

# Palliative Medicine

## QUALITY INDICATORS FOR PALLIATIVE DAY SERVICES: A MODIFIED DELPHI STUDY

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal:                      | <i>Palliative Medicine</i>  |
| Manuscript ID                 | PMJ-18-0136.R1  |
| Manuscript Type:              | Original Article  |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 11-Sep-2018   |
| Complete List of Authors:     | <p>McCorry, Noleen; Queen's University Belfast, Centre of Excellence for Public Health<br/> O'Connor, Sean; Ulster University, Institute of Nursing and Health Research<br/> Leemans, Kathleen; Ghent University &amp; Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), End of Life Care Research Group; Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Department of Radiotherapy<br/> Coast, Joanna; University of Bristol, School of Social and Community Medicine<br/> Donnelly, Michael; Queen's University Belfast, Centre of Excellence for Public Health<br/> Finucane, Anne; Marie Curie Hospice Edinburgh, Research<br/> Jones, Louise; Marie Curie Palliative Care Research Department, Division of Psychiatry, UCL<br/> Kernohan, George; Ulster University, Institute of Nursing and Health Research<br/> Perkins, Paul; Sue Ryder Care Leckhampton Court Hospice, Palliative Medicine; Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Palliative Medicine<br/> Dempster, Martin; Queens University Belfast, Psychology</p>   |
| Keywords:                     | Quality Indicators, Delphi technique, Day services, Quality Improvement, Palliative care  |
| Abstract:                     | <p>Background: The goal of Palliative Day Services is to provide holistic care that contributes to the quality of life of people with life threatening-illness and their families. Quality indicators provide a means by which to describe, monitor and evaluate the quality of Palliative Day Services provision, and act as a starting point for quality improvement. However, currently, there are no published quality indicators for Palliative Day Services.</p> <p>Aim: To develop and provide the first set of quality indicators that describe and evaluate the quality of Palliative Day Services.</p> <p>Design and setting: A modified Delphi technique was used to combine best available research evidence derived from a systematic scoping review with multi-disciplinary expert appraisal of the appropriateness and feasibility of candidate indicators. The resulting indicators were compiled into 'toolkit', and tested in five UK Palliative Day Service settings.</p> <p>Results: A panel of experts independently reviewed evidence summaries</p> |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>for 182 candidate indicators and provided ratings on appropriateness, followed by a panel discussion and further independent ratings of appropriateness, feasibility, and necessity. This exercise resulted in the identification of 30 indicators which were used in practice testing. The final indicator set comprised 7 structural indicators, 21 process indicators, and 2 outcome indicators.</p> <p>Conclusions: The indicators fulfil a previously unmet need among Palliative Day Service providers by delivering an appropriate and feasible means to assess, review, and communicate the quality of care, and to identify areas for quality improvement.</p> |
|  |  |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

## QUALITY INDICATORS FOR PALLIATIVE DAY SERVICES: A MODIFIED DELPHI STUDY

Noleen K. McCorry<sup>1</sup>, Sean O'Connor<sup>2</sup>, Kathleen Leemans<sup>3</sup>, Joanna Coast<sup>4</sup>, Michael Donnelly<sup>1</sup>,  
Anne Finucane<sup>5</sup>, Louise Jones<sup>6</sup>, George Kernohan<sup>7</sup>, Paul Perkins<sup>5</sup>, Martin Dempster<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre of Excellence for Public Health, Centre for Public Health, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>School of Nursing, Ulster University, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>End of Life Care Research Group, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

<sup>4</sup>School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

<sup>5</sup>Marie Curie Hospice Edinburgh, Marie Curie, United Kingdom

<sup>6</sup>University College London, United Kingdom

<sup>7</sup>Institute of Nursing and Health Research, Ulster University, United Kingdom

<sup>8</sup>Sue Ryder Leckhampton Court Hospice and Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

<sup>9</sup>School of Psychology, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom

Corresponding author:

Noleen McCorry, Centre of Excellence for Public Health, Centre for Public Health, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Royal Victoria Hospital, Belfast BT12 6BA United Kingdom

n.mccorry@qub.ac.uk

MeSH keywords: Palliative Care; Delphi Technique; Quality Indicators, Health Care; Day Services, medical; Quality Improvement.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

QUALITY INDICATORS FOR PALLIATIVE DAY SERVICES: A MODIFIED DELPHI STUDY

For Peer Review

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** The goal of Palliative Day Services is to provide holistic care that contributes to the quality of life of people with life threatening-illness and their families. Quality indicators provide a means by which to describe, monitor and evaluate the quality of Palliative Day Services provision, and act as a starting point for quality improvement. However, currently, there are no published quality indicators for Palliative Day Services.

**Aim:** To develop and provide the first set of quality indicators that describe and evaluate the quality of Palliative Day Services.

**Design and setting:** A modified Delphi technique was used to combine best available research evidence derived from a systematic scoping review with multi-disciplinary expert appraisal of the appropriateness and feasibility of candidate indicators. The resulting indicators were compiled into 'toolkit', and tested in five UK Palliative Day Service settings.

**Results:** A panel of experts independently reviewed evidence summaries for 182 candidate indicators and provided ratings on appropriateness, followed by a panel discussion and further independent ratings of appropriateness, feasibility, and necessity. This exercise resulted in the identification of 30 indicators which were used in practice testing. The final indicator set comprised 7 structural indicators, 21 process indicators, and 2 outcome indicators.

**Conclusions:** The indicators fulfil a previously unmet need among Palliative Day Service providers by delivering an appropriate and feasible means to assess, review, and communicate the quality of care, and to identify areas for quality improvement.

### WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ABOUT THE TOPIC?

- Measurement of health care quality creates the basis for quality improvement
- Quality indicators can provide a valid and reliable means of measuring quality of care
- There are currently no published quality indicators specifically for **Palliative Day Services**

### WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS

- This paper describes the development of the first set of quality indicators specifically for quality improvement in Palliative Day Services
- The final set comprises 7 structural indicators (e.g. 'Service has a written standard operating procedure for development and use of multidisciplinary care plans'), 21 process indicators (e.g. 'Proportion of service users with assessment of pain severity at screening using a valid measure'), and 2 outcome indicators (e.g. 'Proportion of service users re-assessed at regular review who report that main care goals are met').

### IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, THEORY OR POLICY

- The quality indicator set offers day service providers with a means of describing and reviewing the quality of their care, and providing feedback to stakeholders
- **Use of the indicator set in practice will allow providers to identify areas for quality improvement**

## INTRODUCTION

Quality indicators are statements that define explicitly and in measurable terms the quality of a given construct or phenomenon. They provide a means with which to describe, monitor and evaluate healthcare.[1] Ideally, they should be evidence-based with a theoretical foundation such as Donabedian's structure, processes and outcomes framework.[2] Quality indicators can provide service users, their families, care staff, providers, commissioners, purchasers, and inspectorates of care with data in relation to the quality of care, sometimes against benchmarks or previous quality assessments. In addition, by providing a valid and reliable means of measuring quality of care, quality indicators (although not sufficient by themselves) can act as a starting point for quality improvement.[3]

In the United Kingdom, as in many European countries, Palliative Day Services provide specialist palliative care within a group context for people with terminal or life-limiting illness, facilitated by a specialist multi-disciplinary team.[4] The goal of Palliative Day Services is to provide individualised, holistic care that promotes independence and rehabilitation, improves self-worth, and ultimately enables the best quality of life for patients and their families.[4,5] However, there is considerable variation within Palliative Day Services, and providers are under pressure to define and measure the quality of their services, identify areas for improvement and assess the impact of service development and improvement efforts. In order to address these issues, we developed the first set of quality indicators that are designed specifically for use by Palliative Day Services. **We propose that our indicators be used to support services to evaluate care quality on an ongoing basis, to identify valid and appropriate goals for quality improvement.**


## METHODS AND RESULTS

We used the RAND/UCLA appropriateness method[6] which has been incorporated into a comprehensive approach for the development of quality indicators in palliative care.[7] The RAND/UCLA appropriateness method is a modified Delphi method which combines the use of evidence with the collective judgement of experts, and is particularly suited to this area of healthcare because of the dearth of evidence related to day services. Expert panellists provide two rounds of *independent* ratings and have the opportunity to discuss their judgments between the rating rounds during a face-to-face meeting. The method has been shown to have a high level of reproducibility and validity.[6] Figure 1 shows the phases in the research process.

The study protocol was approved by the School of Psychology, Queen's University Belfast Research Ethics Committee (ref: 10-2015-16) in September 2015. Expert panel members provided written informed consent to participate in the study.



Figure 1: Phases in the research process, including number of potential quality indicators identified at each stage.



1  
2  
3 **Phase 1 – A systematic scoping review to identify existing quality indicators and domains**  
4

5  
6 A systematic scoping review was conducted to identify existing quality indicators in all areas  
7  
8 of palliative care, and other evidence or recommendations which might inform the  
9  
10 development of (or translation of evidence into) a quality indicator, i.e. structural or process  
11  
12 level variables which have been shown to be related to outcomes of care. Any domains /  
13  
14 themes used to describe the indicators were also identified. Established frameworks were  
15  
16 used to guide the review protocol,[8,9] which is published elsewhere.[10]  
17  
18

19  
20 This review resulted in the identification of 182 unique candidate indicators (supplementary  
21  
22 file 1) and 17 care domains. Evidence tables summarising the content, sources and quality of  
23  
24 evidence (using AIRE[11] and GRADE[12] scores where appropriate) of quality indicators  
25  
26 represented in each domain were compiled.  
27  
28

29  
30 **Phase 2 - Quality indicator selection by expert consultation following the internationally**  
31  
32 **validated RAND (Research ANd Development) / UCLA (University of California, Los**  
33  
34 **Angeles) Appropriateness Method (RAM)**  
35  
36

37 Round 1 – Expert panel questionnaire  
38  
39

40 A multidisciplinary panel of individuals with expertise in Palliative Day Services was  
41  
42 established. A total of 58 potential panel members were directly approached  
43  
44 (recommended by the research team) or responded to advertisements. We selected experts  
45  
46 based on their experience and expertise in the area of Palliative Day Services, while aiming  
47  
48 for diversity in geographical representation and professional specialism. Panel members  
49  
50 were asked to commit 21 hours to the project over 3 months. The resultant panel consisted  
51  
52 of 21 individuals from across the United Kingdom, including palliative care consultants,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 specialist nurses, day service and hospice managers, allied health professionals, spiritual  
4 care providers, a social worker, a complementary therapist, a psychologist and a  
5 pharmacist. Several panellists had experience of more than one day service model and  
6 previous experience of consensus development methods. Panel members were sent a  
7 document pack including general information about quality indicators and their properties  
8 (including a description of Donabedian's model)[2], a series of evidence tables for candidate  
9 quality indicators, a rating booklet, and a short commentary from Marie Curie (a major UK  
10 palliative care provider) endorsing the project objectives. All materials were reviewed by the  
11 research team and two user representatives.  
12  
13

14 Panellists were asked to independently rate the *appropriateness* of each quality indicator on  
15 a 9-point scale (according to the RAND/UCLA method[6] method) where an appropriate  
16 indicator (rated 7-9) was defined as one which was acceptable and likely to represent a  
17 reasonable measure of quality in Palliative Day Services. Alternatively, an inappropriate  
18 indicator (rated 1-3) was defined as one which should rarely or never be used as a measure  
19 of quality in Palliative Day Services, and where any re-wording or reframing of the indicator  
20 would not alter this assessment. Ratings of 4-6 represented indicators which were thought  
21 to be neither appropriate nor inappropriate. Panellists were asked to base ratings on their  
22 own knowledge and experience, as well as the evidence summary tables provided, but not  
23 to rate appropriateness based on the **cost implications associated with a particular**  
24 **indicator. It was explained to panellists that although cost consideration is an important**  
25 **factor in deciding whether a particular procedure or treatment is ultimately made available**  
26 **to patients, the RAM focuses only on the initial question of whether it is effective.** Panellists  
27 were also asked to suggest additional quality indicators, and to review and provide feedback  
28 on the proposed quality domains. The indicator ratings were subsequently analysed based  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 on their median appropriateness scores and the level of agreement between panel  
4  
5 members using the criteria specified by the RAND/UCLA appropriateness method.[6]  
6  
7 Indicators with a median appropriateness rating of 3 or less (inappropriate) and good  
8  
9 agreement on this rating by the panel, were highlighted for exclusion.  
10

11  
12 Twenty panellists returned round 1 ratings. Round 1 resulted in the identification of 70  
13  
14 inappropriate indicators and 112 candidate appropriate or uncertain indicators.  
15  
16

### 17 Round 2 – Expert panel meeting

18  
19 All panellists who participated in round 1 were invited to attend a one day, face-to-face  
20  
21 meeting, where the analysis of round 1 ratings was presented. The meeting was moderated  
22  
23 by a health psychologist (MDe) with extensive experience in facilitating group discussion,  
24  
25 and was attended by 12 panellists. The aims of the meeting were to:  
26  
27

- 28 1) confirm the exclusion of indicators rated as inappropriate as a result of round 1 ratings,
- 29 2) discuss those indicators for which, following round 1, appropriateness was uncertain
- 30 3) discuss indicators for which appropriateness was acceptable but there was
- 31 disagreement between panellists and
- 32 4) review the terminology used in indicator descriptions
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42

43 Following the discussions, panellists were asked to independently re-rate the  
44  
45 *appropriateness* of the 112 indicators. Panel members agreed that the indicator set should  
46  
47 be designed and promoted as a tool to support the assessment of quality in a formative  
48  
49 manner, and the identification of quality improvement goals, and not as a means of  
50  
51 comparison between services or for inspection purposes - which would require more  
52  
53 detailed consideration of risk adjustments. At this stage, panel members were also asked to  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 independently rate the *feasibility* of measuring each indicator in the day service setting  
4  
5 using the same 9-point scale, and to assess if each indicator was a *necessary* measure  
6  
7 (yes/no response). A necessary measure was defined as: *appropriate; likely to benefit the*  
8  
9 *patient; that the benefit is not small; and where it would be improper care not to offer the*  
10 *procedure under review.*[6] The same criteria as round 1 were used to remove inappropriate  
11  
12 indicators. In addition, only quality indicators with a median feasibility rating of 4 or greater  
13  
14 (with good agreement) were retained. The categorisation of necessity was used to produce  
15  
16 a list of core and supplementary indicators. Indicators were defined as supplementary if less  
17  
18 than half the panel identified the indicators as a necessary measure.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 As a result of round 2 ratings, 11 indicators were agreed to be inappropriate, and 17 were  
25  
26 unfeasible. A further 28 indicators were removed based on the assessment of necessity.  
27  
28 Hence 56 core indicators (agreed to be appropriate, feasible and necessary) were retained  
29  
30 following round 2. Supplementary file 1 shows the decisions during rounds 1 and 2.  
31  
32  
33

### 34 Round 3 – Second panel questionnaire

35  
36  
37 The set of 56 core indicators were then reviewed by the research team and expert panel  
38  
39 members (with a particular focus on wording and duplication) who were sent the indicator  
40  
41 set by email.  
42  
43

44 Round 3 resulted in the rewording or combination of 41 indicators, and hence a  
45  
46 consolidated set of 30 unique indicators. Supplementary file 2 shows the derivation of the  
47  
48 draft indicator set from the original 182 candidate indicators. This draft indicator set  
49  
50 included 7 structural indicators, 21 process indicators and 2 outcome indicators, categorised  
51  
52 under 10 domains of care. There were most quality indicators (n=9) representing the  
53  
54 domain 'co-ordination and continuity of care'. For 24 of the indicators, the focus is on  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 patient or staff interaction with the service (eg. *'Proportion of service users with assessment*  
4 *of pain severity at screening using a valid measure' (#A1)*), while 6 indicators represented  
5 service characteristics (eg. *'Service has a written care pathway for assessment and*  
6 *management of moderate or severe pain including appropriate onward referral routes'*  
7 *(#E12)*).

### 15 **Phase 3 - Testing the draft quality indicator set in practice**

16  
17  
18 The draft indicator set was compiled into a toolkit with detailed descriptions of each quality  
19 indicator (including the numerator, denominator and definitions), and instructions to assist  
20 with the extraction of relevant data. Supplementary file 3 is an extract from the toolkit. The  
21 indicator set and toolkit was then field-tested in 5 UK **Palliative Day Service** settings, in  
22 England (2), Scotland (1) and Northern Ireland (2) representing 3 different palliative care  
23 providers. The toolkit instructed data abstractors to assess performance on each quality  
24 indicator using paper-based or electronic records for 15 consecutive patients discharged  
25 from the **Palliative Day Service** in the previous 12 months (for patient level indicators), and  
26 any relevant accessible documentation including service policies and procedures (for service  
27 level indicators). Day service managers at each site completed the data abstraction.

28  
29 Abstractors were asked to 'think aloud'[13] while completing the paperwork – so that  
30 challenges or misunderstandings could be readily identified by the researcher, who was  
31 available during the entire abstraction process.

32  
33 In total, data were extracted from 82 patient records. Following completion of the practice  
34 test, the rate and variation in the proportion of patients/staff for whom each quality  
35 indicator was met, and the proportion of settings which satisfied the service level indicators  
36 was compiled (supplementary file 4). Overall, there was considerable variation across the 5

1  
2  
3 services in performance against the indicators, particularly for assessment of patient  
4  
5 satisfaction, recording of care goals, and completion of care plans. The indicators that were  
6  
7 least likely to be met were concerned with quality of life assessment, availability of a  
8  
9 completed multidisciplinary care plan, and assessment of patient satisfaction with support  
10  
11 for decision making, with some services not collecting any information on patient  
12  
13 satisfaction or quality of life. The indicators that were most likely to be met were concerned  
14  
15 with the documentation of: time from referral to first attendance date offered; informed  
16  
17 consent to treatment or medical intervention; and communication between the service and  
18  
19 the General Practitioner providing information on care needs and care plans. Feedback from  
20  
21 data abstractors indicated that:  
22  
23  
24

- 25 • Data abstraction was perceived as time consuming
- 26
- 27 • Abstractors had to refer to several different sources of information
- 28
- 29 • The paper-based extraction forms added to the cumbersome nature of the process
- 30
- 31 • Data abstractors were not confident about the process for *calculation* of each  
32  
33 indicator  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 As a result of the practice test minor amendments were made to three of the indicators,  
39  
40 and to the toolkit instructions. Table 1 shows the final (QualPalUK) quality indicator set.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Final QualPalUK quality indicator set (n=30), following phase 3 of the RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method

|     | Indicator description, categorised by care domain   | Indicator type* |
|-----|---|-----------------|
|     | <b>A. Physical care and support, assessment and treatment</b>   |                 |
| A1  | Proportion of service users with assessment of pain severity at screening using a valid measure   | P               |
| A2  | Proportion of service users with moderate or severe pain assessed to explore possible causes of pain  | P               |
| A3  | Proportion of service users with assessment of breathlessness at screening using a valid measure  | P               |
| A4  | Proportion of service users with assessment of fatigue at screening using a valid measure   | P               |
| A5  | Proportion of service users with assessment of functional status to identify daily activity limitations completed before a multidisciplinary care plan  | P               |
|     | <b>B. Psychological care and support, assessment and treatment</b>  |                 |
| B6  | Proportion of service users screened for depression at screening using a valid measure  | P               |
| B7  | Proportion of service users screened for anxiety at screening using a valid measure   | P               |
| B8  | Proportion of service users with assessment of cognitive functioning  | P               |
|     | <b>C. Spiritual and emotional care and support</b>  |                 |
| C9  | Proportion of service users with documentation of a 'spiritual aspects of care discussion or assessment' completed before a multidisciplinary care plan   | P               |
|     | <b>D. Information and Communication with Service Users</b>  |                 |
| D10 | Proportion of service users who report that they are provided with sufficient, appropriately tailored information or advice on their condition and on intervention options to support decisions on agreed care planning | O               |
|     | <b>E. Co-ordination and continuity of care</b>  |                 |
| E11 | Proportion of service users with a comprehensive needs assessment completed before a multidisciplinary care plan to identify main symptoms and concerns, and their effect   | P               |
| E12 | Service has a written care pathway for assessment and management of moderate or severe pain including appropriate onward referral routes  | S               |
| E13 | Proportion of service users with documentation of re-assessment at regular review in line with time points agreed in the multidisciplinary care plan  | P               |
| E14 | Service has written standard operating procedures defining timeframes for time to initial contact, completion of needs assessment and multidisciplinary care plan   | S               |
| E15 | Proportion of service users with documentation of appropriate intervention in line with the agreed, multidisciplinary care plan   | P               |
| E16 | Proportion of service users with documented communication between the service & the General Practitioner providing information on care needs and care plans   | P               |
| E17 | Proportion of service users with a care plan available as specified by the service's written standard operating   | P               |



|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | procedure for development and usage of multidisciplinary care plans   |   |
| E18   | Proportion of service users with documented evidence of being offered the opportunity for completion of advance care planning   | P |
| E19   | Proportion of service users with quality of life assessed using a valid measure at screening and at regular review in line with time points agreed in the multidisciplinary care plan | P |
| <b>F. Care planning, goal setting and shared decision making with service users</b> |   |   |
| F20   | Service has a written standard operating procedure for development and use of multidisciplinary care plans  | S |
| F21   | Proportion of service users with documentation of main care goals in the multidisciplinary care plan  | P |
| <b>G. Evidence of effectiveness, outcome assessment and measurement</b>             |   |   |
| G22   | Service has a written policy for reviewing and updating standard operating procedures and care pathways   | S |
| G23   | Proportion of service users re-assessed at regular review who report that main care goals are met in line with the multidisciplinary care plan  | O |
| G24   | Proportion of service users with assessment of satisfaction with overall care and support performed using a valid measure   | P |
| G25   | Proportion of service users with assessment of satisfaction with involvement in shared decision making  | P |
| <b>H. Staff training and education, service and professional development</b>        |   |   |
| H26   | Extent to which staff have access to training around core components of care as part of continuing education and personal development   | S |
| <b>I. Access to services and service environment</b>                                |   |   |
| I27   | Proportion of service users with a record of time in days from referral date to first attendance date offered by service  | P |
| I28   | The service provides suitable equipment and settings to deliver care  | S |
| I29   | Service has a written policy for defining standards for equipment and settings which are available for delivery of care   | S |
| <b>J. Societal, ethical and legal aspects of care</b>                               |   |   |
| J30   | Proportion of service users with correctly completed documentation of informed consent to treatment or medical intervention   | P |

\*Indicator type: S: Structure; P: Process; O: Outcome

## DISCUSSION

### Results of the study

We have developed the first set of quality indicators specifically for use in Palliative Day Services, using a recommended, evidence based approach[7]. The indicators were derived from a comprehensive review of the international literature. The full set of original 182 indicators are provided as a resource in supplementary material and can be used to make adjustments for jurisdictions outside the UK if necessary. The final indicator set (reflecting Donebedian's model)[2] contains 2 outcome, 21 process, and 7 structural indicators, across 10 domains of care. The limited number of outcome indicators is a result of the expert panel's preference to incorporate patient reported outcome measurement (in relation to the assessment of pain, breathlessness, fatigue, functional status, depression, anxiety, and quality of life) into relevant *process* and *structural* indicators, and to avoid the complex adjustment and exclusions often associated with the quality appraisal using *outcome* indicators[14-19]. For example, rather than measure absolute 'pain intensity' or 'change in pain intensity' (both outcome indicators), the panel preferred to measure the extent to which patients had their pain measured using a validated instrument (#A1 and #A2- both process indicators), and the extent to which valid pathways were in place to manage the individual patient's pain (E12 – a structural indicator). This approach still incorporates the perspective of the service user in the process of quality assessment,[20,21] but requires that staff solicit these patient reported outcomes routinely and use them effectively to meet patient needs. Clearly however, both structural and process level quality indicators are only valid assessments of quality of care if they can be shown to increase the likelihood of a good outcome,[22] and hence the evidence base should be reviewed regularly to identify these

1  
2  
3 relationships. The panel did, however, endorse *outcome* indicators in relation to service  
4 users' satisfaction with information and advice received (#D10) and whether service users  
5 reported that their main care goals had been met (#G23).  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 One characteristic of a 'good quality indicator' is the extent to which the quality indicator  
11 refers to an aspect of care which can be influenced by the players being evaluated[23].  
12  
13

14 Many quality indicators developed more recently[7,24,25,26] have been proposed to be  
15 relevant to a range of different palliative care services. It is inevitable though that some of  
16 the indicators within these sets will not be within the control of those care personnel  
17 associated with the service being evaluated. Several authors have commented on this 'fit'  
18 between the indicator set and the service being evaluated[27,28] and have recommended  
19 that indicators be amended or removed as appropriate. We believe that the specificity of  
20 our indicator set is a significant advantage as it means the indicator set is immediately  
21 accessible to UK Palliative Day Services, without modification. **There is considerable scope  
22 for international collaboration in the development of quality indicators,[29,30] and hence  
23 with appropriate modifications to account for contextual and cultural differences, our  
24 indicator set will be valuable in other PDS services, internationally. The original set of 182  
25 unique PDS quality indicators (supplementary file 2) derived from a comprehensive review  
26 of the *international* literature is a valuable reference for other providers wishing to develop  
27 PDS quality indicators.**  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 **Implementation in practice**

48  
49 The value of quality indicators is fully realised when they are implemented in routine  
50 practice, and used as a basis for quality improvement. Fifteen years after the Council of  
51 Europe first encouraged the definition and adoption of quality indicators of good palliative  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 care, there is still little evidence of widespread implementation in practice.[16,31,32] Some  
4  
5 of the barriers to successful implementation of quality indicators in palliative care settings  
6  
7 include the attitudes towards quality improvement within the organisation[27] and among  
8  
9 staff,[28] the perceived value of quality indicators,[27,28] and 'top-down' engagement[27].  
10  
11 Drawing upon this evidence and the improvement science literature,[33] we have  
12  
13 incorporated features in our research design which are intended to improve the likelihood  
14  
15 of uptake and implementation by Palliative Day Services. Use of the rigorous RAND/UCLA  
16  
17 method results in a set of indicators with high face and content validity.[34-36] We have  
18  
19 enhanced the perceived acceptability and credibility of the indicator set by promoting  
20  
21 stakeholder awareness and involvement in the development of the indicators, and by  
22  
23 ensuring representation on our expert panel from services where we wish the indicators to  
24  
25 be utilised. We have communicated widely (via newsletters, presentations, the [QualPalUK](#)  
26  
27 website, and site visits) about the development process, and have provided opportunities  
28  
29 for stakeholder feedback. However, for successful implementation we will also need to be  
30  
31 attuned to variations in current practice, the range of measures already in place in care  
32  
33 settings, the diversity of systems (including IT systems), and staff training.[28,37]  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **Assessment of care quality is agreed to be an essential element of service provision, and the**  
41 **quality indicator set is a comprehensive and evidence based tool that enables this process.**  
42  
43 **This comprehensive assessment requires time investment by services that are often time-**  
44 **poor, on an annual or bi-annual basis. Implementation will be facilitated where: services are**  
45 **able to organise their routinely collected data in a manner that is easily accessible for data**  
46 **extractors; service personnel recognise the direct impact of quality assessment on service**  
47 **improvements; data extractors become more familiar with use of the tool; and where**  
48 **efficiency of data extraction is enhanced via electronic capture. We are now developing an**  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 electronic version of the quality indicator toolkit which will help to reduce the time required  
4  
5 for data extraction and calculation of the quality indicators by allowing abstractors to input  
6  
7 the required (prompted) fields, with calculations completed by the programme in the  
8  
9 background. We will supplement the quality indicator toolkit with a quality improvement  
10  
11 module which will support Palliative Day Services to first identify areas for quality  
12  
13 improvement, and subsequently to use Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles[38] to work towards  
14  
15 improvement, and subsequently to use Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles[38] to work towards  
16  
17 improvement.

18  
19 Although there were only five practice sites, the practice test indicated that the assessment  
20  
21 of satisfaction and quality of life, and the production (and communication of)  
22  
23 comprehensive care plans and needs assessments are areas which may require attention  
24  
25 within Palliative Day Services. This finding is consistent with existing literature which has  
26  
27 demonstrated that, despite initiatives promoting the routine measurement of patient  
28  
29 reported outcomes,[39-42], and strong evidence of a positive effect on a multitude of care  
30  
31 outcomes (including patient-clinician communication, patient satisfaction, and identification  
32  
33 of unrecognized symptoms),[43] they are not yet widely measured in palliative care  
34  
35 practice. Failure to implement patient reported outcome measurement in palliative care has  
36  
37 been attributed to barriers including fear of change, time management/ constraints, lack of  
38  
39 education on use of tools, burden of tools for staff and service users, illness severity,  
40  
41 concerns about criticism, and cost constraints.[44] The assessment of patient reported  
42  
43 outcomes is therefore one area where quality improvement projects may be particularly  
44  
45 productive and valued by the Palliative Day Services community. In contrast, indicators  
46  
47 which utilise administrative data that maps onto the requirements of national[45] or  
48  
49 internal organisational audits were more likely to be met, such as 'time from referral to first  
50  
51 attendance', or 'consent to treatment'.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Strengths and weaknesses

The RAND/UCLA method has been shown to produce indicators with high content[34,46] and predictive validity.[32,47,48] However, these characteristics and others (including sensitivity to change and reliability) should be field tested in a larger representative sample of Palliative Day Services, using the electronic toolkit for data extraction. In addition, the time commitment required from Delphi panellists often results in a panel that is atypical with respect to their interest and commitment to the topic being investigated. Generating interest in the value and implementation of PDS quality indicators more widely is likely to be challenging.

### What this study adds

Our quality indicator set fulfils a need within the Palliative Day Services community, by providing a means of assessing and reviewing quality of care and identifying areas for improvement.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Farquhar M. AHRQ Quality Indicators. In: Hughes RG, ed. Patient Safety and Quality: An Evidence-Based Handbook for Nurses. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US) 2008: Chapter 45.
- 2 Donabedian A. The Quality of Care. How Can It Be Assessed? *JAMA* 1988;260:1743–1748. doi:10.1001/jama.260.12.1743
- 3 Donabedian A. Explorations in quality assessment and monitoring. Volume 1: The definition of quality and approaches to its assessment. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Health Administration Press, 1980.
- 4 Association of Palliative Day Services. <https://apds.org.uk/what-are-palliative-day-services> (accessed: January 2018)
- 5 National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Improving Supportive and Palliative Care for Adults with Cancer 2004. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/csg4/resources/improving-supportive-and-palliative-care-for-adults-with-cancer-pdf-773375005> (accessed January 2018)
- 6 Fitch K, Bernstein SJ, Aguilar MD, et al. The RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method User's Manual. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2001. [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1269](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1269).
- 7 Leemans K, Cohen J, Francke AL, et al. Towards a standardized method of developing quality indicators for palliative care: protocol of the Quality indicators for Palliative Care (Q-PAC) study. *BMC Palliat Care* 2013;12:6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-684X-12-6>
- 8 Colquhoun HL, Levac D, O'Brien KK, et al. Scoping reviews: time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67:1291-4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.013>

- 1  
2  
3 9 Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology.  
4  
5 *Implement Sci* 2010;5:69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>  
6  
7  
8 10 O'Connor S, Dempster M & McCorry NK. Identifying models of delivery, care domains  
9  
10 and quality indicators relevant to Palliative Day Services: a scoping review protocol.  
11  
12 *Systematic Reviews*, 2017; 6:100. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-017-0489-4  
13  
14 11 De Koning J. Development and validation of a measurement tool for appraising indicator  
15  
16 quality: appraisal of indicators through research and evaluation (AIRE) instrument  
17  
18 [abstract] 2007. [www.egms.de/static/en/meetings/gmds2007/07gmds798.shtml](http://www.egms.de/static/en/meetings/gmds2007/07gmds798.shtml)  
19  
20  
21 12 GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.  
22  
23 *BMJ* 2004;328:1490. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.328.7454.1490> (Published 17  
24  
25 June 2004).  
26  
27  
28 13 van Someren MW, Barnard YF, and Sandberg JAC. The think aloud method: a practical  
29  
30 approach to modelling cognitive processes. (Knowledge-based systems). London:  
31  
32 Academic Press 1994.  
33  
34  
35 14 Blumenthal D and Jena AB. Hospital value-based purchasing. *J Hosp Med* 2013;8:271–7.  
36  
37 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2045>  
38  
39  
40 15 Lilford RJ, Brown CA, Nicholl J. Use of process measures to monitor the quality of clinical  
41  
42 practice. *BMJ* 2007;335:648–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39317.641296.AD>  
43  
44  
45 16 Brook RH, McGlynn EA, and Shekelle PG. Defining and measuring quality of care: a  
46  
47 perspective from US researchers. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2000;12:281–295.  
48  
49 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/12.4.281>  
50  
51  
52 17 Bruckel J, Liu X, Hohmann SF, et al. The denominator problem: national hospital quality  
53  
54 measures for acute myocardial infarction. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2017;26:189-199. doi:  
55  
56 10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004888. Epub 2016 Mar 3.  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 18 Bilimoria KY. Facilitating quality improvement: pushing the pendulum back toward  
4  
5 process measures. *JAMA* 2015;314:1333-4. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.12470.  
6  
7  
8 19 Gross PA. Editorial process versus outcome measures: the end of the debate. *Med Care*  
9  
10 2012;50:200-2. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e31824a59fb.  
11  
12 20 Claessen SJ, Francke AL, Belarbi HE, et al. A new set of quality indicators for palliative  
13  
14 care: Process and results of the development trajectory. *J Pain Symptom Manage*  
15  
16 2011;42:169-182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2010.10.267>  
17  
18  
19 21 Seow H, Snyder CF, Mularski RA, et al. A framework for assessing quality indicators for  
20  
21 cancer care at the end of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2009;38:903-912.  
22  
23 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2009.04.024>  
24  
25  
26 22 Shahian DM, Meyer GS, Mort E, et al. Association of National Hospital Quality Measure  
27  
28 adherence with long-term mortality and readmissions. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21:325-36.  
29  
30 doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000615. Epub 2012 Mar 2.  
31  
32  
33 23 Reiter A, Fischer B, Kötting J, et al. QUALIFY: instrument for the assessment of quality  
34  
35 indicators. Version 1.0 (English).  
36  
37 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267256474\\_QUALIFY\\_Instrument\\_for\\_the\\_A](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267256474_QUALIFY_Instrument_for_the_Assessment_of_Quality_Indicators)  
38  
39 [ssessment\\_of\\_Quality\\_Indicators](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267256474_QUALIFY_Instrument_for_the_Assessment_of_Quality_Indicators)  
40  
41  
42 24 Woitha K, Van Beek K, Ahmed N, et al. Validation of quality indicators for the  
43  
44 organization of palliative care: A modified RAND Delphi study in seven European  
45  
46 countries (the Europall project). *Palliat Med* 2013;28:121-129.  
47  
48 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216313493952>  
49  
50  
51 25 Dy SM, Kiley KB, Ast K, et al. Measuring What Matters: Top-Ranked Quality Indicators for  
52  
53 Hospice and Palliative Care From the American Academy of Hospice and Palliative  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Medicine and Hospice and Palliative Nurses Association. *J Pain Symptom Manage*  
4  
5 2015;49:773-781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.01.012>  
6

7 26 van Riet Paap J, Vernooij-Dassen M, Dröes R-M, Radbruch L, Vissers K, Engels Y.  
8  
9 Consensus on quality indicators to assess the organisation of palliative cancer and  
10  
11 dementia care applicable across national healthcare systems and selected by  
12  
13 international experts. *BMC Health Services Research* 2014;14:396. doi=10.1186/1472-  
14  
15 6963-14-396  
16  
17

18  
19 27 Iliffe S, Davies N, Manthorpe J et al. Improving palliative care in selected settings in  
20  
21 England using quality indicators: a realist evaluation. *BMC Palliat Care* 2016;15:69. doi:  
22  
23 10.1186/s12904-016-0144-1.  
24

25  
26 28 Leemans K, van den Block L, Vander R, et al. How to implement quality indicators  
27  
28 successfully in palliative care services: perceptions of team members about facilitators  
29  
30 of and barriers to implementation. *Support Care Cancer*, 2015;23:3503–3511. doi:  
31  
32 10.1007/s00520-015-2687-8  
33

34  
35 29 Marshall NM, Shekelle PG, McGlynn EA, Campbell S, Brook RH, Roland MO. Can health  
36  
37 care quality indicators be transferred between countries? *Qual Saf Health Care*  
38  
39 2003;12:8–12. doi: 10.1136/qhc.12.1.8  
40

41  
42 30 Thomson RG, McElroy H, Kazandjian VA. Maryland hospital quality indicator project in  
43  
44 the United Kingdom: an approach for promoting continuous quality improvement. *Qual*  
45  
46 *Health Care* 1997;6:49–55.  
47

48  
49 31 Pasma HR, Brandt HE, Deliens L, et al. Quality indicators for palliative care: a systematic  
50  
51 review. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2009;38:145-56. doi:  
52  
53 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2008.07.008.  
54  
55

- 1  
2  
3 32 DeRoo ML, Leemans K, Claessen SJJ et al. Quality indicators for palliative care: update of  
4  
5 a systematic review. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2013;46:556-572. doi:  
6  
7 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2012.09.013. Epub 2013 Jun 26.  
8  
9  
10 33 Grol R, Baker R, Moss F, eds. Quality Improvement Research: Understanding the Science  
11  
12 of Change in Health Care. London: BMJ Books 2004.  
13  
14 34 Campbell SM, Braspenning J, Hutchinson A, et al. Research methods used in developing  
15  
16 and applying quality indicators in primary care. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2002;11:358-364.  
17  
18  
19 35 Shekelle PG, Kahan JP, Bernstein SJ, et al. The reproducibility of a method to identify the  
20  
21 overuse and underuse of procedures. *N Engl J Med* 1998;338:1888–95.  
22  
23  
24 36 Selby JV, Fireman BH, Lundstrom RJ. Variation among hospitals in coronary-angiography  
25  
26 practices and outcomes after myocardial infarction in a large health maintenance  
27  
28 organisation. *N Engl J Med* 1996;335:1888–96  
29  
30  
31 37 Palliative Care Outcomes Collaboration. *Palliative Care Outcomes Collaboration: Three*  
32  
33 *years of progress (2010 to 2013)*. Australian Health Services Research Institute,  
34  
35 University of Wollongong, Wollongong 2013.  
36  
37 <https://ahsri.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@chsd/documents/doc/uow15>  
38  
39 <https://ahsri.uow.edu.au/content/groups/public/@web/@chsd/documents/doc/uow15>  
40  
41 4319.pdf  
42  
43  
44 38 Langley G, Nolan K, Nolan T et al. The Improvement Guide. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco  
45  
46 1996.  
47  
48  
49 39 Council of Europe. Recommendation Rec (2003) 24 of the Committee of Ministers to  
50  
51 member states on the organisation of palliative care. CM 2002:130.  
52  
53 [https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/health/Source/Rec\(2003\)24\\_en.pdf](https://www.coe.int/t/dg3/health/Source/Rec(2003)24_en.pdf)  
54  
55  
56 40 Radbruch L, Payne S, and the Board of Directors of the EAPC. White Paper on standards  
57  
58 and norms for hospice and palliative care in Europe: Part 1 Recommendations from the  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 European Association for Palliative Care. *European Journal of Palliative Care* 2010;17:1.  
4  
5 [www.eapcnet.eu/Themes/Resources/Organisation/EAPCStandardsNorms.aspx](http://www.eapcnet.eu/Themes/Resources/Organisation/EAPCStandardsNorms.aspx)  
6  
7  
8 41 Bausewein C, Daveson BA, Currow DC et al. EAPC White Paper on outcome  
9  
10 measurement in palliative care: Improving practice, attaining outcomes and delivering  
11  
12 quality services – Recommendations from the European Association of Palliative Care  
13  
14 (EAPC) taskforce on outcome measurement. *Palliat Med* 2016;30:6-22. DOI:  
15  
16 10.1177/0269216315589898  
17  
18  
19 42 Simon S, Higginson I, Harding R, et al. Enhancing patient reported outcome  
20  
21 measurement in research and practice of palliative care and end-of-life care. *Support*  
22  
23 *Care Cancer* 2012;20:1573-1578. doi: 10.1007/s00520-012-1436-5. Epub 2012 Mar 7.  
24  
25  
26 43 Dudgeon D. The Impact of Measuring Patient-Reported Outcome Measures on Quality of  
27  
28 and Access to Palliative Care. *J Palliat Med* 2017;20:S76-80. doi: 10.1089/jpm.2017.0447  
29  
30  
31 44 Antunes B, Harding R, Higginson J, on behalf of EUROIMPACT. Implementing patient-  
32  
33 reported outcome measures in palliative care clinical practice: A systematic review of  
34  
35 facilitators and barriers. *Pall Med* 2014;28:158-175.  
36  
37  
38 45 The National Council for Palliative Care Minimum Data Set [online]. Available at:  
39  
40 <http://www.ncpc.org.uk/minimum-data-set> [Accessed 28 Aug. 2018].  
41  
42  
43 46 Merrick NJ, Fink A, Park RE, Brook RH, Kosecoff J, Chassin MR, et al. Derivation of clinical  
44  
45 indications for carotid endarterectomy by an expert panel. *Am J Pub Health*  
46  
47 1987;77:187-90. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.77.2.187.  
48  
49  
50 47 Salzer MS, Nixon CT, Schut LJA, Karver MS, Bickman L. Validating quality indicators:  
51  
52 quality as relationship between structure, process and outcome. *Evaluation Review*  
53  
54 1997;21:292-309. doi: 10.1177/0193841X9702100302.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 48 Kravitz RL, Laouri M, Kahan JP, Guzy P, Sherman T, Hilborne L, et al. Validity of criteria  
4  
5 used for detecting underuse of coronary revascularization. *JAMA* 1995;274:632-8. doi:  
6  
7 10.1001/jama.274.8.632.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 13 14 **DECLARATIONS**

### 15 16 **Authorship**

17  
18 All authors made a substantial contribution to the concept or design of the work or  
19  
20 acquisition of data, revised the article for important intellectual content, approved the  
21  
22 submitted version, and participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for  
23  
24 appropriate portions of the content. McCorry, Dempster and O'Connor drafted the article.  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Funding**

29  
30 This work was supported by the Marie Curie Research Grants Scheme, grant  
31  
32 [C10667/A17151].  
33  
34

### 35 **Conflicts of interest**

36  
37 There are no conflicts of interest.  
38  
39

### 40 **Ethics**

41  
42 The study protocol was approved by the School of Psychology, Queen's University Belfast  
43  
44 Research Ethics Committee (ref: 10-2015-16).  
45  
46

### 47 **Data management and sharing**

48  
49 The final QualPalUK indicator set is available for use in the main document. The most recent  
50  
51 version of the QualPalUK data extraction toolkit can be obtained by contacting the  
52  
53 corresponding author. Supplementary files 1 and 2 provide a detailed account of the  
54  
55 derivation of the final indicator set.  
56  
57

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the members of the QualPalUK expert panel for providing their time and expertise in the development of the indicator set, including representatives of: Marie Curie Hospice West Midlands; Rowcroft Hospice, Torquay; Brunel University; LOROS Hospice, Leicester; Marie Curie Hospice Hampstead, Sobell House, Oxford; St Joseph's Hospice, London; Sue Ryder Leckhampton Court Hospice, Cheltenham; Bournemouth University; St Catherine's Hospice, Crawley; Northern Ireland Hospice; University of East Anglia; St Michael's Hospice, Hereford; University of the West of Scotland; Willen Hospice, Milton Keynes; St Barnabas Lincolnshire Hospice, Lincoln; St Benedict's Hospice and Centre for Specialist Palliative Care, Sunderland; and St Clare Hospice, Essex.

We thank our colleagues who performed data abstraction at each participating site, including Gail Watson and Susan Buchanan.

Supplementary file 1: Original 182 candidate indicators, and panel ratings during round one and two of the RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method (RAM)

| #  | Potential quality indicator descriptions  | Round 1                                 |                              | Round 2                                  |                             | Core or supplementary indicator |                                      |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|  |   | Median Appropriateness Score/9 (Range)* | Agreement between panel Y/N† | Median Appropriateness Score/9 (Range) ‡ | Median Feasibility Score/9§ |                                 | Rated as necessary by panel Y/N (%)¶ |
| <b>Care Domains</b>  |   |   |                              |  |                             |                                 |                                      |
| <b>Physical care and support, assessment and treatment</b> |   |   |                              |  |                             |                                 |                                      |
| DQI#01   | Number of patients screened for pain using a validated measure  | 8 (5)                                   | Y                            | 8.5 (3)                                  | 8                           | Y (100)                         | Core                                 |
| DQI#02   | Number of patients with a score >x/10 on a NRS/VAS (average pain on a typical day over the last week)                     | 3 (8)                                   | N                            | -  | -                           | -                               | -                                    |
| DQI#03   | Number of patients with moderate to severe pain   | 7 (8)                                   | Y                            | 7 (5)                                    | 5.5                         | Y (55)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#04   | For patients who screen positive for pain, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                               | 7 (4)                                   | Y                            | 8 (3)                                    | 7.5                         | N (36)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#05   | For patients who screen positive for pain, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]                      | 5.5 (7)                                 | N                            | 4.5 (4)                                  | 2                           | N (45)                          | -                                    |
| DQI#06   | Number of patients assessed to identify likely cause of pain based on site and radiation (e.g. using a body diagram)      | 7 (3)                                   | Y                            | 8 (3)                                    | 8                           | N (27)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#07   | Number of patients assessed to identify likely cause of pain based on character (e.g. using a list of descriptors)        | 9 (3)                                   | Y                            | 7.5 (3)                                  | 7.5                         | N (27)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#08   | Number of patients assessed to identify likely cause of pain based on exacerbating/relieving factors including analgesics | 8.5 (3)                                 | Y                            | 8 (3)                                    | 8                           | N (27)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#09   | Number of patients assessed to identify likely cause of pain based on timing and duration                                 | 7.5 (3)                                 | Y                            | 7 (4)                                    | 7.5                         | N (27)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#10   | Number of patients assessed to identify likely cause of pain based on effect on function, sleep and mood                  | 9 (2)                                   | Y                            | 7.5 (2)                                  | 8                           | Y (55)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#11   | Documentation of other factors (e.g. emotional, psychological or spiritual) with possible effect on pain perception       | 4 (5)                                   | Y                            | 4.5 (3)                                  | 4.5                         | Y (55)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#12   | Number of patients screened for SOB using a validated measure   | 7 (3)                                   | Y                            | 8 (4)                                    | 5.5                         | N (57)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#13   | For patients who screen positive for SOB, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                                | 5 (4)                                   | Y                            | 3.5 (4)                                  | 7                           | N (36)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#14   | For patients who screen positive for SOB, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]                       | 3.5 (4)                                 | Y                            | 7 (3)                                    | 8                           | N (64)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#15   | Number of patients screened for upper GI (stomach) problems (nausea/vomiting) using a validated measure                   | 6 (5)                                   | Y                            | 4 (2)                                    | 5.5                         | N (18)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#16   | For patients who screen positive for upper GI problems, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                  | 8 (3)                                   | Y                            | 8 (3)                                    | 8                           | N (45)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#17   | For patients who screen positive for upper GI problems, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]         | 7 (5)                                   | N                            | 4.5 (3)                                  | 3                           | N (9)                           | -                                    |
| DQI#18   | Number of patients screened for lower GI (abdominal) problems (constipation) using a validated measure                    | 7 (4)                                   | Y                            | 7.5 (3)                                  | 6                           | Y (55)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#19   | For patients who screen positive for lower GI problems, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                  | 7 (3)                                   | Y                            | 5.5 (2)                                  | 7.5                         | Y (55)                          | Core                                 |
| DQI#20   | For patients who screen positive for lower GI problems, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]         | 9 (2)                                   | Y                            | 5 (5)                                    | 2                           | N (27)                          | -                                    |
| DQI#21   | Number of patients screened for poor mobility using a validated measure   | 6.5 (2)                                 | Y                            | 3.5 (2)                                  | 7.5                         | N (45)                          | Supplementary                        |
| DQI#22   | For patients who screen positive for poor mobility, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                      | 6 (8)                                   | N                            | 5.5 (3)                                  | 1.5                         | N (27)                          | -                                    |

|    |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
|----|--------|--|---------|---|---------|-----|---------|---------------|--|
| 1  |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 2  | DQI#23 | For patients who screen positive for poor mobility, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]                | 3 (5)   | N | 4.5 (3) | 2   | N (27)  | -             |  |
| 3  |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 4  | DQI#24 | Number of patients screened for tiredness/weakness   | 8 (3)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 8   | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 5  | DQI#25 | For patients who screen positive for tiredness/weakness, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                    | 4 (5)   | N | 5.5 (3) | 3   | N (36)  | -             |  |
| 6  | DQI#26 | For patients who screen positive for tiredness/weakness, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]           | 5.5 (3) | Y | 3.5 (4) | 5.5 | Y (73)  | Core          |  |
| 7  |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 8  | DQI#27 | Number of patients screened for insomnia using a validated measure   | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 9  | DQI#28 | For patients who screen positive for insomnia, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                              | 3 (4)   | Y | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 10 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 11 | DQI#29 | For patients who screen positive for insomnia, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]                     | 3 (4)   | Y | 4       | 5   | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 12 | DQI#30 | Number of patients with an assessment of functional status made using a validated measure reviewed within a [x] month period | 9 (3)   | Y | 7 (3)   | 5.5 | Y (64)  | Core          |  |
| 13 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 14 | DQI#31 | Number of patients screened for general symptom assessment using a validated measure and reviewed within a [x] month period  | 9 (3)   | Y | 8 (4)   | 8   | Y (91)  | Core          |  |
| 15 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 16 | DQI#32 | Number of patients with a symptom management plan, including goals, agreed in conjunction with the patient and family        | 9 (3)   | Y | 7.5 (4) | 7.5 | Y (100) | Core          |  |
| 17 | DQI#33 | Number of patients with agreed arrangements for regular review of symptoms   | 9 (3)   | Y | 7 (5)   | 7.5 | Y (73)  | Core          |  |
| 18 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 19 | DQI#34 | Number of patients provided with written advice on physical symptom management   | 5 (5)   | Y | 4 (5)   | 2   | N (27)  | -             |  |
| 20 | DQI#35 | Number of patients who receive an individualized assessment of physical activity levels                                      | 3 (7)   | Y | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 21 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 22 | DQI#36 | Number of patients with an assessment made of satisfaction with overall physical care and support                            | 8 (2)   | Y | 7.5 (3) | 8   | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 23 | DQI#37 | Number of patients satisfied with overall physical care and support assessed using a standardized measure                    | 3 (8)   | Y | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 24 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 25 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 26 |        | <b>Psychological care and support, assessment and treatment</b>  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 27 | DQI#38 | Number of patients screened for depression using a validated measure within a [x] month period                               | 9 (2)   | Y | 7.5 (3) | 8   | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 28 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 29 | DQI#39 | Number of patients who screen positive for depression, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                      | 5 (6)   | N | 6.5 (3) | 4   | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 30 | DQI#40 | Number of patients who screen positive for depression, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]             | 7 (4)   | Y | 8 (4)   | 5.5 | Y (55)  | Core          |  |
| 31 | DQI#41 | Number of patients screened for anxiety using a validated measure within a [x] month period                                  | 9 (1)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 7.5 | Y (91)  | Core          |  |
| 32 | DQI#42 | Number of patients who screen positive for anxiety, the number with any treatment within [x] week[s]                         | 5 (4)   | Y | 5.5 (2) | 6   | N (27)  | Supplementary |  |
| 33 | DQI#43 | Number of patients who screen positive for anxiety, the number with significant improvement after [x] week[s]                | 7 (3)   | Y | 7 (3)   | 2   | Y (55)  | -             |  |
| 34 | DQI#44 | Number of patients who receive support when they feel anxious or feel depressed  | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 35 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 36 | DQI#45 | Number of patients diagnosed with depression with a documented treatment plan  | 8.5 (2) | Y | 6 (3)   | 8.5 | Y (64)  | Core          |  |
| 37 | DQI#46 | Number of patients diagnosed with depression with response to therapy documented within [x] week[s]                          | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 38 | DQI#47 | Number of patients who receive adequate attention from their   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 39 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 40 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 41 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 42 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 43 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 44 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 45 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 46 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 47 |        |  |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |



|    |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
|----|--------|---|---------|---|---------|-----|---------|---------------|
| 1  |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 2  |        | caregivers  |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 3  | DQI#48 | Number of patients are satisfied with the counselling aspects of “politeness” and “being taken seriously”                             | 1 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 4  | DQI#49 | Number of patients who experience respect for their autonomy  | 2.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 5  | DQI#50 | Number of patients who experience respect for their privacy   | 2 (4)   | Y | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 6  | DQI#51 | Number of patients who receive overall quality of life assessment using a validated measure   | 9 (3)   | Y | 8 (2)   | 7.5 | Y (100) | Core          |
| 7  | DQI#52 | Number of patients who receive condition specific psychological assessment using a validated measure                                  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 8  | DQI#53 | Number of patients referred to / receiving stress management program or intervention  | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 9  | DQI#54 | Number of patients who receive treatment for psychological symptoms in a timely, safe and effective manner                            | 5 (6)   | N | 6 (4)   | 6.5 | N (27)  | Supplementary |
| 10 | DQI#55 | Number of patients with an assessment of cognition performed and results reviewed at least [x] times within [x] months                | 9 (2)   | Y | 4.5 (3) | 7.5 | Y (64)  | Core          |
| 11 | DQI#56 | Number of patients with neuropsychiatric symptoms receiving or recommended to receive intervention within a [x] month period          | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 12 |        | <b>Social care, assessment and management</b>   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 13 | DQI#57 | Number of patients with a comprehensive social care plan addressing social, practical, and legal needs of patient and caregivers      | 1.5 (6) | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 14 | DQI#58 | Number of patients with equity of access to support for social care needs including counselling services                              | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 15 | DQI#59 | Number of patients with a comprehensive interdisciplinary assessment identifying social needs of patients and families                | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 8   | Y (82)  | Core          |
| 16 | DQI#60 | Number of patients with an assigned professional who maintains contact to ensure co-ordinated delivery of services                    | 6 (5)   | N | 5.5 (4) | 4   | N (18)  | Supplementary |
| 17 |        | <b>Spiritual and emotional care and support</b>   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 18 | DQI#61 | Number of patients who indicate that caregivers respect their life stance   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 19 | DQI#62 | Number of patients who indicate that they have access to a counsellor for spiritual problems  | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 20 | DQI#63 | Number of relatives who indicate that the patient had access to a counsellor for spiritual problems                                   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 21 | DQI#64 | Number of relatives who indicate that the patient had accepted her/his approaching death  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 22 | DQI#65 | Number of relatives who indicate that there was attention and respect for the spiritual well-being of the patient                     | 5 (4)   | Y | 2 (3)   | 1.5 | N (9)   | -             |
| 23 | DQI#66 | Number of relatives who indicate that the patient had access to a counsellor for spiritual problems                                   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 24 | DQI#67 | Number of patients who indicate that they feel that life is worthwhile  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |
| 25 | DQI#68 | Number of patients with documentation of discussion of spiritual/religious concerns or that the patient did not want to discuss       | 9 (3)   | Y | 6 (2)   | 8   | Y (82)  | Core          |
| 26 | DQI#69 | Number of patients with a plan based on an assessment of religious, spiritual, and existential concerns using a structured instrument | 9 (4)   | Y | 4 (3)   | 8   | Y (64)  | Core          |
| 27 | DQI#70 | Number of patients with information about the availability of spiritual care services   | 8 (4)   | Y | 6 (4)   | 8   | Y (91)  | Core          |
| 28 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 29 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 30 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 31 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 32 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 33 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 34 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 35 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 36 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 37 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 38 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 39 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 40 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 41 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 42 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 43 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 44 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 45 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 46 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |
| 47 |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |

|    |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
|----|--------|---|---------|---|---------|-----|---------|---------------|--|
| 1  |        |   |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 2  | DQI#71 | Number of patients assessed to identify important spiritual and emotional aspects of care using a validated measure   | 6 (4)   | Y | 4 (2)   | 6.5 | Y (73)  | Core          |  |
| 3  |        | <b>Cultural aspects of care</b>   |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 4  | DQI#72 | Number of patients with a non-English native language who have baseline screening performed in their native language  | 4.5 (5) | N | 5 (4)   | 2   | N (9)   | -             |  |
| 5  | DQI#73 | Number of patients with access to translators where caregivers and patient / family members do not speak the same language  | 8.5 (2) | Y | 7 (3)   | 2.5 | Y (64)  | -             |  |
| 6  | DQI#74 | Number of patients with a cultural assessment including preferences regarding disclosure of information and desire for support measures   | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 7  | DQI#75 | Number of patients provided with culturally sensitive materials in the patient's and family's preferred language  | 9 (2)   | Y | 5 (6)   | 2   | Y (55)  | -             |  |
| 8  |        | <b>Generic aspects of care and health promotion</b>   |         |   |         |     |         |               |  |
| 9  | DQI#76 | Extent to which staff assess and manage symptoms and side effects in a timely, safe, and effective manner   | 8 (1)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 7.5 | Y (64)  | Core          |  |
| 10 | DQI#77 | Number of patients with documented communication between Day Service and General Practitioner   | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (4)   | 8   | Y (100) | Core          |  |
| 11 | DQI#78 | Extent to which patients receive information about the expected course of the illness   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 12 | DQI#79 | Extent to which patients receive information about the advantages and disadvantages of various types of treatments  | 2.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 13 | DQI#80 | Extent to which the distinct care needs of patients with different conditions are recognised and addressed  | 2 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 14 | DQI#81 | Number of patients who receive individual or group patient self-management  | 2 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 15 | DQI#82 | Number of exercise / rehabilitation sessions attended by patient  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 16 | DQI#83 | Number of patients or their caregiver(s) referred for counselling regarding safety concerns within an [x] month period  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 17 | DQI#84 | Number of patients provided with education on disease management or referred to additional resources of support   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 18 | DQI#85 | Number of patients with assessment and appropriate management of sexual dysfunction   | 8 (6)   | N | 7 (2)   | 8   | Y (52)  | Core          |  |
| 19 | DQI#86 | Extent to which patients experience respect for their autonomy / privacy  | 6 (3)   | Y | 4 (4)   | 7   | N (36)  | Supplementary |  |
| 20 | DQI#87 | Number of patients assessed screened at least once to detect whether they use tobacco regularly   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 21 | DQI#88 | Number of patients with an inventory of complaints and problems   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 22 | DQI#89 | Number of patients assessed to detect problem drinking by taking a history of alcohol use or using standardized screening questionnaires  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -       | -             |  |
| 23 | DQI#90 | Extent to which commissioners work to meet needs of patients for complementary therapies where there is evidence to support their use. As a minimum, high quality information should be made available to patients about complementary therapies and services | 9 (2)   | Y | 4 (3)   | 8   | Y (82)  | Core          |  |
| 24 | DQI#91 | Extent to which providers ensure practitioners delivering complementary therapies conforms to policies designed to ensure best practice   | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (2)   | 7.5 | Y (82)  | Core          |  |
| 25 | DQI#92 | Extent to which commissioners institute mechanisms to ensure patient needs for rehabilitation are met and that services and   | 8.5 (2) | Y | 8.5 (3) | 8.5 | Y (91)  | Core          |  |

|    |         |  |         |   |         |     |                      |
|----|---------|--|---------|---|---------|-----|----------------------|
| 1  |         |  |         |   |         |     |                      |
| 2  |         | suitable equipment are available to patients in all care locations   |         |   |         |     |                      |
| 3  |         | <b>Information and communication with patients, carers and family</b>  |         |   |         |     |                      |
| 4  | DQI#93  | Number of patients who indicate that they receive understandable explanations  | 9 (1)   | Y | 4.5 (6) | 7.5 | N (45) Supplementary |
| 5  | DQI#94  | Number of patients with documentation concerning the desired care and treatment  | 8.5 (4) | Y | 5 (3)   | 8   | Y (73) Core          |
| 6  | DQI#95  | Extent to which patients feel able to communicate their needs in the best possible way, whether verbally or non-verbally   | 5 (4)   | Y | 3 (3)   | 3   | N (45) -             |
| 7  | DQI#96  | Extent to which patients feel they are provided with enough information to understand their illness and treatment  | 9 (2)   | Y | 3 (2)   | 7.5 | Y (64) -             |
| 8  | DQI#97  | Extent to which patients feel they are given bad news in a sensitive way   | 5 (4)   | Y | 4.5 (5) | 4   | N (36) Supplementary |
| 9  | DQI#98  | Number of patients with a holistic assessment of palliative care needs of patients and their family caregivers (e.g. SPARC)  | 9 (2)   | Y | 4 (4)   | 8.5 | N (36) Supplementary |
| 10 | DQI#99  | Extent to which, according to the direct relatives, attention was paid to their own psychosocial and spiritual well-being  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 11 | DQI#100 | Extent to which the direct relatives felt that they were treated well in all respects by the caregivers  | 2 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 12 | DQI#101 | Extent to which direct relatives received information that was understandable and unambiguous  | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 13 | DQI#102 | Extent to which direct relatives received information about the advantages and disadvantages of various types of treatment   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 14 | DQI#103 | Extent to which patients feel that specialists show an interest in you as a person   | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 15 | DQI#104 | Extent to which family and friends had opportunities to ask questions  | 4 (5)   | N | 3.5 (4) | 2   | N (36) -             |
| 16 | DQI#105 | Extent to which patients feel they have the knowledge and support to make decisions  | 8 (2)   | Y | 3 (2)   | 8.5 | Y (73) -             |
| 17 | DQI#106 | Extent to which patients feel that they have opportunities to ask questions  | 8 (1)   | Y | 5.5 (2) | 4.5 | Y (64) Core          |
| 18 | DQI#107 | Number of patients and family/caregivers that understand and are satisfied with provider communication about prognosis   | 2 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 19 | DQI#108 | Extent to which patients are satisfied with their involvement in decision making   | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 8   | Y (73) Core          |
| 20 |         | <b>Care planning, goal setting and shared decision making with patients, carers and family</b>   |         |   |         |     |                      |
| 21 | DQI#109 | Number of patients with documentation of initial assessment completed within [x] week[s] from referral   | 8.5 (4) | Y | 7.5 (3) | 8.5 | Y (64) Core          |
| 22 | DQI#110 | Number of patients with regular patient and family care conferences with interdisciplinary team to discuss goals of care and care planning   | 2 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 23 | DQI#111 | Number of patients with documentation of converted treatment goals into medical orders transferable across settings, for example, through Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment (POLST) program | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | - -                  |
| 24 | DQI#112 | Number of patients with advance directives and surrogacy designations available across settings using Internet-based registries or electronic personal health records                                    | 8 (4)   | Y | 7 (2)   | 8   | Y (55) Core          |
| 25 | DQI#113 | Number of patients with documentation of patient/surrogate   | 9 (3)   | Y | 8 (2)   | 8   | Y (91) Core          |

|    |         |   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
|----|---------|---|---------|---|---------|-----|--------|---------------|
| 1  |         |   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 2  |         | preferences for goals of care and treatment options at first        |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 3  |         | assessment and at frequent intervals as conditions change           |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 4  | DQI#114 | Number of patients with documentation of involvement in             | 9 (3)   | Y | 4.5 (6) | 7.5 | N (45) | Supplementary |
| 5  | DQI#115 | Number of patients or caregiver(s) who received 1)                  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 6  |         | comprehensive counselling regarding palliation and symptom          |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 7  |         | management and end of life decisions 2) have advance care plan      |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 8  |         | or surrogate decision maker in the medical record or                |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 9  |         | documentation that patient did not wish or was not able to name     |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 10 | DQI#116 | Number of patients and family/caregivers that understand and        | 9 (3)   | Y | 5 (4)   | 7.5 | Y (55) | Core          |
| 11 |         | are satisfied with their participation in the development of        |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 12 |         | treatment goals   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 13 |         | <b>End of life care and decisions</b>                               |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 14 | DQI#117 | Number of patients with documentation of patient and family         | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 15 |         | wishes about the care setting for the site of death, and fulfil     |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 16 | DQI#118 | patient and family preferences when possible                        | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 17 |         | Number of patients with adequate dosage of analgesics and           |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 18 |         | sedatives as appropriate to achieve comfort during the active       |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 19 |         | dying phase, and with addressed concerns and fears about using      |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 20 |         | narcotics and of analgesics hastening death                         |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 21 |         | <b>Pre and post-bereavement support</b>                             |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 22 | DQI#119 | Number of patients with an assessment of psychological              | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 23 |         | reactions of patients and families (including stress, anticipatory  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 24 | DQI#120 | grief, and coping) in a regular, ongoing fashion in order to        | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 25 |         | address emotional and functional impairment and loss                |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 26 | DQI#121 | Number of patients with a grief and bereavement care plan to        | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 27 |         | provide services to patients and families prior to and for at least |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 28 | DQI#122 | [x] months after the death of the patient                           | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 29 |         | Number of relatives offered counselling for survivors               |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 30 | DQI#123 | Extent to which the hospice team kept family members informed       | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 31 |         | about the patient's condition (e.g.                                 |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 32 |         | always/usually/sometimes/never)                                     |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 33 | DQI#124 | Number of relatives who received information from the team          | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 34 |         | about the medicines that were used to manage the patient's pain     |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 35 | DQI#125 | Number of relatives who received information from the team          | 3 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 36 |         | about what was being done to manage the patient's trouble with      |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 37 | DQI#126 | breathing   | 4 (8)   | N | 3 (5)   | 1   | N (0)  | -             |
| 38 |         | Number of patients where an immediate bereavement plan is           |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 39 | DQI#127 | activated post-death  | 2.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 40 |         | Number of relatives who indicate that the patient received          |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 41 |         | support with preparations for saying goodbye                        |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 42 |         | <b>Co-ordination and continuity of care</b>                         |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 43 | DQI#128 | Number of patients with a professional caregiver nominated as       | 6 (4)   | Y | 2.5 (4) | 2.5 | N (36) | -             |
| 44 |         | the responsible 'key worker' who coordinates care                   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 45 | DQI#129 | Number of patients with a regular review of the care plan based     | 9 (1)   | Y | 7.5 (2) | 8   | Y (91) | Core          |
| 46 |         | on a comprehensive interdisciplinary assessment of the values,      |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 47 |         | preferences, goals, and needs of the patient and family             |         |   |         |     |        |               |
|    | DQI#129 | The extent to which care plans are broadly disseminated to all      | 9 (2)   | Y | 7 (4)   | 8   | Y (64) | Core          |
|    |         | professionals involved in the patient's care                        |         |   |         |     |        |               |

|    |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
|----|---------|--|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---------------|--|
| 1  |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 2  | DQI#130 | The extent to which treatments that are no longer helpful are stopped  | 4 (5)   | N | 1 (4)   | 2 | N (9)   | -             |  |
| 3  |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 4  | DQI#131 | The extent to which palliative care services are integrated into the local area health authority and operate at the specific request of the GP and in association with him/her   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 5  |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 6  | DQI#132 | While under the care of hospice, was there always one nurse who was identified as being in charge of the patient's overall care? (yes/no)  | 3 (8)   | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 7  |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 8  | DQI#133 | Was there any problem with hospice doctors or nurses not knowing enough about the patient's medical history to provide the best possible care? (yes/no)  | 1 (8)   | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 9  |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 10 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 11 | DQI#134 | Time from referral to first contact [calculated as the time in days between the referral date and the date of first contact or episode start date (whichever occurs first)] calculated for all episodes of care and across all settings of care  | 7 (3)   | Y | 8.5 (4) | 7 | Y (91)  | Core          |  |
| 12 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 13 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 14 | DQI#135 | Number of patients with documentation of letter to the referring physician contains the following components: diagnosis; conclusions concerning the care needs of the patient and caregiver(s); medical treatment plan; non-medical treatment plan; advice concerning driving aptitude; care advice for the patient and the caregiver(s) | 9 (5)   | N | 7.5 (3) | 8 | Y (100) | Core          |  |
| 15 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 16 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 17 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 18 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 19 | DQI#136 | Number of patients with a care plan that is revisited with patient and family on a regular basis and following any significant change in health condition  | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (4)   | 8 | Y (64)  | Core          |  |
| 20 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 21 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 22 |         | <b>Structure and process of care</b>   |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 23 | DQI#137 | Number of patients with documentation of a regular interdisciplinary/multi-professional meeting to discuss management  | 9 (2)   | Y | 7 (3)   | 8 | Y (100) | Core          |  |
| 24 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 25 | DQI#138 | Number of patients provided with documentation on important complaints that can occur after primary treatment and can be a sign of disease progression   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 26 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 27 | DQI#139 | Number of patients provided with sufficient time and attention during appointments and after primary treatment has finished  | 2 (8)   | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 28 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 29 | DQI#140 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Ethical, legal aspects of care   | 1.5 (7) | N | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 30 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 31 | DQI#141 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Clinical summary   | 9 (2)   | Y | 8 (2)   | 8 | Y (91)  | Core          |  |
| 32 | DQI#142 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Spiritual, religious, existential aspects of care  | 8 (2)   | Y | 8 (3)   | 8 | N (36)  | Supplementary |  |
| 33 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 34 | DQI#143 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Physical aspects of care   | 8 (2)   | Y | 8.5 (4) | 8 | N (45)  | Supplementary |  |
| 35 | DQI#144 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Follow up assessment   | 9 (2)   | Y | 7.5 (6) | 8 | N (36)  | Supplementary |  |
| 36 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 37 | DQI#145 | Number of patients with a palliative care clinical record containing evidence of: Psychological and psychiatric aspects of care  | 9 (3)   | Y | 7.5 (4) | 8 | N (36)  | Supplementary |  |
| 38 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 39 | DQI#146 | Number of patients with evidence that the care plan was implemented by all providers consistent with goals of care   | 1 (7)   | Y | -       | - | -       | -             |  |
| 40 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 41 |         | <b>Evidence of effectiveness, outcome assessment and measurement</b>   |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 42 | DQI#147 | Number of patients where a validated tool used to monitor  | 7 (3)   | N | 8.5 (4) | 8 | Y (64)  | Core          |  |
| 43 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 44 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 45 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 46 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |
| 47 |         |  |         |   |         |   |         |               |  |

|    |   |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
|----|---|--|---------|---|---------|-----|--------|---------------|--|
| 1  |   |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 2  |   | progress (e.g. Edmonton Symptom Assessment System,                   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 3  |   | Edmonton Functional Assessment Tool, Part A of the McGill            |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 4  |   | Quality of Life Index or the Palliative Care Problem Severity        |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 5  | DQI#148   | Evidence that the palliative care service is involved in research in | 1 (8)   | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 6  |   | palliative care (e.g. authorship of publications, research grants)   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 7  | DQI#149   | Number of non-oncological patients receiving palliative care         | 4 (5)   | Y | 6.5 (7) | 1   | N (9)  | -             |  |
| 8  | DQI#150   | Number of patients with documentation of adverse events              | 9 (2)   | Y | 7.5 (4) | 7   | N (45) | Supplementary |  |
| 9  | DQI#151   | Number of patients with evidence of a documented procedure to        | 9 (2)   | N | 7.5 (4) | 7   | N (45) | Supplementary |  |
| 10 |   | analyse and follow up adverse events                                 |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 11 | DQI#152   | Number of patients aware of patient complaint procedures             | 4 (6)   | Y | 3.5 (7) | 4   | N (18) | Supplementary |  |
| 12 | DQI#153   | Number of patients where a patient-reported outcome measures         | 7 (5)   | N | 7 (8)   | 8   | N (9)  | Supplementary |  |
| 13 |   | (PROMs) is used that has been validated with relevant                |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 14 |   | populations requiring palliative care and which are sufficiently     |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 15 | DQI#154   | brief and straightforward and that they allow for proxy reports to   | 2.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 16 |   | be collected when the patient is unable to self-report               |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 17 | DQI#155   | Number of assessment using outcome measures to assess the            |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 18 |   | needs of unpaid caregivers (family and others) alongside the         |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 19 |   | needs of patients  |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 20 | DQI#156   | Evidence of use of change management principles, facilitation        | 3 (8)   | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 21 |   | and communication to embed outcome measurement into routine          |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 22 |   | clinical practice and evaluate the implementation process to         |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 23 |   | ensure sustained use that penetrates practice within the             |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 24 |   | organisation   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 25 | DQI#157   | Evidence of use of quality improvement systems to sustain            | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 26 |   | routine practice of outcome measurement and institute                |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 27 |   | interoperable electronic systems to ensure integration of            |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 28 |   | measures   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 29 | DQI#158   | Evidence of use of established national and international            | 1 (6)   | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 30 |   | outcome collaborations that work towards benchmarking to             |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 31 |   | establish and improve care standards                                 |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 32 | DQI#158   | Evidence of use of monitoring of palliative care practice through    | 6 (4)   | Y | 7 (4)   | 7   | N (36) | Supplementary |  |
| 33 |   | routine collection of outcome data used to establish a minimum       |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 34 |   | dataset of palliative care outcome measures in order to improve      |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 35 |   | and advance care   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 36 | <b>Staff training and education, service and professional development</b> |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 37 | DQI#159   | Number of staff who receive a standardised induction training        | 9 (2)   | Y | 3 (5)   | 4   | N (9)  | -             |  |
| 38 |   | within [x] month[s] of employment                                    |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 39 | DQI#160   | All health and social care professionals have standardised           | 4 (5)   | Y | 4 (4)   | 1.5 | N (0)  | -             |  |
| 40 |   | learning objectives for continuing basic training in palliative care |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 41 | DQI#161   | Number of staff who professionally deal with loss with access to     | 1.5 (8) | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |  |
| 42 |   | a program for care for the carers                                    |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 43 | DQI#162   | Number of staff assessed for satisfaction with working in the        | 7 (6)   | Y | 6.5 (4) | 1   | Y (55) | -             |  |
| 44 |   | team (e.g. Team Climate Inventory)                                   |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 45 | DQI#163   | Documentation of processes in place to identify the training         | 9 (3)   | Y | 4.5 (4) | 8   | N (27) | Supplementary |  |
| 46 |   | needs of all workers (registered and unregistered) that take into    |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
| 47 |   | account the four core common requirements for workforce              |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
|    |   | development (communication skills, assessment and care               |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |
|    |   | planning, advance care planning, and symptom management) as          |         |   |         |     |        |               |  |

|    |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
|----|---------|--|---------|---|---------|-----|--------|---------------|
| 1  |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 2  |         | they apply to end of life care   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 3  | DQI#164 | Number of staff with access to curricula for training as part of continuing professional education including palliative care for patients with illness other than cancer   | 7 (6)   | Y | 7.5 (3) | 7.5 | Y (64) | Core          |
| 4  |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 5  |         | <b>Access to services and service environment</b>  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 6  | DQI#165 | Number of patients who have access to diagnostic investigations (e.g. x-rays, blood samples) regardless of the setting   | 1 (8)   | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 7  |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 8  | DQI#166 | Number of patients receiving palliative care provided with transportation to the service   | 1 (8)   | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 9  | DQI#167 | Number of patients experiencing a crisis where the following is arranged within [x] hours: admission   | 1.5 (7) | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 10 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 11 | DQI#168 | Number of patients receiving the following treatments as needed 24 hours a day, [x] days a week: opioids and other controlled drugs  | 8 (2)   | N | 3.5 (7) | 4   | N (18) | Supplementary |
| 12 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 13 | DQI#169 | There is a dedicated room where multidisciplinary team meetings within one setting takes place   | 3 (7)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 14 | DQI#170 | Relevant services and care providers should ensure equal access to available day services based on need through appropriate referrals  | 9 (2)   | N | 3 (5)   | 9   | N (45) | -             |
| 15 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 16 | DQI#171 | All service users should have equity of access to all day services and support that is available   | 3 (6)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 17 | DQI#172 | If a confidential discussion has to take place then it should take place in private  | 1.5 (8) | Y | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 18 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 19 | DQI#173 | The setting of care should meet the preferences, needs, and circumstances of the patient and family to the extent possible   | 8.5 (4) | N | 4.5 (4) | 4.5 | Y (82) | Core          |
| 20 | DQI#174 | In rural areas where accessing specialized care is difficult, organizations should institute telehealth and telemedicine communications  | 4 (6)   | Y | 3.5 (4) | 3   | N (0)  | -             |
| 21 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 22 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 23 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 24 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 25 |         | <b>Promotion of effective external engagement</b>  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 26 | DQI#175 | Number of patients provided with access to an up to date directory of local caregivers and organisations   | 1 (8)   | N | -       | -   | -      | -             |
| 27 | DQI#176 | Number of patients provided with access to dedicated information about the palliative care service: A website  | 8 (6)   | Y | 7 (3)   | 5   | Y (82) | Core          |
| 28 | DQI#177 | Number of patients provided with access to dedicated information about the palliative care service: Leaflets or brochures  | 9 (7)   | Y | 6.5 (3) | 7   | Y (91) | Core          |
| 29 | DQI#178 | Develop healthcare and community collaborations to promote advance care planning and the completion of advance directives for all individuals (for example, the Respecting Choices and Community Conversations on Compassionate Care programs)     | 8.5 (4) | Y | 8.5 (3) | 7   | Y (82) | Core          |
| 30 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 31 | DQI#179 | Processes will be in place to manage ethical aspects involving discordant patient, family, and caregiver goals and to handle disputes and uncertainties regarding a patient's previously stated preferences and current family or proxy decisions. | 8 (7)   | Y | 5 (5)   | 9   | Y (55) | Core          |
| 32 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 33 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 34 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 35 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 36 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 37 |         | <b>Societal, ethical and legal aspects of care</b>   |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 38 | DQI#180 | Number of patients with documentation of informed consent before therapy   | 9 (4)   | Y | 8 (4)   | 9   | Y (91) | Core          |
| 39 | DQI#181 | Annual reports are produced reporting the activities and characteristics of the service such as team composition, staff composition, resources, referring physicians, patient characteristics  | 4 (3)   | Y | 1.5 (8) | 3   | N (0)  | -             |
| 40 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 41 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 42 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 43 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 44 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 45 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 46 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |
| 47 |         |  |         |   |         |     |        |               |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

|         |  |       |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------|--|-------|---|---|---|---|---|
| DQI#182 | All patients living in psychosocial circumstances presenting a high-risk for their health should be identified as soon as possible | 3 (2) | Y | - | - | - | - |
|---------|--|-------|---|---|---|---|---|

\*Median Appropriateness Score /9 (Range): Appropriateness ratings of 1-3 were categorized as inappropriate, ratings of 4-6 were classified as uncertain and ratings 7-9 were classified as appropriate.

†Agreement between panel Y/N: With a panel size of 16, level of agreement was based on a maximum of four panel members rating a quality indicator outside a three-point region around the median value; with disagreement defined as five or more panel members rating an indicator at the extreme ends of the scale as either inappropriate (1-3) or appropriate (7-9).

§Median Feasibility Score /9: Feasibility was assessed using the same 9 point scale as appropriateness, and level of agreement was based on a maximum of three panel members rating a quality indicator outside a three-point region around the median value; with disagreement defined as four or more panel members rating an indicator at the extreme ends of the scale as either inappropriate (1-3) or appropriate (7-9). Level of agreement data for feasibility are not shown

¶Rated as necessary by panel members Y/N (% yes).

For Peer Review



## Supplementary file 2: Derivation of final indicator set (n=30) from original candidate indicators, including indicators combined during RAM round 3

|     | <b>Final indicator description following phase three of RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method</b>  | <b>Original (combined) candidate indicators</b> |
|-----|---|---|
|     | <b>A. Physical care and support, assessment and treatment</b>   |   |
| A1  | Proportion of service users with assessment of pain severity at screening using a valid measure   | #01   |
| A2  | Proportion of service users with moderate or severe pain assessed to explore possible causes of pain  | #03,#10,#11                                     |
| A3  | Proportion of service users with assessment of breathlessness at screening using a valid measure  | #12   |
| A4  | Proportion of service users with assessment of fatigue at screening using a valid measure   | #24   |
| A5  | Proportion of service users with assessment of functional status to identify daily activity limitations completed before a multidisciplinary care plan  | #30   |
|     | <b>B. Psychological care and support, assessment and treatment</b>  |   |
| B6  | Proportion of service users screened for depression at screening using a valid measure  | #38   |
| B7  | Proportion of service users screened for anxiety at screening using a valid measure   | #41   |
| B8  | Proportion of service users with assessment of cognitive functioning  | #55   |
|     | <b>C. Spiritual and emotional care and support</b>  |   |
| C9  | Proportion of service users with documentation of a spiritual aspects of care discussion or assessment completed before a multidisciplinary care plan   | #68,#71   |
|     | <b>D. Information and Communication with Service Users</b>  |   |
| D10 | Proportion of service users who report that they are provided with sufficient, appropriately tailored information or advice on their condition and on intervention options to support decisions on agreed care planning | #177,#179                                       |
|     | <b>E. Co-ordination and continuity of care</b>  |   |
| E11 | Proportion of service users with a comprehensive needs assessment completed before a multidisciplinary care plan to identify main symptoms and concerns and their effect  | #59,#85,#109                                    |
| E12 | Service has a written care pathway for assessment and management of moderate or severe pain including appropriate onward referral routes  | #10,#11   |
| E13 | Proportion of service users with documentation of re-assessment at regular review in line with time points agreed in the multidisciplinary care plan  | #128,#136,#137,#147                             |
| E14 | Service has a written standard operating procedure defining timeframes for time to initial contact, completion of needs assessment and multidisciplinary care plan  | #33, #94  |
| E15 | Proportion of service users with documentation of appropriate intervention in line with the agreed, multidisciplinary care plan   | #39, #70, #76                                   |
| E16 | Proportion of service users with documented communication between the service and the General Practitioner providing information on care needs and the agreed care plans  | #77,#135  |
| E17 | Proportion of service users with a care plan available as specified by the service's written standard operating procedure for development and usage of multidisciplinary care plans                                     | #129,#141                                       |
| E18 | Proportion of service users with documented evidence of being offered the opportunity for completion of advance care planning   | #178  |
| E19 | Proportion of service users with quality of life assessed using a valid measure at screening and at regular review in line with time points agreed in the multidisciplinary care plan                                   | #51   |
|     | <b>F. Care planning, goal setting and shared decision making with service users</b>   |   |
| F20 | Service has a written standard operating procedure for development and usage of multidisciplinary care plans  | #109  |
| F21 | Proportion of service users with documentation of main care goals in the multidisciplinary care plan  | #32,#33,#45,#69,#94,#113                        |
|     | <b>G. Evidence of effectiveness, outcome assessment and measurement</b>   |   |
| G22 | Service has a written policy for reviewing and updating standard operating procedures and care pathways   |   |
| G23 | Proportion of service users re-assessed at regular review who report that main care goals are met in line with the multidisciplinary care plan  | #14,#26,#29,#40                                 |
| G24 | Proportion of service users with assessment of satisfaction with overall care and support performed using a valid measure   | #37   |
| G25 | Proportion of service users with assessment of satisfaction with involvement in shared decision making  | #106, #108, #116                                |
|     | <b>H. Staff training and education, service and professional development</b>  |   |
| H26 | Extent to which staff have access to training around core components of care as part of continuing education and personal development   | #164  |
|     | <b>I. Access to services and service environment</b>  |   |
| I27 | Proportion of service users with a record of time in days from referral date to first attendance date offered by service  | #134  |
| I28 | The service provides suitable equipment and settings to deliver care  | #92,#173  |
| I29 | Service has a written policy for defining standards for equipment and settings which are available for delivery of care   | #92   |
|     | <b>J. Societal, ethical and legal aspects of care</b>   |   |
| J30 | Number of service users with correctly completed documentation of informed consent to treatment or medical intervention   | #180  |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

For Peer Review

Supplementary file 3: Extract from the QualPalUK toolkit, showing data extraction required for quality indicator A1 (Proportion of service users with assessment of pain severity at screening using a valid measure)

|      |   |   |  |  |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| LOGO | PALLIATIVE DAY SERVICE QUALITY INDICATOR SET:<br>DATA ABSTRACTION FORM A [PATIENT LEVEL INDICATORS] | ABTRACTOR: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text"/> | DATE: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text"/> | SITE: <input style="width: 80%;" type="text"/> |
|------|---|---|--|--|

|  |  |   |    |                          |                             |                          |
|--|--|---|----|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| DATA SAMPLE & REFERENCE PERIOD: <i>e.g. 15 consecutive service users discharged in period (INSERT DATES)</i> |  | Please use table to abstract the required information from each clinical record |    |                          |                             |                          |
| QI   | DENOMINATOR  |   |    |                          |                             |                          |
| A1   | Number of sample attending day hospice during reference period   | N=15  | #  | Assessment documented    | Assessment during screening | Valid Measure used       |
|  | NUMERATOR  |   |    |                          |                             | State measure used       |
|  | Number of service users with assessment of pain severity at screening using a valid measure  | -   | 1  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <b>Required criteria:</b>  |   | 2  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pain severity assessment documented in notes   |   | 3  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pain severity assessed completed during screening [within 1-3 visits]  |   | 4  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pain severity assessed using a valid measure   |   | 5  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | <b>Key terms/definitions:</b>  |   | 6  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | • Service users: Patients attending day hospice  |   | 7  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | • Pain severity: Unidimensional assessment of current pain level using a valid measure and accepted descriptors of pain severity or intensity (e.g., Pain Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), Pain Numerical Rating scale (NRS) or Pain Verbal Rating Scale (VRS)** |   | 8  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | • Screening: Processes of assessment undertaken during the early stages (within 1-3 visits) of attendance at day service, at triage, or at the beginning of a new episode or phase of care   |   | 9  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | • Valid measure: The measure is appropriate and has acceptable validity and reliability when used according to specific instructions   |   | 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  | ** Observational or other non, self-reported measures are not included in assessment of this indicator   |   | 11 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  |  |   | 12 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  |  |   | 13 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  |  |   | 14 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|  |  |   | 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Supplementary file 4: Practice test results: combined (across 5 settings) mean performance on each indicator.

| QI  | Patient and staff level indicators*  | Mean (%) | SD   | Range   |
|-----|--|----------|------|---------|
| A1  | Pain severity assessed at screening using a valid measure  | 76.8     | 10.2 | 67-93   |
| A2  | If moderate or severe pain present, patient assessed to explore possible causes of pain          | 63.8     | 15.1 | 50-87   |
| A3  | Breathlessness assessed at screening using a valid measure                                       | 73.2     | 13.8 | 55-86   |
| A4  | Fatigue assessed at screening using a valid measure  | 68.8     | 16.6 | 47-93   |
| A5  | Functional status assessed to identify daily activity limitations prior to formulating care plan | 64.8     | 17.3 | 46-93   |
| B6  | Depression assessed at screening using a valid measure   | 49.4     | 21.3 | 27-75   |
| B7  | Anxiety assessed at screening using a valid measure  | 45.6     | 9.2  | 34-56   |
| B8  | Cognitive function assessed  | 56.0     | 17.1 | 32-78   |
| C9  | Spiritual aspects of care discussion or assessment completed before care plan                    | 59.8     | 21.6 | 26-85   |
| D10 | Patient provided with sufficient information or advice to support decisions on care planning     | 16.4     | 4.5  | 10-21   |
| E11 | Comprehensive needs assessment completed before care plan  | 42.2     | 29.2 | 0-78    |
| E13 | Re-assessment made at regular review in line with time-points agreed in care plan                | 71.8     | 28.8 | 23-93   |
| E15 | Appropriate intervention documented in line with the agreed care plan                            | 54.6     | 25.5 | 28-93   |
| E16 | Communication between the service and general practitioner documented                            | 89.2     | 17.6 | 58-100  |
| E17 | Care plan available as specified by standard operating procedure                                 | 15.0     | 22.4 | 0-54    |
| E18 | Opportunity offered for completion of advance care planning                                      | 56.0     | 20.3 | 37-90   |
| E19 | Quality of life assessed using a valid measure   | 11.0     | 15.6 | 0-38    |
| F21 | Care goals documented in care plan   | 65.2     | 20.9 | 32-86   |
| G23 | Care goals met at regular review in line with care plan  | 35.0     | 33.4 | 12-93   |
| G24 | Assessment of satisfaction with overall care and support using a valid measure                   | 43.4     | 27.9 | 0-78    |
| G25 | Assessment of satisfaction with involvement in decision making                                   | 17.6     | 36.1 | 0-82    |
| I27 | Time in days from referral date to first attendance date offered                                 | 95.8     | 6.2  | 86-100  |
| J30 | Documentation of informed consent to treatment or medical intervention correctly completed       | 93.4     | 11.2 | 74-100  |
| H26 | Staff with access to training around core components of care                                     | 100.0    | 0.0  | 100-100 |

| QI  | Service level indicators*   | % of services meeting the QI |
|-----|---|------------------------------|
| E12 | Care pathway for assessment and management of pain including onward referral routes             | 40% (2/5)                    |
| E14 | Written standard operating procedure defining timeframes  | 20% (1/5)                    |
| F20 | Written standard operating procedure for development and usage of care plans                    | 40% (2/5)                    |
| G22 | Written policy for reviewing and updating standard operating procedures and care pathways       | 40% (2/5)                    |
| I28 | The service provides suitable equipment and settings to deliver care                            | 60% (3/5)                    |
| I29 | Written policy for defining standards for equipment and settings available for delivery of care | 60% (3/5)                    |

\*Abbreviated indicator names

## Recommendations for the Conducting and Reporting of DELphi Studies (CREDES)\*

| CREDES Recommendation |  |  | Yes /No | Authors' comments   |
|-----------------------|--|--|---------|---|
| 1.                    | Justification                            | The choice of the Delphi technique as a method of systematically collating expert consultation and building consensus needs to be well justified. When selecting the method to answer a particular research question, it is important to keep in mind its constructivist nature  | ✓       | RAND UCLA method (modified Delphi technique) has been justified (p4)  |
| 2.                    | Planning and process                     | The Delphi technique is a flexible method and can be adjusted to the respective research aims and purposes. Any modifications should be justified by a rationale and be applied systematically and rigorously  | ✓       | The RAND/UCLA method is a modified Delphi technique. We have used the method specified in the RAND/UCLA manual[6] (p4)  |
| 3.                    | Definition of consensus                  | Unless not reasonable due to the explorative nature of the study, an a priori criterion for consensus should be defined. This includes a clear and transparent guide for action on (a) how to proceed with certain items or topics in the next survey round, (b) the required threshold to terminate the Delphi process and (c) procedures to be followed when consensus is (not) reached after one or more iterations | ✓       | The RAND/UCLA method does not require <i>consensus</i> . There are however predefined criteria for selection of items to proceed in the next round, which we have adhered to. These are specified on pp 7-9.                          |
| 4.                    | Informational input                      | All material provided to the expert panel at the outset of the project and throughout the Delphi process should be carefully reviewed and piloted in advance in order to examine the effect on experts' judgements and to prevent bias   | ✓       | All materials provided to the expert panel, including the evidence tables, instructions, and ratings forms were reviewed by both the research team (which includes palliative care clinicians) and two end user representatives. (p8) |
| 5.                    | Prevention of bias                       | Researchers need to take measures to avoid directly or indirectly influencing the experts' judgements. If one or more members of the research team have a conflict of interest, entrusting an independent researcher with the main coordination of the Delphi study is advisable   | ✓       | Researchers involved with the coordination of the RAND/UCLA process had no conflicts of interest. The expert ratings (judgements) were all completed independently. Standardised instructions were provided to panellists. (p8)       |
| 6.                    | Interpretation and processing of results | Consensus does not necessarily imply the 'correct' answer or judgement; (non)consensus and stable disagreement provide informative insights and highlight differences in perspectives concerning the topic in question   | ✓       | As in 3 above, consensus is not required for the RAND/UCLA process. However, there are predefined criteria for 'agreement' about the appropriateness and feasibility of individual  |

|     |                            |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|
|     |                            |   |   | items. Agreement (or lack of agreement) on individual items is provided in supplementary file 1.  |
| 7.  | External validation        | It is recommended to have the final draft of the resulting guidance on best practice in palliative care reviewed and approved by an external board or authority before publication and dissemination  | ✓ | The development of the indicators was funded, and endorsed by Marie Curie (UK palliative care provider). In response to feedback from end users we are currently developing an electronic version of the toolkit, and have sought funding to support the implementation of the toolkit in UK palliative day services. We will seek validation for the electronic quality indicator toolkit from palliative care organisations and care providers. |
| 8.  | Purpose and rationale      | The purpose of the study should be clearly defined and demonstrate the appropriateness of the use of the Delphi technique as a method to achieve the research aim. A rationale for the choice of the Delphi technique as the most suitable method needs to be provided  | ✓ | The purpose of the study and the appropriateness of the RAND/UCLA method (modified Delphi technique) is clearly defined on p 4.   |
| 9.  | Expert panel               | Criteria for the selection of experts and transparent information on recruitment of the expert panel, sociodemographic details including information on expertise regarding the topic in question, (non)response and response rates over the ongoing iterations should be reported  | ✓ | Criteria for the selection of experts and information on recruitment of expert panel members is provided on p7, including a summary of the professional background and expertise of panel members.  |
| 10. | Description of the methods | The methods employed need to be comprehensible; this includes information on preparatory steps (How was available evidence on the topic in question synthesised?), piloting of material and survey instruments, design of the survey instrument(s), the number and design of survey rounds, methods of data analysis, processing and synthesis of experts' responses to inform the subsequent survey round and methodological decisions taken by the research team throughout the process | ✓ | The methods have been described in detail, and are informed by the processes, steps, and criteria specified in the RAND/UCLA manual[6]. The survey instruments (rating forms) are also adapted from the RAND/UCLA manual. The number and design of rounds, methods of data analysis and decision-making re items are described, and adapted from the RAND/UCLA manual[6].   |
| 11. | Procedure                  | Flow chart to illustrate the stages of the Delphi process, including a  | ✓ | A flowchart detailing the phases of the   |

|     |  |  |   |  |
|-----|--|--|---|--|
|     |  | preparatory phase, the actual 'Delphi rounds', interim steps of data processing and analysis, and concluding steps   |   | research, including the RAND/UCLA rounds, and the results at each stage is provided.   |
| 12. | Definition and attainment of consensus | It needs to be comprehensible to the reader how consensus was achieved throughout the process, including strategies to deal with non-consensus   | ✓ | As in 3 above, <i>consensus</i> is not required. We have however described how decisions were made about the progression of items between rounds.  |
| 13. | Results                                | Reporting of results for each round separately is highly advisable in order to make the evolving of consensus over the rounds transparent. This includes figures showing the average group response, changes between rounds, as well as any modifications of the survey instrument such as deletion, addition or modification of survey items based on previous rounds   | ✓ | We have reported the results of each round separately. Supplementary file 1 provides a detailed description of the scores for each individual item at round 1 (including median appropriateness scores and agreement), and at round 2 (including median appropriateness and feasibility scores, and necessity ratings). Supplementary file 2 provides details of indicators combined at round 3.   |
| 14. | Discussion of limitations              | Reporting should include a critical reflection of potential limitations and their impact of the resulting guidance   | ✓ | A critical summary of limitations is provided in the discussion section (p18)  |
| 15. | Adequacy of conclusions                | The conclusions should adequately reflect the outcomes of the Delphi study with a view to the scope and applicability of the resulting practice guidance   | ✓ | The conclusions reflect the results of the RAND study. We have commented on scope and applicability of the indicators, including further work required. (p15-17)   |
| 16. | Publication and dissemination          | The resulting guidance on good practice in palliative care should be clearly identifiable from the publication, including recommendations for transfer into practice and implementation. If the publication does not allow for a detailed presentation of either the resulting practice guidance or the methodological features of the applied Delphi technique, or both, reference to a more detailed presentation elsewhere should be made (e.g. availability of the full guideline from the authors or online; publication of a separate paper reporting on methodological details and particularities of the process (e.g. persistent disagreement and controversy on certain issues)). A dissemination plan should include endorsement of the guidance by | ✓ | The final indicator set is provided within the publication (table 1). The authors can be contacted for a copy of the toolkit used to abstract data relevant to the indicator set. An abstract of the toolkit is provided in supplementary file 3. As described on pp 17-18 we are, in response to feedback from users, currently developing an electronic version of the indicator toolkit which will be subsequently assessed for feasibility and appropriateness in practice. We will seek |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | professional associations and health care authorities to facilitate implementation | endorsement from palliative care organisations for the final electronic toolkit, and will work in collaboration with these organisations to implement use of the indicators in palliative day services throughout the UK. |
|--|--|---|

\*reproduced from: Junger S, Payne SA, Brine J, et al. Guidance on Conducting and REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2017;31:684-706.

For Peer Review



## PALLIATIVE MEDICINE AUTHOR SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

Please complete this checklist for all papers submitted. Please indicate, very briefly, how this has been addressed. This checklist is a mandatory upload on submission.

| Item                    | Explanation  | How this has been addressed (briefly, a sentence will suffice)  |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Article title           | <p><b>WHY: Because we want readers to find your work.</b><br/>Have you followed our guidelines on writing a good title that will be found by search engines? (E.g. with methods in the title, use of common words for the issue addressed, no country names, and possibly indicating findings). If your study has an acronym is it included in the title?</p>  | Yes. We have included key terms and method (modified Delphi Technique).   |
| Abstract                | <p><b>WHY: Because structured abstracts have more detail for readers and search engines.</b><br/>Have you followed our guidelines on writing your structured abstract? Please remember we have separate abstract structures for original research, reviews and case reports. There should be <b>no</b> abbreviations in the abstract, EXCEPT a study acronym which should be included if you have one. If a trial (or other design formally registered with a database) have you included your registration details?</p> | We have included a structured research abstract. We have combined the sub-headings 'design' and 'setting', as we believe this to be more appropriate and concise for our study characteristics. |
| Key statements          | <p><b>WHY: Because readers want to understand your paper quickly.</b><br/>Have you included our key statements within the body of your paper (after abstract and before the main text is a good place!) and followed our guidelines for how these are to be written? There are three main headings required, and each may have 1-3 separate <b>bullet</b> points. Please use clear, succinct, single sentence separate bullet points rather than complex or multiple sentences.</p>                                      | We have included several clear succinct statements under each of the 3 headings.  |
| Keywords                | <p><b>WHY: Because MeSH headings mean it is properly indexed.</b><br/>Have you given keywords for your study? We ask that these are current <b>MeSH</b> headings unless there is no suitable heading for use (please give explanation in cover letter). <a href="https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search">https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search</a></p>  | We have included 5 current MeSH headings.   |
| International relevance | <p><b>WHY: We have readers from around the world who are interested in your work.</b><br/>Have you contextualised your work for an international audience and explained how your work contributes to an international knowledge base? Avoid drawing from policy from one context only, think</p>   | We have explained that our quality indicator set is relevant to palliative day internationally. We  |

|                                      |  |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                      | how your work could be relevant more widely. Do define terms clearly e.g. hospice has a different meaning in many countries.   | have also provided the results of the international systematic scoping review (182 original indicators) which can be used by other jurisdictions to modify their indicators if necessary.   |
| Publishing guidelines                | <b>WHY: Because clear and robust reporting helps people interpret your work accurately</b><br>Have you submitted a completed checklist for a relevant publishing guideline as a supplementary file? <a href="http://www.equator-network.org/">http://www.equator-network.org/</a> These include CONSORT, PRISMA, COREQ checklists, but others may be more relevant for your type of manuscript. If no published checklist exists please create one as a table from the list of requirements in your chosen guideline. If your study design does not have a relevant publishing guideline please review closest matches and use the most appropriate with an explanation. | There are no reporting guidelines for a RAND/UCLA appropriateness study specifically. However, as the RAND/UCLA method is a modified Delphi technique, we have used the Recommendations for the Conducting and REporting of DElphi Studies (CREDES), published in Pall Med and available via the EQUATOR website. |
| Word count                           | <b>WHY: Because readers want to find the core information quickly.</b><br>Does your paper adhere to our word count for your article type? Please insert number of words in the box to the right. Remember that tables, figures, qualitative data extracts and references are not included in the word count.   | Yes. Word count (excluding tables, figures, references and abstract) is 2999/3000.  |
| Figures and tables and/or quotations | <b>WHY: Because readers want to find the core information quickly.</b><br>Have you adhered to our guidelines on the number of tables and figures for your article type?<br><br>Data (e.g. quotations) for qualitative studies are not included in the word count, and we prefer that they are integrated into the text (e.g. not in a separate table).   | Yes. We have included 1 figure and 1 table in the main document, and additional information in 4 supplementary files.   |
| Study registration                   | <b>WHY: Because this means readers understand how you planned your study</b><br>Where appropriate have you included details (including reference number, date of registration and URL) of study registration on a database e.g. trials or review database. If your study has a published protocol, is this referenced within the paper?  | n/a   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| Other study publications?  | <b>WHY: So readers can understand the full context of your study</b><br>If there are other publications from this study are these referenced within the body of the paper? Please do not reference papers in preparation or submitted, but in-press publications are acceptable.   | We have referenced the published protocol of the scoping review - which produced the original candidate quality indicators used in the study.   |
| Scales, measures or questionnaires   | <b>WHY: So readers can understand your paper in the context of this information</b><br>If your study primarily reports the development or testing of scales/measures or questionnaires have you included a copy of the instrument as a supplementary file?   | We have developed a set of 30 quality indicators, which are provided within the main document. We have also provided an extract of the data extraction toolkit as a supplementary file, and detailed contact information for parties interested in using the toolkit. |
| Abbreviations  | <b>WHY: Because abbreviations make a paper hard to read, and are easily misunderstood</b><br>Have you removed <b>all</b> abbreviations from the text except for extremely well known, standard abbreviations (e.g. SI units), which should be spelt out in full first? We do not allow abbreviations for core concepts such as palliative or end of life care.   | There are no abbreviations in the text.   |
| Research ethics and governance approvals for research involving human subjects | <b>WHY: We will only publish ethically conducted research, approved by relevant bodies</b><br>Have you given full details of ethics/governance/data protection approvals with reference numbers, full name of the committee(s) giving approval and the date of approval? If such approvals are not required have you made it explicit within the paper why they were not required. Are details of consent procedures clear in the paper? | Yes. These details are included in the text.  |
| Date(s) of data collection   | <b>WHY: So readers understand the context within which data were collected</b><br>Have you given the dates of data collection for your study within the body of your text? If your data are over 5 years old you will need to articulate clearly why they are still relevant and important to current practice.  | Yes. These details are included in the text.  |
| Structured discussion  | <b>WHY: So readers can find key information quickly</b><br>Papers should have a structured discussion, with sub headings, summarising the main findings,   | Yes. We have included a structured discussion.  |

|                                   |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
|                                   | addressing strengths and limitations, articulating what this study adds with reference to existing international literature, and presenting the implications for practice.  |  |
| Case reports                      | <b>WHY: So that participants are protected, and its importance made clear</b><br>If your study is a case report have you followed our clear structure for a case report, including highlighting what research is needed to address the issue raised? Have you made clear what consent was required or given for the publication of the case report? Have you provided evidence of such consent as a supplementary file to the editor? | n/a  |
| Acknowledgements and declarations | <b>WHY: So readers understand the context of the research</b><br>Have you included a funding declaration according to the SAGE format? Are there acknowledgements to be made? Have you stated where data from the study are deposited and how they may be available to others? Have you conflicts of interest to declare?   | Funding declaration, acknowledgements and conflicts of interest are included. Additional data is available as a supplementary file.  |
| Supplementary data and materials  | <b>WHY: So the context is clear, but the main paper succinct for the reader</b><br>Is there any content which could be provided as supplementary data which would appear only in the online version of accepted papers? This could include large tables, full search strategies for reviews, additional data etc.   | Yes. There are 4 supplementary files, including two large table showing the derivation of the quality indicators, an extract from the data extraction toolkit, and results from the practice test. |
| References                        | <b>WHY: So people can easily find work you have referenced</b><br>Are your references provided in SAGE Vancouver style? You can download this style within Endnote and other referencing software.  | Yes.   |
| Ownership of work.                | Can you assert that you are submitting your original work, that you have the rights in the work, that you are submitting the work for first publication in the Journal and that it is not being considered for publication elsewhere and has not already been published elsewhere, and that you have obtained and can supply all necessary permissions for the reproduction of any copyright works not owned by you.                  | Yes, I confirm this.   |