Self-management toolkit and delivery strategy for end-of-life pain: the mixed-methods feasibility study

Michael I Bennett,^{1*} Matthew R Mulvey,¹
Natasha Campling,² Sue Latter,² Alison Richardson,²
Hilary Bekker,¹ Alison Blenkinsopp,³ Paul Carder,⁴
Jose Closs,⁵ Amanda Farrin,⁶ Kate Flemming,⁷
Jean Gallagher,¹ David Meads,¹ Stephen Morley,^{1†}
John O'Dwyer,¹ Alexandra Wright-Hughes⁶
and Suzanne Hartley⁶

Declared competing interests of authors: Amanda Farrin is a member of the Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Themed Call Panel. David Meads is a member of the Elective and Emergency Specialist Care National Institute for Health Research HTA panel.

Published December 2017

DOI: 10.3310/hta21760

Plain English summary

Self-management toolkit and delivery strategy for end-of-life pain

Health Technology Assessment 2017; Vol. 21: No. 76

DOI: 10.3310/hta21760

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

¹Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

²Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

³School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Bradford, Bradford, UK

⁴Bradford and Airedale NHS, Bradford, UK

⁵School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

⁶Leeds Institute of Clinical Trials Research, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

⁷Department of Health Science, University of York, York, UK

^{*}Corresponding author M.I.Bennett@leeds.ac.uk †In memoriam

Plain English summary

Pain affects most people approaching the end of life and can be severe for some. Opioid pain medicines (such as morphine) are effective, but evidence is needed about how best to support patients who are approaching the end of life in managing these medicines.

By reviewing published research and interviewing patients, carers and health-care professionals, we designed a self-management support toolkit (SMST). This consisted of factsheets, a pain diary, medication chart and a goal-setting sheet. We trained clinical nurse specialists in palliative care to deliver the tool using a four-step coaching process [the Self-Management of Analgesia and Related Treatments at the end of life (SMART) intervention]. We then asked the trained nurses to trial the SMART intervention with a group of patients over a 6-week period. The purpose of this trial was to see what patients, their carers and nurses thought of the SMST and to decide if it was possible to run a larger trial.

Many patients were unable to take part because they were not prescribed strong enough painkillers or were too unwell. We approached 37 patients, and 19 took part. The SMART intervention was acceptable and valued by patients and nurses. In general, the study nurses delivered the intervention as planned. We were able to collect information from patients on a regular basis and that this was not too much for them. We interviewed the nurses at the end of the trial and this showed that we need to make some refinements to the study: allowing patients on more types of painkiller to be included and providing more training support to nurses. Based on these findings we have concluded that a larger study in the NHS is feasible. This will determine whether or not SMART can provide cost-effective benefits to patients who are approaching the end of life.

HTA/HTA TAR

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.236

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 12/188/05. The contractual start date was in September 2014. The draft report began editorial review in September 2016 and was accepted for publication in June 2017. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2017. This work was produced by Bennett et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

Professor Hywel Williams Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of the NIHR Dissemination Centre, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk