Digital patient portals for people with cancer

Population	People with brain cancer, or cancer in general
Intervention/Exposure	Use of a (digital) patient portal allowing access to health information and data
Comparator	Usual care; health/illness management without this technology (i.e. without a digital patient portal)
Outcomes	QoL; mental health outcomes

Interview Details:

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

- Has lived experience as a cancer patient with limited energy experiencing the burden of dealing with many appointments and administrative tasks.
- Interested in the impact of digital innovations on society.
- With the advent of digital technologies, a window of opportunity is opening to find solutions to reduce some of these administrative tasks.

What do you hope to learn from researching this topic?

- Which actors developed these portals and to what extent were patients consulted in the design of these platforms?
- Are these platforms accessible for all patients or only for certain groups (the more affluent, those with digital and health literacy, etc.)?
- If they are accessible (portals), why are they not more 'publicized'?
- What are the facilitators and barriers to their implementation?
- Are they more publicly or privately funded?

Who needs to know about the findings?

- SPOR Evidence Alliance
- SSA Québec Support Unit
- Patient advocacy groups, including the Québec Coalition Priorité Cancer
- Decision-makers at the Québec Ministry of Health and Social Services, CISSS (integrated health and social services centres) and CIUSSS (integrated university health and social services centres)

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

- A digital portal would make it possible to manage appointments, test results, the information that is agreed to share and with which professionals.
- Would also like the panel to bear in mind that the QoL and health of people with cancer goes beyond medical treatment.

Feasibility Assessment Results

Summary:

Two systematic reviews were identified during the scoping literature search. The following two reviews by Gyawali et al (2023) and Hasnan et al (2022) were assessed using AMSTAR-2. A summary of the AMSTAR-2 assessments is provided in the table below.

Review #1: Gyawali et al, 2023	**Review #2:** Hasnan et al, 2022
LOW quality rating ●●○○	**LOW quality rating** ●●○○
Critical flaw: Missing 1 checklist item **Study design**: Systematic review	**Critical flaw**: Missing 1 checklist item **Study design**: Systematic review

Conclusion:

This topic has low quality systematic reviews, which suggests that there is scope to conduct further research in this area.