



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons: <http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/>

This is the authors' version of an article published in the *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. The published version is available by subscription at:

[http://www.jpmsjournal.com/article/S0885-3924\(09\)00425-4/fulltext](http://www.jpmsjournal.com/article/S0885-3924(09)00425-4/fulltext)

Please cite this as: McCaffrey, N., Currow, D.C. and Eckermann, S., 2009. Measuring impacts of value to patients is crucial when evaluating palliative care. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 37(6), e7-e9.

doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2008.11.010

Copyright © 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Please note that any alterations made during the publishing process may not appear in this version.

“NOTICE: this is the authors' version of a work that was accepted for publication in the *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Cities*. Published Journal Articles (PJAs) Definition: A published journal article (PJA) is the definitive final record of published research that appears or will appear in the journal and embodies all value-adding publisher activities including copy-editing, formatting and (if relevant) pagination. Policy: Elsevier guarantees each PJA's authenticity, we work with others (e.g. national libraries) to preserve them for posterity and in perpetuity, and we invest to drive their usage. We strictly apply an absolute guideline regarding their location: every PJA will reside only on a completely controlled site because this is the only way that we as the publisher can guarantee each PJA's permanence, authenticity and that it is not altered. The continued viability of scholarly journals and their PJAs is also important to the research community. Publishers invest significant time, money and resources to create, maintain and develop both journals' reputations and the publishing process. The distribution of PJAs is therefore also subject to strict guidelines so that journals' ability to recoup the investments required to create them are not compromised. An author may use the PJA for personal use and internal institutional use (see above for definitions of these terms). In the interest of safeguarding the correct scientific record, however, Elsevier does not permit the posting of PJAs (Elsevier-provided PDF or HTML files) on any open websites. This is to ensure that the final published version of an article, which has been edited and peer-reviewed according to the publishing standards of an Elsevier journal, is always recognized as such only via the journal itself, whether in print or electronic format. PJAs may not be used for commercial use or for systematic distribution (see above for definitions of these terms).

Measuring impacts of value to patients is crucial when evaluating palliative care.

Nikki McCaffrey, BSc (Hons), MSc, Centre for Clinical Change and Health Care Research, Flinders University, Daw Park, South Australia¹

David C Currow, MPH, FRACP, Department of Palliative and Supportive Services, Flinders University, Daw Park, South Australia

Simon Eckermann, PhD, Centre for Clinical Change and Health Care Research, Flinders University, Daw Park, South Australia

To the editor: The inclusion of preparation for death and managing affairs in the end of life instrument designed by Borreani et al. (1) to elicit preferences about dying is commendable. Of note, few quality of life (QOL) measurement tools contain or adequately assess this patient-valued domain. Given the importance that patients place on these issues, it is possible that evaluations of palliative health care interventions, including comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness analyses, could easily misinterpret the net benefit of such interventions without inclusion of this domain as an outcome measure. Better assessment methods that incorporate preparation for death and managing affairs are needed.

At a service level, if evaluation measures used in clinical practice or research do not adequately highlight patient-valued domains, service provision may also fail to focus on complex issues, such as preparation for death, and seek to focus only on managing

¹ Corresponding author: Centre for Clinical Change and Health Care Research, Room 52, Block A, Flinders University, Repatriation General Hospital, Daws Road, Daw Park, South Australia, 5041. Telephone number: +618 8275 2859. Fax number: +618 8275 2854. E-mail: nicola.mccaffrey@flinders.edu.au.

physical symptoms, limiting the potential impact of palliative care on identified patient-valued outcomes.

The high value placed on the ability to prepare for death and manage affairs by people at the end of life has been clearly demonstrated. Having 'financial affairs in order' was rated 'important' or 'very important' by 94% (320/340) of people with advanced chronic illness randomly selected from the national Veterans Affairs database in the United States (US) (2) and for 87% (349/434) of older Canadian patients with a 50% probability of survival for six months, 'completing things and preparing for life's end' was 'very' or 'extremely important' (3). Therefore, quantifying the impact of palliative care involvement on this domain in clinical research is crucial, although few measurement tools administered in this setting have attempted to do this.

In a recent systematic review by Zimmermann et al. (4) examining the effectiveness of specialized palliative care teams, only one study (8%) used a QOL measurement tool specific for a palliative care population. However, this tool did not explicitly include preparation for death (5). Similarly, the measurement tools administered in the remaining 11 studies, including the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30) (6) and the Medical Outcomes Study Short Form (SF-36) (7) did not explicitly include this domain. Research into patients' values at the end of life has grown considerably since these tools were initially constructed and some of the more recent palliative care specific measurement tools do include preparation for death, although the focus first tends to be on health-related domains such as symptoms or functional status (8) (9).

Research that seeks to define the relative benefits of different models of care for end of life, including palliative care, is used by health systems around the world, such as

Medicare in the US, to inform decisions regarding the funding and provision of palliative care services. The data needed to inform such deliberations should include the outcomes most valued by patients themselves. It is crucial that the impact of interventions on important patient-relevant domains, including preparation for death and managing affairs, is systematically captured. Otherwise, a sub-optimal model of measurement could lead to missed funding opportunities for valuable palliative care programs or interventions may be inappropriately supported. Once these impacts are captured, robust analysis of multiple patient-valued domains is available to evaluate complex interventions like palliative care that span in-patient, out-patient and community care across a large number of providers (10).

It is vital that clinicians and researchers choose appropriate tools to measure important patient-relevant aspects of QOL, including preparation for death and managing affairs. Such data can drive clinical practice to ensure opportunities are optimized for patients and evaluation studies are better informed. There are numerous QOL and health-related QOL measurement tools available to assess comparative effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of health care interventions in clinical research. The desire to choose a well-established, robust tool that has been used many times before and produces generalisable data should not outweigh the need to systematically capture the impact of interventions on patient-relevant aspects in palliative care. The article by Borreani et al. (1) is a timely reminder that continuing development of palliative care specific QOL measurement tools is required, particularly given the apparent paucity of tools that include preparation for death and managing affairs as components.

References

1. Borreani C, Brunelli C, Miccinesi G et al. Eliciting Individual Preferences About Death: Development of the End-of-Life Preferences Interview. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2008;36(4): 335-350.
2. Steinhauser KE, Christakis NA, Clipp EC et al. Preparing for the end of life: preferences of patients, families, physicians, and other care providers. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2001;22(3):727-737.
3. Heyland DK, Dodek P, Rocker G et al. What matters most in end-of-life care: perceptions of seriously ill patients and their family members. *CMAJ* 2006;174(5):627-633.
4. Zimmermann C, Riechelmann R, Kryzanowska M, Rodin G, Tannock I. Effectiveness of specialized palliative care. *JAMA* 2008;299(14):1698-1709.
5. McMillan SC & Mahon M. Measuring quality of life in hospice patients using a newly developed Hospice Quality of Life Index. *Quality of Life Research* 1994;3:437-447.
6. Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B et al. The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: A Quality-of-Life Instrument for Use in International Clinical Trials in Oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1993;85(5):365-376.
7. Ware JE & Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36) 1992;30(6):473-483.
8. Higginson IJ & Gao W. Caregiver assessment of patients with advanced cancer: concordance with patients, effect of burden and positivity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2008;6:42.
9. Byock IR & Merriman MP. Measuring quality of life for patients with terminal illness: the Missoula-VITAS quality of life index. *Palliative Medicine* 1998;12:231-244.

Measuring impacts of value to patients is crucial when evaluating palliative care

10. Eckermann S, Briggs A, and Willan AR. Health technology assessment in the cost-disutility plane. *Med Decis Making* 2008;28(2):172-181.