oncologists on site participated in Phase 2 and there were too few remaining medical oncologists to form a focus group. Instead, the committee encouraged me to continue the analysis of the Phase 1 and 2 data with respect to identifying physician barriers and facilitators to women’s involvement in TDM. The committee also encouraged me to prepare a draft manuscript based on Phase 2 data in response to an invitation from the journal, Patient Education and Counselling.

Results

B. Physician Facilitators and Barriers to Women’s Involvement in TDM

Women’s Views: Facilitators

The most common facilitators were:

- Gave clear explanations about the disease, risk of recurrence, and treatment options
- Encouraged the woman to process information by techniques such as summarizing, clarifying, and using visual aids such as diagrams and decision aids
- Encouraged the woman to take enough time to make a treatment decision
- Explained the rationale for women’s involvement in TDM
- Gave a clear treatment recommendation which helped the woman focus on options
- Made the woman feel comfortable e.g. making eye contact, friendly and relaxed manner
- Prepared the woman for chemotherapy discussion (family doctor and surgeon)

Women’s Views: Barriers

Generally few physician barriers were mentioned. The most commonly noted barriers were insufficient use of visual aids such as diagrams, giving too much information at once, not explaining the rationale for women’s involvement in TDM and not preparing women for chemotherapy discussions (surgeons). Some women also mentioned that the physician did not appear interested in women’s views. Women also mentioned system barriers including lack of access to information prior to surgical and MO consults.

Physicians’ Views
Physicians described similar categories but more facilitating behaviours related to information-giving and information processing than women. Physicians relied on verbal explanations rather than visual aids. They described fewer interpersonal behaviors such as making women feel comfortable and providing reassurance. Physicians described few barriers to women’s involvement in TDM.

**Statement of Work Task 4: Writing of Thesis and Manuscript Preparation (Months 31-36)**

In conjunction with my supervisory committee, a decision was made to prepare a ‘sandwich’ thesis. The thesis consists of three papers as well as a background and concluding chapters. Two manuscripts have been completed and the third is in preparation. As indicated below, one of the manuscripts has been accepted for publication in the journal, Patient Education and Counselling.

**Key Research and Training Accomplishments**

1. Successfully competed all PhD course requirements with an ‘A’ standing or higher (previous report).
2. Successfully completed the PhD comprehensive examination (previous report).
3. Thesis related tasks:
   a. Completed Phase 1 data collection (previous report).
   b. Developed a process to videotape consultations of women with ESBC (previous report).
   c. Completed pilot testing for Phase 2 (previous report).
   d. Completed Phase 2 interviews of 21 women with ESBC and their oncologist or surgeon. These interviews identified stages/steps in TDM used by these women as clinician facilitators and barriers to their involvement in TDM. (previous report)
   e. Completed an analysis of patient and physician perceptions of physician barriers and facilitators of patient involvement in TDM.
4. As part of my training program, I participated in other research projects that resulted in podium or poster presentations at conferences.
5. Also as part of my training program, I reviewed several manuscripts and a national grant application in conjunction with my supervisor.
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Conclusions

In summary, progress has been made during the final year of the Predoctoral Traineeship Award as noted in the section on Key Research and Training Accomplishments. While I was unable to conduct the patient focus groups, I was able to complete the analysis of patient and physician perceptions of physician barriers and facilitators to patient involvement in TDM. A manuscript based on the Phase 2 data has been accepted for publication in the journal, Patient Education and Counselling. As contained in the previous report, all PhD course
requirements have been successfully completed as has the comprehensive examination. The study has received the support from the oncologists and nurses at the JCC as well as surgeons at HHS and St. Joseph’s Hospital. This support was crucial to the successful completion of the study.

Appendices

1. Phase 3 Eligibility Form
2. Phase 3 Interview Guide
3. CV
4. Abstract from DOD Breast Cancer Research Program, Era of Hope Meeting
ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

To be completed for all patients who meet the Inclusion Criteria

SECTION 1: INCLUSION CRITERIA

Answer EACH criterion listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The patient:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) Is female.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b) Has histologically documented invasive carcinoma of the breast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c) Is Stage I, Stage II, or Stage III a and eligible for surgery, chemotherapy or radiation therapy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If all answers are “Yes” continue to SECTION 2. If at least one “No” answer, patient is not eligible, do not continue.

SECTION 2: EXCLUSION CRITERIA

Answer EACH criterion listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The patient:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a) Is Stage III b, c or Stage IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b) Is unable to speak or understand English fluently (including visual impairment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c) Is mentally incompetent including any psychiatric or addictive disorders that would preclude taking part in an interview.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to SECTION 3

SECTION 3: ELIGIBILITY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a) Is the patient eligible to participate in the study?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i.e., all Inclusion Criteria are answered “Yes” and all Exclusion Criteria answered “No”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Yes → Continue to SECTION 4

PATIENT CONSENT

2 No → Sign and date form
SECTION 4: PATIENT CONSENT

4a) Has the patient provided written informed consent?  

☐ 1 Yes → **Include**

☐ 2 No → *Please provide reason:*

○ 1 Physician did not want the patient to be approached

○ 2 Patient did not want to consent

○ 3 Other: ______________________________

SECTION 5: Identification

Study ID Number: __ __ __ __

Cancer Centre Chart Number: ____ · _______ __________

Date of Eligibility Assessment __ __ / __ __ __ / __ __ __ __

Signature of person completing form: ______________________________

Date form completed: __ __ / __ __ __ / __ __ __ __
Study Title: Enhancing Involvement in Treatment Decision Making by Women with Breast Cancer

Phase 3: Focus Group Guide

Welcome and Introduction

Thank you for coming to the group meeting. We are here to talk about how women think that they can be involved in the process of making a treatment decision. We will also discuss how doctors can help or hinder a woman’s involvement in the process of making a treatment decision. In this group, we will have a discussion about these issues.

It is important to remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Some women are involved in decision making just a little while others are involved quite a bit. As well, the treatments that women choose or decline may be different because no two women are alike. Everyone is different.

Everything that is said here today must be kept confidential. That is, information that is discussed in the group must not be discussed outside of the group. Any information that someone shares will not be discussed with her doctor.

If there are any questions that you do not want to answer, just remain silent. If you have a comment, just state your opinion. It is important to have just one person speak at a time.

As a reminder, today’s session is being audiotaped. No individual names will appear in the typed record.

A summary of every group will be made and each person will receive a copy of the summary. If you do not want to receive a copy of the summary, just let me know afterward.

Questions

1. In your opinion, how do you think that women can be involved in the process of making a treatment decision?
   Prompts: obtaining information from cancer centre, listening to doctors, asking questions, discussing options with friends or family, etc.

2. Do you think that your doctor did anything to help you to be involved in the process of making a treatment decision?
   Prompts: explained your treatment options clearly, listened to your concerns, gave you enough time to make a treatment decision, etc.
3. Do you think that your doctor did anything that made it hard for you to be involved in the process of making a treatment decision? Prompts: did not listen to you, did not give you any options, did not make you feel comfortable, etc.

4. Here are some ways that some women say how doctors have helped women to take part in the process of making a treatment decision.
   *Do you agree with this item? Why?*
   *Do you disagree with this item? Why?*
   *Is there an item that you would like to add?*

5. Here are some ways that doctors have made it hard for women to take part in the process of making a treatment decision?
   *Do you agree with this item? Why?*
   *Do you disagree with this item? Why?*
   *Is there an item that you would like to add?*

**Closing**

Thank you once again for participating in this study. Please remember that everything that was said here today is confidential and must not be discussed outside of the group.

Once again, it is important to remember that no two women are alike. Some women may be involved just a little in decision making while others are involved quite a bit. As well, the treatments that women choose or decline may be different because no two women are alike. Everyone is different.

In approximately, two months, you will receive a summary of today’s discussion. Please let me know if you do not wish to receive a copy.

Once again, thank you for participating in the group discussion today.
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Exploring women’s decision making experiences about breast cancer treatment through video stimulated recall interviews

O'Brien MA¹, Whelan TJ¹, Charles C², Ellis PM¹, Gafni A², Lovrics P³, Hasler A¹, Dimitry S¹.
Supportive Cancer Care Research Unit, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON¹
Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON²
St. Joseph's Hospital, Hamilton, ON, CANADA³

Background: Women with breast cancer (BC) desire information, in part, to be involved in treatment decision making (TDM). However, several researchers have reported that patients’ actual experiences in TDM have not matched their preferences. This study’s objectives were to identify processes of TDM used by women with BC and to identify physicians’ behaviors that facilitated or impeded women’s involvement in TDM.

Methods: A qualitative approach with video-stimulated recall interviews was used. Surgical (n=6) or medical oncology consultations (n=15) with new BC patients were videotaped. Subsequently, women and surgeons or medical oncologists separately viewed their consultation while being interviewed. Interviews were taped, transcribed, and analyzed.

Results: Most women described an iterative TDM process where they obtained information about treatment options from social networks and identified preferred treatment options prior to the consultation. All women reached an agreement about the type of surgery with their surgeon during the consultation. At the post-surgery appointment, most women wanted their surgeons to give them more detailed information about tumor pathology and potential treatments offered by medical oncologists to help them prepare for subsequent TDM. Most women deliberated about adjuvant systemic therapy options both during and after the medical oncology consultation and reached a decision several days post-consultation. Surgeons and oncologists described many behaviors that they used to facilitate women’s involvement in TDM. While women identified many of the same behaviors as the physicians reported, they also described different behaviors. Women identified more items related to patient-physician rapport than did physicians. Women also identified that physicians helped to involve them in TDM when they: explicitly explained the rationale for patient involvement in TDM; used visual aids to explain treatment options; offered a treatment recommendation which provided reassurance; and indicated that women had time to make treatment decisions. Physicians identified more specific information-giving behaviors than did women. Women identified relatively few physician barriers to their involvement in TDM. The most frequently mentioned barrier related to lack of preparation for chemotherapy discussions.

Conclusions: Many women with BC identified several TDM processes including information gathering, identification of preferred options, deliberation about treatment options, and reaching agreement with their physician on the type of treatment to be implemented. Most women perceived that TDM involved several processes that occurred over time. These findings have implications for researchers who are interested in measuring patient involvement in TDM. Family physicians and surgeons are important in the TDM process by ensuring that women have early access to high quality information about different aspects of treatment. While physicians and women had many shared views of how physicians involved women in TDM, there were also important differences which have implications for clinical practice and for the design of physician training programs.