

Caregivers and care practitioners' knowledge of hospice and palliative care

Population	Caregivers and care practitioners of complimentary services to palliative care services
Intervention/Exposure	Communication pathways/palliative care networks for accessing end-of-life care and resources for caregivers and healthcare professionals
Comparator	Usual care
Outcomes	Knowledge of palliative care pathways; provider experience

Interview Details:

Why did you choose this topic and why is it important to you?

- They have a background as an end-of-life doula.
- There is a general sense that patients do not know how to access palliative care.
- There is not enough conversation between various end-of-life service providers.

What do you hope to learn from researching this topic?

- What communication pathways for palliative care currently exist?
 - Where and how is the communication breaking down?
 - Are there success stories and lessons learned?
- Foundational evidence to:
 - Eventually develop a communication pathway/social network/navigational tool;
 - Understand which communication pathways do/do not exist.
- Province by province nuanced approach to work, given regional differences in palliative care pathways.
 - As an exemplar, an initial provincial framework might be used that is

responsive, flexible and culturally sensitive.

Who needs to know about the findings?

- General public
- Palliative/end-of-life care providers
- Patient advocacy groups and cultural societies (e.g., Indigenous groups)

Is there anything that you feel a panel of patients, caregivers, healthcare providers, and policy-makers should keep in mind when reviewing this topic?

- This is a grassroots-developed need that has come from healthcare providers and those outside of the healthcare system (e.g., families, doulas, funeral homes).
 - Interdisciplinary group requires an interdisciplinary approach to the research.

Anything else you would like to share?

- Would like findings to be shared in many ways:
 - Final report with executive summary (to be used as advocacy tool)
 - Creative, culturally relevant knowledge translation beyond written information (e.g., presentations, stories, visuals, theatre)

Feasibility Assessment Results

Summary:

Three scoping reviews and one systematic review were identified during the scoping literature search. The following four reviews by Vellani et al (2021), Broady et al (2018), Cahill et al (2017) and Threapleton et al (2017) were assessed using AMSTAR-2. A summary of the AMSTAR-2 assessments is provided in the table below.

Review #1: Vellani et al, 2021	Review #2: Broady et al, 2018
MODERATE quality rating ●●●○	CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○
Critical flaw: Partially addressed all checklist items Study design: Scoping review	Critical flaw: Missing 2 checklist items Study design: Scoping review

Review #3: Cahill et al, 2017	Review #4: Threapleton et al, 2017
CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○	CRITICALLY LOW quality rating ●○○○
Critical flaw: Missing several checklist items Study design: Systematic review	Critical flaw: Missing several checklist items Study design: Scoping review

Conclusion:

This topic has a critically low quality systematic review and critically low to moderate quality scoping reviews, which suggests that there is scope to conduct further research in this area.