

Journal of
Evaluation in Clinical Practice
International Journal of Public Health Policy and Health Services Research

**Editorial Introduction: Decision-making, reasoning, context
and perspective**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Editorial articles
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Loughlin, Michael; University of West London, European Institute for Person Centered Health and Social Care
Keywords:	person-centered medicine, experience, humanity, patient-centered care, philosophy of medicine
Abstract:	Editorial introduction to the 2020 thematic edition of shared decision making and person-centred care

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Philosophy Thematic Edition 2020**Title: Editorial Introduction: Decision-making, reasoning, context and perspective**

Author:

Michael Loughlin PhD, Professor of Applied Philosophy, University of West London, London, UK (ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2234-2146)

Correspondence: Professor Michael Loughlin, Co-Director, Institute for Person-Centred Health and Social Care, University of West London, St Mary's Rd, London W5 5RF, UK

michael_loughlin@ymail.com

Keywords: clinical reasoning, diversity, evidence, person-centred care, patient perspective, phenomenology, practice, shared decision-making, social context

Editorial Introduction: Decision-making, reasoning, context and perspective

The 2019 philosophy thematic edition of this journal was devoted to the discussion of shared decision-making and person-centred care. [1] Initial contributions were based on presentations to an international conference in March 2019 at the University of West London (UWL) in the UK, on the subject of 'Shared Decision-Making, Person-Centred Care & The Values Agenda' – a conference organised by UWL's European Institute for Person Centred Health and Social Care, in collaboration with the European Society for Person Centered Healthcare and the Collaborating Centre for Values-based Practice at St. Catherine's College, Oxford, UK. A call for papers was circulated to invite contributions from across the globe, and the response was overwhelming. It soon became clear that the number of high quality submissions was such that one edition of the journal would be insufficient to include them all.

Consequently, this edition of the Journal continues the debates which commenced in the 2019 thematic edition, featuring papers that address how best to conceptualise, implement and evaluate shared decision-making (SDM) and person-centred care (PCC) in a vast range of professional, social, cultural and national contexts. It opens with a series of papers aimed at improving our understanding of the underlying philosophy of SDM and associated concepts and methods, including agency, autonomy, phenomenology, self-disclosure, epistemic justice, the logic of choice and the logic of care, and how to recognise and respect the personhood of patients, practitioners and other affected parties in practice. [2-7] Authors argue that the *meaningful* implementation of SDM presents not only practical but conceptual challenges. Articles focus on the cognitive and emotional skills needed to implement SDM, and the need for broader conceptions of reasoning and evidence in clinical practice – conceptions that fully acknowledge and meaningfully utilise diverse sources of evidence, addressing the role of trust, the first-personal perspective, the distinction between "bias" in clinical decision-making and attention to relevant differences, and even the role of differences determined by sheer luck. [8-14]

Meaningful implementation of SDM requires understanding factors affecting patient decision-making. The edition contains several research papers aimed at getting a clearer picture of the patient decision-making process in a number of areas, in different national contexts. [15-17] These papers are followed by articles identifying barriers to the implementation of SDM (again, in a diverse range of social and cultural contexts) and proposing ways of overcoming these barriers. [18-20]

The edition concludes with a number of papers proposing innovative methods for implementing and evaluating the impact of PCC and SDM. [21-36] Again, the core concepts of PCC and SDM are explored across a very diverse set of contexts. It would of course be misleading to present this edition as the "conclusion" of the debate commenced in our previous thematic issue on this subject. However, while the debates are by no means resolved, as noted in the previous editorial on this subject, [1] authors are making significant progress in exploring connections between arguments about underlying or "foundational"

issues confronting the defenders of SDM and PCC, and practical questions about the implementation of these challenging ideas in real-world contexts.

References

1. Loughlin, M et al (2019) Interactions between persons – knowledge, decision-making and the coproduction of practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 25(6) 911-920
2. Azevedo, M & Dall'Agnol, D (2020) An agency model of consent and the standards of disclosure in healthcare: knowing-how to reach respectful shared decisions among real persons [JEC-2019-0354.R1]
3. Berg, H et al (2020) Therapist self-disclosure and the problem of shared-decision making [JEC-2019-0284.R3]
4. Christiansen, R & Emiliussen, J (2020) Manipulation and Free Will in Shared Decision Making [JEC-2019-0341.R1]
5. Thomas, A et al (2020) What is 'shared' in shared decision making? Philosophical perspectives, epistemic justice and implications for health professions education [JEC-2019-0358.R1]
6. de Bock, B & Willems, D (2020) Hearing what cannot be said [JEC-2019-0390.R2]
7. Crişan, HT & Copoeru, I (2020) Illness and two meanings of phenomenology [JEC-2019-0347.R1]
8. Stalnikowicz, R & Brezis, M (2020) Meaningful shared decision-making: a complex process demanding cognitive and emotional skills [JEC-2019-0135.R3]
9. Engebretsen, KM & Bjorbækmo, WS (2020) Burned out or "just" depressed? An existential phenomenological exploration of burnout [JEC-2019-0199]
10. Ghinea, N (2020) A return to reasonableness and virtue in medical epistemology [JEC-2019-0314.R1]
11. Kowalski, C et al (2020) Scientism recognises evidence only of the quantitative/general variety [JEC-2019-0052.R2]
12. Wilde, M & Auken-Howlett, D (2020) Reinforced reasoning in medicine [JEC-2019-0387.R1]
13. Prasad, R (2020) Medical Good Luck and Medical Bad Luck [JEC-2019-0093.R2]
14. Ahuja, A & Reddy, V (2020) Should Race and Gender be Taken into Account in Both Medical Research and Clinical Practice: Point-Counterpoint [JEC-2019-0276.R2]
15. Ville, I & Lafarge, C (2020) Frames of decision-making in prenatal consultations in England and France. Towards a sociological, relational and processual approach to autonomy [JEC-2019-0733]
16. Sima, R-M & Ples, L et al (2020) Factors Affecting the Decision to Undergo Abortion in Romania: Experiences at Our Clinic [JEC-2019-0315]
17. Poitras, M-E et al (2020) Decisional needs assessment of patients with complex care needs in primary care [JEC-2019-0355.R1]
18. Groot, G et al (2020) Trust and World View in Shared Decision-Making with Indigenous Patients: A Realist Synthesis [JEC-2019-0157.R1]
19. Villarme, S & Kelly, B (2020) What barriers are there to establishing shared decision-making as the norm in obstetrics? [JEC-2019-0431.R1]
20. Giuliani, E et al (2020) Overview of the main challenges in shared decision making in a multicultural and diverse society [JEC-2019-0162.R2]
21. Damman, O et al (2020) The use of PROMs and Shared Decision Making in medical encounters with patients: an opportunity to deliver value-based healthcare to patients [JEC-2019-0353.R1]

22. Jervaeus, A et al (2020) Psychometric properties of the SCREESCO questionnaire used in a colorectal cancer screening programme – a Rasch analysis [JECp-2019-0340.R1]
23. Lin, S et al (2020) Enhanced Youden's Index with net benefit: a feasible approach for optimal-threshold determination in shared decision making [JECp-2019-0177.R2]
24. Gibson, A et al (2020): Clients' experiences of shared decision-making in an integrative psychotherapy for depression [JECp-2019-0332.R1]
25. Nykänen, P (2020) Shared decision making in the social services? Reasons to consider when choosing methods for service user participation [JECp-2019-0359.R1]
26. Allen, K-A et al (2020) Implementing a Shared Decision-Making and Cognitive Strategy-Based Intervention: Knowledge User Perspectives and Recommendations [JECp-2019-0360.R1]
27. Pham, C et al:(2020) Strategies for implementing shared decision making in elective surgery by healthcare practitioners: a systematic review [JECp-2019-0349]
28. Arab-Zozani, M et al (2020) Shared decision making; how can it be helpful in reducing medical overuse due to medical misinformation mess? [JECp-2019-0319.R1]
29. Konstantinidis, M (2020) Clinical Anisotropy: A case for shared decision making in the age of too much data [JECp-2019-0338.R1]
30. Balanescu, P, Baicus, C et al (2020) Characteristics of Shared Decision Making in Romania from the patient perspective from: cross-sectional multicentric study [JECp-2019-0194.R2]
31. Kienlin, S et al (2020) Ready for SDM – Pretesting a training module for health professionals on sharing decisions with their patients [JECp-2019-0098.R1]
32. Manley, K & Jackson, C (2020) The Venus model for integrating practitioner led workforce transformation and complex change across the health care system [JECp-2019-0469.R1]
33. Coombes, J et al (2020) Using a structured, patient-centred, educational exchange to facilitate a 5 shared conversation about stroke prevention medications. [JECp-2019-0249.R2]
34. Rodenburg-Vandenbussche, S, Carlier, I et al (2020) Patients' and clinicians' perspectives on shared decision making regarding treatment decisions for depression, anxiety disorders, and obsessive-compulsive disorder in specialized psychiatric care [JECp-2019-0350.R1]
35. Kuilman, L et al (2020) Moral Deliberation and Paternalism: New dimensions of Moral Sensitivity? Analysis of the 30-item Moral Sensitivity Questionnaire [JECp-2019-0504.R1]
36. Costa, F et al (2020) The patient pathway in cardiovascular care: a position paper from the International Pharmacists for Anticoagulation Care Taskforce (iPACT) [JECp-2019-0101.R1]