Business Meeting—Patient Reported Outcomes Methods Group
Cochrane Collaboration

Minutes

17:00-18:30 - Monday 1 October 2012

Auckland New Zealand

In attendance: 15 persons

1) Riki reviewed her work on reviews on properties of PRO measurement instruments specific to review group topic areas which are now on PRO website.

2) There was an abstract from Germany examining current use of PROs in Cochrane reviews which was not presented here. Riki will contact the author to see if we could collaborate. Two other abstracts looked at use of PROs and find them underused.

3) We noted that one of the major roles of the PRO methods group is to support individual reviews and that people can access help through the PRO website.

4) Donald suggested the possibility of having attention drawn to the issue of PROs at the time that reviews are registered with the Review Group.

5) Donald described a meeting of medical editors and methodologists developing CONSORT guidance for the minimal reporting of PROs in clinical trials. A publication describing the results of the guidance will be forthcoming. One part of the guidance is to report number of patients and a measure of variability.

6) We suggested that the development of online tutorial(s) for use of PROs in Cochrane systematic reviews including presentation of PROs.

7) We discussed issues around MID. One suggestion was that the MID in absolute terms may differ at different ends of the intensity spectrum (larger changes needed at the high levels of intensity). This would argue for presenting the MID as a relative rather than an absolute measure. MIDs may differ across methods of establishing the MID, and patient characteristics (including the severity).

8) If studies use more than one instrument the reviewer has to decide which one to use. The best approach is to specify a hierarchy of instruments (best measurement properties, second best, third best) and to use in each trial the instrument highest in the hierarchy.