The effectiveness of a web-based decision aid for patients with hip osteoarthritis: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial

Lilisbeth Perestelo-Perez (✉ lilisbeth.peresteloperez@sescs.es)

Canary Islands Health Service

Yolanda Alvarez-Perez

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Amado Rivero-Santana

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Vanesa Ramos-García

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Andrea Duarte-Díaz

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Alejandro Torres-Castaño

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Ana Toledo-Chávarri

Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias

Mario Herrera

Hospital Universitario de Canarias

Jose Luis País-Brito

Hospital Universitario de Canarias

José Carlos del Castillo

Hospital San Juan De Dios de Santa Cruz de Tenerife

José Ramón Vázquez

Gerencia de Atención Primaria de Tenerife

Carola Orrego

Avedis Donabedian Research Institute

Pedro Serrano-Aguilar

Evaluation Unit of the Canary Islands Health Service

Study protocol

Keywords: Hip osteoarthritis, patient decision aids, person-centred care, shared decision-making, web-based intervention, randomized controlled trial

Posted Date: May 13th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-18885/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on August 24th, 2020. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-020-04661-z>.

Abstract

Background: Osteoarthritis (OA) is a health condition sensitive to patient's preferences and values regarding the benefits and risks of the different treatment options. In this sense, patient decision aids (PtDA) can play an important role in helping patients to incorporate their values, needs and preferences into the decision-making process, thus improving Person-Centred Care. Previous research has focused almost exclusively on knee OA, and therefore the aim of this study is to develop and evaluate the effectiveness of a PtDA for patients with hip OA.

Methods: The general design consists of two phases: 1) design a web-based PtDA for patients with hip OA, following the recommended procedures: systematic review of safety/effectiveness of treatments, and an iterative process of development with the help of an Advisory Committee composed of health professionals and patients; 2) To evaluate the impact of the PtDA on hip OA patients' decision-making process related with their treatment. For that aim, a multicenter randomized controlled trial will be carried out with 124 patients with hip OA in Tenerife (Spain) comparing intervention or usual care.

Discussion: PtDAs have been recommended as a useful and effective resource for improving PCC in many health conditions. The intervention is intended to empower patients by fostering their active participation during the decision-making process about their treatment, and by ensuring they make informed decisions congruent with their values and preferences. This study will contribute to the scientific knowledge about effectiveness of PtDAs in hip OA, in order to improve the quality of health care offered to these patients.

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04241978). Registered on 24 January 2020.

Background

Osteoarthritis (OA) is one of the most prevalent chronic diseases [1], which affects more than 70% of people older than 50 years and its prevalence clearly increases with age until 70 years old [2]. It can affect any joint, but preferably affects the knee, hands, hip and spine [3]. Pain, stiffness and loss of functionality caused by OA have an important impact in the quality of life of patients [4,5]. Furthermore, OA represents a high economic burden for society, due to its direct and indirect health costs [6]. As a chronic disease, OA is associated with long-term multimorbidity and poly medication.

Conservative therapeutic options for hip OA include exercise, weight loss, walking aids, as well as drugs and corticosteroids injections in more advanced stages. When these options fail to improve symptoms, a surgical intervention called arthroplasty or joint replacement is recommended, with some variations depending on the damaged joint. This technique has been shown to be safe and effective [7], although like any other surgical procedure it implies risks such as infection, thromboembolism or the need for re-intervention due to problems in the prosthesis [8]. Indication for arthroplasty is not straightforward, since subjective symptoms are not highly correlated with the cartilage deterioration observed in radiographic images [9]. This fact, along with the existing uncertainty about the absolute and relative efficacy of

conservative treatments, makes OA a preference-sensitive condition, in which patients' values and preferences regarding the benefits and risks associated with different treatment options should play a decisive role when making treatment decisions [10]. A shared decision-making (SDM) process thus seems a necessary approach in this health condition, providing patients with reliable information and promoting their involvement in decision-making, according to the principles of the Patient-Centred Care model [11].

Patient decision aids (PtDAs) are one of the most used interventions to promote SDM and help patients to decide between different treatments options [11]. They provide information on a specific health problem and its available treatments, including quantitative information about their risks and benefits, and other characteristics relevant for making a decision. They also addresses patient's values and preferences regarding those characteristics and potential consequences, implicitly or explicitly promoting reflection about those own values/preferences [12,13]. PtDAs have shown to improve patients' knowledge about the disease and treatments, their decisional conflict, the concordance between patients' preferences and their actual choices, or their involvement in decision making, among other variables [14]. In the field of OA, the few existing studies have been focused on knee OA, or included hip patients but did not report separate analyses for them [15,16]. Because hip OA has its own characteristics and given the existing shortages in this field, the aim of this study is to develop a PtDAs for hip OA and evaluate its effectiveness on the improvement of patients' decisional process.

Methods/design

This clinical trial protocol follows the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) 2013 statement [17] (see Additional file 1). Flow of participants are presented in Figure 1 and the schedule of enrollment, intervention, and assessments is shown in Figure 2. Any future protocol modification will be registered in the [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) database and communicated to the Scientific and Ethics Committee of the University Hospital Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria (Tenerife, Spain).

Study design

The general design of the study consists of two phases: 1) Development of a web-based PtDA for hip OA patients, and 2) Assessment of its effectiveness in a randomized controlled trial (RCT).

Phase 1: Development of a web-based PtDA

The procedure for the development of the PtDA will consist of the following steps:

1. Systematic review to identify studies evaluating updated evidence on hip OA treatments and patients' information needs. We will also search for existing PDAs for hip and knee OA.

2. The Project Management Group will be composed of a scientific team (researchers and clinical experts) and a technical team (web developers and designers). An Advisory Committee will also be created with 6–8 external primary and specialized care professionals (i.e., traumatology, rheumatology, physiotherapy, rehabilitation) and 3–4 OA patients and their families and/or caregivers.
3. Evidence synthesis and prototype of the PtDA: the scientific team will analyse and discuss the evidence on the efficacy and safety of the different treatment options, based on the results of the systematic review, and a first draft of the PtDA contents and structure will be developed. Along with the technical team, format and presentation issues will be discussed. At the end of this phase a first version of the PtDA will be prepared.
4. Review and evaluation of contents: the PtDA will be send to all members of the Advisory Committee. Content and presentation issues will be reviewed and refined, in an iterative process that will result in a second version of the PtDA. The review will be through virtual or face-to-face meetings, according to the availability of the members of Advisory Committee.
5. Field testing: this new version of the PtDA will be tested in individual interviews with 10 hip OA patients (with and without previous arthroplasty), who will evaluate its acceptability in terms of content (quantity, clarity and usefulness of information), structure, format and navigability. Qualitative and quantitative information will be collected. After modifying those aspects highlighted by patients in order to improve the PtDA, it will be ready to evaluate its effectiveness.

Phase 2: Assessment of effectiveness

Study design and setting

A parallel, multicenter, superiority RCT will be carry out in hospitals and primary and specialty care centers of Tenerife (Spain). Patients will be randomly allocated to intervention (web-based PtDA) or control group (general information about OA).

Eligibility criteria

Adult patients with a diagnosis of hip OA will be included in the trial. Exclusion criteria will be: previous hip arthroplasty, patients with terminal illnesses, non-fluent Spanish language, be participating in other trials, or mental or sensory alterations that impede or hinder the response to the measurement instruments or do not have the capacity to make decisions.

Randomisation and allocation concealment

Computer-based randomization will be performed centrally by an independent researcher. Randomization will be stratified by patient inclusion in waiting list for arthroplasty (yes/no). Sealed envelopes with each patient's allocation will be prepared, which will be opened only after the patient signs the informed consent for participation in the study. The nature of the intervention makes it impossible to blind patients and researchers to group allocation.

Recruitment and procedure

Eligible patients will be identified through the review of participating centres' clinical charts. A member of the research team will contact them by telephone to explain the study and invite them to participate. Those who agree will complete the baseline assessment in the same phone call, and an appointment will be scheduled with a researcher at their referral primary healthcare centre or hospital. There, patients will be asked to read the project information sheet, which will explain in detail what their participation will consist of, and to sign the informed consent. Then, patients allocated to the intervention group will review the PtDA accompanied by a researcher, who will give support in navigation if necessary. Then, they will complete the questionnaires assessing the outcome measures, in the same web interface. Patients in the control group will follow the same procedure, but instead of the PtDA they will review general information about OA of the hip, knee, ankle and foot, information included in a brochure delivered in primary care centers of the Canary Islands Health Service, which will be also presented in a web format.

Outcome measures

The primary outcome of this study will be decisional conflict regarding the treatment for OA, assessed with the Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS) [18], immediately after reviewing the PtDA. This is a 16-item self-reported scale widely used in PtDA research. It has 5 subscales: feeling informed, values clarity, feeling supported, uncertainty and effectiveness. Scores are transformed to a 0–100 scale, with higher scores indicating more conflict. In previous studies in other health conditions, we have obtained good internal consistency values (0.88–0.90) [19–21]. The secondary outcomes will include:

- Knowledge of the disease and treatments: assessed with a 7-item questionnaire previously used in studies of PtDA in OA, specifically adapted for hip OA [22]. Items have a “true/false/don't know” format. The percentage of correct responses represents the total score.
- Values about characteristics of treatments: patients will be asked to rate in a 0–10 scale the importance they attribute to different characteristics of treatment: mode of administration, improvement in pain and function, risk of mild and serious adverse effects, time until symptoms' improvement, duration of benefits, and in the case of arthroplasty, period of rehabilitation and risk of needing surgery revision.
- Treatment preference (physiotherapy, medication, intra-articular injections, arthroplasty, not sure).

- Intention to undergo the preferred treatment: assessed with one item ranging 0 (not sure) to 5 (completely sure).
- Concordance between values and intention to undergo arthroplasty vs. conservative treatments: binary variable (yes/no) derived from the association between values and intention to undergo arthroplasty (see statistical analysis).
- Decision quality about arthroplasty: binary variable (yes/no) defined as a combination of adequate knowledge ($\geq 60\%$ of correct responses) and concordance.
- Satisfaction with the decision making process: assessed with the 12-item questionnaire developed by Barry et al. [23]. In a previous study with type-2 diabetes patients we obtained a Cronbach alpha value of 0.90 [20].
- Safety: patients will be asked whether participation in the study has produced any psychological undesired outcome such as anxiety, mood changes, uncertainty or any kind of concern.

At baseline, in the telephone call to recruit patients, assessment will include the primary outcome (DCS), as well as the following control variables: sociodemographic and clinical data; the Patient Activation Measure (PAM) [24], and general quality of life measured with the EuroQoL questionnaire (EQ-5D-5L) [25]. Knowledge will be assessed just before the application of the PtDA (or the OA general information in the control group). Immediately after the intervention, all the outcome measures will be assessed again.

Sample size calculation

Assuming type I and II errors of 0.05 and 0.20 respectively, a total of 124 patients are needed in order to detect a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.5$) in the primary dependent variable (DCS). No losses are expected given that the post-intervention assessment will take place immediately after the application of the PtDA.

Statistical analysis

Data will be analysed on an intention-to-treat basis, although given the nature of the intervention we do not expect relevant protocol deviations. The baseline equivalence of the randomized groups will be assessed by means of Student's t-test and χ^2 test, for continuous and categorical variables, respectively. To analyse the effect of the intervention on the primary outcome (DCS), mixed linear regression model with intervention as independent variable will be used, adjusting for DCS baseline scores and sociodemographic or clinical variables which show significant between-group differences at baseline. Centre will be included as a random intercept to control for the potential intraclass correlation. The same analysis will be carried out for the remaining continuous outcomes. Treatment preference will be analysed by means of χ^2 test. Concordance between values and intention to undergo arthroplasty will be calculated by means of a method similar to the one proposed by Sepucha et al. [26]: first, a binary variable will be created, with a value of 1 for participants who prefer arthroplasty and scored 4 or 5 in

intention to undergo it, and zero for the remaining patients. Second, a mixed logistic regression model will be performed with patients' values as independent variables and intention to undergo arthroplasty (vs. other treatments) as dependent variable. Significant predictors will be retained in the model and the predicted score for each patient will be calculated. Patients with a predicted score equal or higher (lower) than 0.5 and intention to (not) undergo arthroplasty will be classified as concordant, and the remaining ones as not concordant. Finally, the effect of the DA in the number of concordant patients, as well as the number who make a quality decision, will be assessed with χ^2 test.

Data monitoring, management, and confidentiality

This is a minimal risk study and we do not expect harms derived from participation. Therefore, an independent safety data monitoring committee is not needed. Nonetheless, researches who will apply the intervention and collect outcomes data will be asked for any undesired outcome and register any behavioural or verbal sign which could indicate discomfort, annoyance or worry.

Study data will be stored on secure drives on a server's institution, and managed according to the General Registry for the Protection of Personal Data (RGPD UE 679/2016) and Spanish Organic Law 3/2018, of December 5, on the Protection of Personal Data and Guarantee of Digital Rights. Only the study team will have access to the final dataset.

Dissemination policy

Results of this study will be published in a peer-review journal and presented in international conferences.

Discussion

Patient-centred care is currently advocated as the gold standard of health care, and SDM is one of its essential aspects. In order to encourage SDM, many interventions aimed at patients, health professionals or both have been developed, to be applied or used before and/or during the clinical encounter [13]. Among them, PtDAs have the strongest evidence favoring their efficacy in increasing patients' knowledge, decreasing their decisional conflict, and in general improving the decision-making process and the quality of their health care decisions (understood as being informed and concordant with own values/preferences) [13,14]. In the field of OA, however, the number of available PtDAs is very scarce, and published RCTs are limited and their assessed outcomes heterogeneous [13,27–29]. Furthermore, they have included only patients with knee OA or have not reported separated data for hip patients [15,16,30]. Therefore, this RCT will contribute to increase the current knowledge about the effectiveness of PtDAs in the field of hip OA, with the ultimate aim of improving the quality of care offered to these patients. No physical or psychological risk is expected to result from participation in this study. Participants allocated to the PtDA group will access to updated information on the disease and the risks and benefits of the

various treatments for hip OA, and will be encouraged to explicitly clarify their values and preferences about those treatment options.

Limitations And Strengths

In relation to the systematic review for the development of the PtDA, it is expected to find limitations related to the coverage and completeness of the information obtained, since the bibliographic search does not guarantee the obtaining of the universe of articles. We will expand the search with consultation of other sources such as specialized websites and institutions working in this area of research.

The main limitations of the effectiveness study are the impossibility of blinding participants to treatment allocation, and the absence of follow up, which precludes the assessment of patients' subsequent interaction with their health care providers and their actual treatment choices. We will try to mitigate the lack of blinding giving control participants a brochure with general information about OA. In the absence of data about patients' actual decisions, we will measure the intensity of their intention to undergo their prefer treatment.

The strength of the study relies on its methodological rigor, beginning with the development of the PtDA based on recommended guidelines [31,32], involving a wide number of researchers, clinical experts and patients, and assessing its effectiveness in a RCT with adequate randomization, allocation concealment and implementation of the intervention. Regarding the population, given the socioeconomic context (one of the less developed regions of Spain) and the advanced age of hip patients on average, it is expected to include a considerable number of patients with low education level and/or health/digital literacy, enhancing the current evidence about the effectiveness of PtDAs interventions in these vulnerable populations [33,34]. The developed PtDA promises to be a useful resource to help patients to improve their knowledge of treatment options for hip OA, to take a more active decisional role about their health care, and to make decisions more aligned with their values and preferences.

TRIAL STATUS

The trial has been registered at [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov) under the identifier number NCT04241978 on 24 January 2020. The recruitment will begin in February 2020 and will be completed in September 2020. This is the Version 2 (April 6, 2020).

Abbreviations

OA: Osteoarthritis

PCC: Person-Centred Care

PtDA: Patient Decision aid

Declarations

Acknowledgements

Not applicable

Authors' contributions

LPP conceived the study and participated in its design and collaborated in the writing of the manuscript. AR and YA participated in its design and collaborated in the writing of the manuscript. VR, AD, AT, ATC, MH, JLP, JRV, CO, PS collaborated in the writing of the manuscript and read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This project is funded by the Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias (FIISC) (reference No. PIFUN33/18). FIISC has not any authority or role in decisions about study design, collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data, writing of the report, or the decision to submit it for publication.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and analysed during the current study will be available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. The PtDA will be available after the end of the study on the PyDeSalud website (<https://www.pydesalud.com/>).

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The Scientific and Ethics Committee of the University Hospital Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria (Tenerife, Spain) approved the study protocol (file number: CHUNSC_2018_59). The study will be performed in accordance with Good Clinical Practice standards, applicable local regulatory requirements and the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki. The informed consent form for patients' participation is shown in Appendix.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Cross M, Smith E, Hoy D, Nolte S, Ackerman I, Fransen M, et al. The global burden of hip and knee osteoarthritis: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. *Ann Rheum Dis* [Internet]. 2014;73:1323–30. Available from: <http://ard.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/annrheumdis-2013-204763>
2. Castaño Carou A, Pita Fernández S, Pérttega Díaz S, de Toro Santos FJ. Perfil clínico, grado de afectación y manejo terapéutico de pacientes con artrosis en atención primaria: estudio multicéntrico nacional EVALÚA. *Reumatol Clínica* [Internet]. 2015;11:353–60. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1699258X14002599>
3. Kloppenburg M, Berenbaum F. Osteoarthritis Year in Review 2019: Epidemiology and Therapy. *Osteoarthr Cartil* [Internet]. 2020; Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063458420300078>
4. Farr II J, Miller LE, Block JE. Quality of Life in Patients with Knee Osteoarthritis: A Commentary on Nonsurgical and Surgical Treatments. *Open Orthop J* [Internet]. 2013;7:619–23. Available from: <https://openorthopaedicsjournal.com/VOLUME/7/PAGE/619/>
5. Boutron I, Rannou F, Jardinaud-lopez M, Meric G, Revel M, Poiraud S. Disability and quality of life of patients with knee or hip osteoarthritis in the primary care setting and factors associated with general practitioners' indication for prosthetic replacement within 1 year. *Osteoarthr Cartil* [Internet]. 2008;16:1024–31. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063458408000022>
6. Bevan S. Economic impact of musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) on work in Europe. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol* [Internet]. 2015;29:356–73. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1521694215000947>
7. Smith LK, Dures E, Beswick A. Systematic review of the clinical effectiveness for long-term follow-up of total hip arthroplasty. *Orthop Res Rev* [Internet]. 2019;Volume 11:69–78. Available from: <https://www.dovepress.com/systematic-review-of-the-clinical-effectiveness-for-long-term-follow-up-peer-reviewed-article-ORR>
8. Harris AH, Kuo AC, Bowe T, Gupta S, Nordin D, Giori NJ. Prediction Models for 30-Day Mortality and Complications After Total Knee and Hip Arthroplasties for Veteran Health Administration Patients With Osteoarthritis. *J Arthroplasty* [Internet]. 2018;33:1539–45. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883540317310914>
9. Kinds MB, Welsing PMJ, Vignon EP, Bijlsma JWJ, Viergever MA, Marijnissen ACA, et al. A systematic review of the association between radiographic and clinical osteoarthritis of hip and knee. *Osteoarthr Cartil* [Internet]. 2011;19:768–78. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063458411000306>

10. Rivero-Santana A, Perestelo-Perez L, Perez-Ramos J, Gozalez-Lorenzo M, Serrano-Aguilar P. Treatment Preferences in Patients with Knee or Hip Osteoarthritis: An Overview. In: Quian C, editor. *Osteoarthr - Diagnosis, Treat Surg*. InTech; 2012. p. 227–42.
11. Trenaman L, Stacey D, Bryan S, Taljaard M, Hawker G, Dervin G, et al. Decision aids for patients considering total joint replacement: a cost-effectiveness analysis alongside a randomised controlled trial. *Osteoarthr Cartil* [Internet]. 2017;25:1615–22. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063458417310427>
12. Jayadev C, Khan T, Coulter A, Beard DJ, Price AJ. Patient decision aids in knee replacement surgery. *Knee* [Internet]. 2012;19:746–50. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0968016012000300>
13. Stacey D, Légaré F, Col NF, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, Eden KB, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. In: Stacey D, editor. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2014. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub4>
14. Légaré F, Adekpedjou R, Stacey D, Turcotte S, Kryworuchko J, Graham ID, et al. Interventions for increasing the use of shared decision making by healthcare professionals. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2018; Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/14651858.CD006732.pub4>
15. Shue J, Karia RJ, Cardone D, Samuels J, Shah M, Slover JD. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Two Distinct Shared Decision-Making Aids for Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis in an Ethnically Diverse Patient Population. *Value Heal* [Internet]. 2016;19:487–93. Available from: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1098301516000127>
16. Bozic KJ, Belkora J, Chan V, Youm J, Zhou T, Dupaix J, et al. Shared Decision Making in Patients with Osteoarthritis of the Hip and Knee. *J Bone Jt Surg* [Internet]. 2013;95:1633–9. Available from: <http://insights.ovid.com/crossref?an = 00004623-201309180-00001>
17. Chan A-W, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gøtzsche PC, Krle A-Jerić K, et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. *Rev Panam salud publica* [Internet]. 2015;38:506–14. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27440100>
18. O'Connor AM. Validation of a Decisional Conflict Scale. *Med Decis Mak* [Internet]. 1995;15:25–30. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X9501500105>
19. Perestelo-Perez L, Rivero-Santana A, Sanchez-Afonso JA, Perez-Ramos J, Castellano-Fuentes CL, Sepucha K, et al. Effectiveness of a decision aid for patients with depression: A randomized controlled trial. *Heal Expect*. 2017;20:1096–105.
20. Perestelo-Pérez L, Rivero-Santana A, Boronat M, Sánchez-Afonso JA, Pérez-Ramos J, Montori VM, et al. Effect of the statin choice encounter decision aid in Spanish patients with type 2 diabetes: A randomized trial. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2016;99:295–9.
21. Perestelo-Perez L, Rivero-Santana A, Torres-Castaño A, Ramos-Garcia V, Alvarez-Perez Y, Gonzalez-Hernandez N, et al. Effectiveness of a decision aid for promoting colorectal cancer screening in Spain: a randomized trial. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2019;19:8.

22. Sepucha K, Atlas SJ, Chang Y, Dorrwachter J, Freiberg A, Mangla M, et al. Patient Decision Aids Improve Decision Quality and Patient Experience and Reduce Surgical Rates in Routine Orthopaedic Care. *J Bone Jt Surg* [Internet]. 2017;99:1253–60. Available from: <http://journals.lww.com/00004623-201708020-00002>
23. Barry MJ, Fowler FJ, Mulley AG, Henderson J V, Wennberg JE. Patient reactions to a program designed to facilitate patient participation in treatment decisions for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Med Care*. 1995;33:771–82.
24. Hibbard JH, Mahoney ER, Stockard J, Tusler M. Development and Testing of a Short Form of the Patient Activation Measure. *Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2005;40:1918–30. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00438.x>
25. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen M, Kind P, Parkin D, et al. Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res* [Internet]. 2011;20:1727–36. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x>
26. Sepucha KR, Borkhoff CM, Lally J, Levin CA, Matlock DD, Ng CJ, et al. Establishing the effectiveness of patient decision aids: key constructs and measurement instruments. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* [Internet]. 2013;13:S12. Available from: <https://bmcmmedinformdecismak.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S12>
27. Ibrahim SA, Blum M, Lee G-C, Mooar P, Medvedeva E, Collier A, et al. Effect of a Decision Aid on Access to Total Knee Replacement for Black Patients With Osteoarthritis of the Knee. *JAMA Surg* [Internet]. 2017;152:e164225. Available from: <http://archsurg.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamasurg.2016.4225>
28. Vina ER, Richardson D, Medvedeva E, Kent Kwoh C, Collier A, Ibrahim SA. Does a Patient-centered Educational Intervention Affect African-American Access to Knee Replacement? A Randomized Trial. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* [Internet]. 2016;474:1755–64. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11999-016-4834-z>
29. de Achaval S, Fraenkel L, Volk RJ, Cox V, Suarez-Almazor ME. Impact of educational and patient decision aids on decisional conflict associated with total knee arthroplasty. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* [Internet]. 2012;64:229–37. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/acr.20646>
30. Stacey D, Taljaard M, Dervin G, Tugwell P, O'Connor AM, Pomey MP, et al. Impact of patient decision aids on appropriate and timely access to hip or knee arthroplasty for osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial. *Osteoarthr Cartil* [Internet]. 2016;24:99–107. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1063458415012674>
31. Elwyn G. Developing a quality criteria framework for patient decision aids: online international Delphi consensus process. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2006;333:417–0. Available from: <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/doi/10.1136/bmj.38926.629329.AE>
32. Coulter A, Stilwell D, Kryworuchko J, Mullen PD, Ng CJ, van der Weijden T. A systematic development process for patient decision aids. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* [Internet]. 2013;13:S2. Available from: <https://bmcmmedinformdecismak.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6947-13-S2-S2>

33. Dugas M, Trottier M-È, Chipenda Dansokho S, Vaisson G, Provencher T, Colquhoun H, et al. Involving members of vulnerable populations in the development of patient decision aids: a mixed methods sequential explanatory study. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak [Internet]. 2017;17:12. Available from: <http://bmcmmedinformdecismak.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12911-016-0399-8>

34. Pons-Rodríguez A, Martínez-Alonso M, Perestelo-Pérezd L, Garcia M, Sala M, Rué M, et al. Elección informada en el cribado del cáncer de mama: el papel del nivel educativo [In press]. Gac Sanit. 2020;

Figures

PAM = Patient Activation Measure; DCS= Decisional Conflict Scale; EQ-5D-5L= EuroQoL questionnaire; SWD= Satisfaction with Decision Scale; PtDA = Patient Decisional Aid

Figure 1

Flow of participants

TIMEPOINT	STUDY PERIOD			
	Enrolment	Allocation	Post-allocation	
	<i>Before randomization</i>	0	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Post-intervention</i>
ENROLMENT:				
Eligibility screen	X			
Informed consent	X			
Allocation		X		
INTERVENTIONS:				
Web-based PtDA			X	
Usual care			X	
ASSESSMENTS:				
Sociodemographic and clinical variables			X	
PAM			X	
EQ-5D-5L			X	
Knowledge			X	X
DCS			X	X
Values about characteristics of treatments				X
Treatment preference				X
Intention to undergo the preferred treatment				X
Concordance between values and intention to undergo arthroplasty vs. conservative treatments				X
Decision quality about arthroplasty				X
SWD				X

PAM: Patient Activation Measure; DCS: Decisional Conflict Scale; EQ-5D-5L: EuroQoL questionnaire; SWD: Satisfaction with Decision Scale; Web-based PtDA: Patient Decisional Aid

Figure 2

Schedule of enrolment, interventions, and assessments (SPIRIT checklist)

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [SPIRIT.pdf](#)
- [renamed3e3a9.doc](#)