



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/236560/>

Version: Accepted Version

Proceedings Paper:

Powell, P., Cooper, M., Taylor, P. et al. (2022) Measuring quality of dying, death and end-of-life care for children and young people: a scoping review of available tools. In: Quality of Life Research. 29th Annual Conference of the International Society for Quality of Life Research, 19-22 Oct 2022, Prague, Czech Republic. , S27-S27. ISSN: 0962-9343. EISSN: 1573-2649.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-022-03257-1>

This version of the article has been accepted for publication, after peer review (when applicable) and is subject to Springer Nature's AM terms of use, but is not the Version of Record and does not reflect post-acceptance improvements, or any corrections. The Version of Record is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11136-022-03257-1>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Title: Measuring quality of dying, death and end-of-life care for children and young people: a scoping review of available tools

Authors: Philip A. Powell,^{1*} Katy A. Sunderland,² Matthew Cooper,³ Paul Taylor,^{1,4} Lucy Zeigler,⁵ Vicki Cox,³ Constance Gilman,³ Nicola Turner,⁶ Kate Flemming,⁷ Lorna K. Fraser,⁸ Catriona R. Mayland^{6,9}

*Presenting author

1 School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, UK

2 The Medical School, University of Sheffield, UK

3 Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK

4 St Luke's Hospice, Sheffield, UK

5 Academic Unit of Palliative Care, School of Medicine, University of Leeds, UK

6 Department of Oncology and Metabolism, University of Sheffield, UK

7 Department of Health Sciences, The University of York, UK

8 Martin House Research Centre, Dept of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

9 Palliative Care Unit, University of Liverpool, UK

Aims: The care provided up to and during end-of-life for children and young people is extremely important and there is a responsibility on healthcare professionals to ensure it is of a high quality. Patient (or proxy) reported outcomes (PROs) are central to the evaluation of care quality, yet the field of PROs in paediatric end-of-life care is poorly understood. This scoping review aimed to: i) identify tools designed to assess the quality of dying, death and end-of-life care for children and young people; and ii) describe data on the validity and reliability of these tools.

Methods: Systematic searches were conducted on four databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL and PsycINFO) and grey literature for studies published between 01/2000 and 06/2021. Results were reviewed by independent teams of reviewers to identify primary research studies featuring tools assessing quality of death, dying or quality of care at end-of-life (defined as the last month of life). Data from included studies on the study, tool, findings, and psychometrics was extracted using an a priori extraction sheet and qualitatively synthesised. The tools' content was conceptually mapped on to a seven-dimension framework designed to characterise the 'good death of a child'.

Results: From 2078 search results, 18 studies, reporting on 11 tools, were included. All tools were 'proxy' reported by either the primary caregiver or healthcare professional and all, bar one, was designed for use after the child's death. All tools assessed aspects of quality of life during the dying phase (e.g., pain, emotional wellbeing) and preparation for death (e.g., communication). The majority assessed aspects of care (e.g., religion/spirituality; n = 10), participation (e.g., being present at death; n = 9), and personal style (e.g., dignity, individuality; n = 8). Less coverage was given to impact on survivors (e.g., grief/bereavement; n = 5) and legacy (e.g., memories, ritual; n = 4). Only 6 tools had supporting psychometric evidence.

Conclusions: Eleven tools were identified assessing dying, death and end-of-life care for children and young people. Their limitations included not including the patients' perspective; limited coverage of some aspects of a 'good death', and insufficient psychometric evidence.