

## P3 A list of tools is not enough! Professionals' advice on how to implement a core outcome set in practice

Ana-Carolina Goncalves, Alda Marques, Dinesh Samuel, Sara Demain

Solent NHS Trust, School of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

Email: [a.c.goncalves@soton.ac.uk](mailto:a.c.goncalves@soton.ac.uk)

Keywords: Core outcome set, dementia, implementation, interview

**Background:** The number of core outcome sets (COS) has increased in recent years and more methodological research has been published aiming to increase the credibility of COS. However, little is yet known about strategies to facilitate COS implementation and promote adherence among professionals and researchers to use COS in practice.

**Methods:** Qualitative interviews ( $n = 29$ ) were conducted in the pre-Delphi stage of the development of a COS to evaluate physical activity interventions for people living with dementia. Nine professionals were asked to comment on strategies to implement this COS, once it had been completed. Data generated from the comments were analyzed thematically.

**Results:** Participants included professionals from a wide range of backgrounds (public, private, and voluntary sectors), and from different settings (hospitals, community, nursing, and care homes). Their comments on COS implementation in practice can be organized into three themes: (1) "Needing a COS in practice"—participants explained how COS can help to meet the needs of professionals to measure patients' physical activity interventions and benchmark their results against others and against published research; (2) "Making it work in practice"—participants stressed not only the need to include feasible measurement tools in COS (low cost and easy to use) but also the need for a "toolkit," including not only the tools, but when and how to use them; and (3) "Broadcasting it widely"—by presenting at conferences, professionals' meetings, and promoting COS among professional and governance bodies.

**Conclusions:** Professionals recognize the need for COS in practice and would welcome a set of outcomes and tools presented as a "toolkit". Wide dissemination activities are likely to be necessary to achieve the homogeneity of reporting outcomes aimed by COS developers.

## P4 Implications of a qualitative study on core outcome set development

Ana-Carolina Goncalves, Alda Marques, Dinesh Samuel, Sara Demain

Solent NHS Trust, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

Email: [a.c.goncalves@soton.ac.uk](mailto:a.c.goncalves@soton.ac.uk)

Keywords: Carers, core outcome set, dementia, health professionals, interview, outcome, patients, qualitative

**Background:** The use of qualitative methods within core outcome set (COS) development has been recognized as a potentially beneficial methodological innovation. Although preliminary guidance on the use of qualitative methods as a pre-Delphi stage in COS development has been published, additional appraisal on the use of this novel approach is still encouraged. The present study reports on the implications of a qualitative study on the development of a COS to evaluate physical activity interventions for people with dementia, across different stages of the condition and intervention settings.

**Methods:** In-depth qualitative interviews ( $n = 29$ ) were conducted with people with dementia, their family carers, and health professionals. Data were analyzed thematically and the outcomes identified in the interviews were compared against those reported in a previous literature review. Interview data was also used to define the scope of each outcome domain. Possible implications of this qualitative study on the development of the COS were identified.

**Results:** The present qualitative study generated 10 new outcomes; nine outcomes were identified in previous literature, but not in this qualitative study. A final list of 77 outcomes was generated to be used in the Delphi stage. A glossary was also developed based on these qualitative findings, clearly defining the scope of each domain prior to the Delphi. The large majority of outcomes were mentioned by participants across stages of dementia. Thus, the COS protocol was changed from a Delphi survey subdivided per stages of dementia to a single Delphi survey common to all stages.

**Conclusions:** Qualitative studies can generate new outcomes to those generated through literature reviews, and they can be paramount in defining the scope of each outcome pre-Delphi. Qualitative studies can inform the structure of COS by providing an in-depth understanding of how outcomes can be meaningful across stages of disease progression.

## P5 A systematic review of outcomes measures in subarachnoid hemorrhage research

Christopher Andersen, Emily Fitzgerald, Anthony Delaney, Simon Finfer

Adult Intensive Care Unit, Oxford University Hospital Trust, Oxford shire, UK

Email: [chris\\_andersen@gmp.usyd.edu.au](mailto:chris_andersen@gmp.usyd.edu.au)

Keywords: Core outcome set, outcome, subarachnoid hemorrhage, systematic review

Consensus on appropriate outcome measures to use in aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage (aSAH) research has not been established, although the transition toward a core outcome set (COS) would provide significant benefits. To inform COS development, we