1	Protocol of a randomized controlled trial evaluating program facilitating empathetic
2	communication for initiating advanced care planning discussions between patients
3	with advanced cancer and healthcare providers (J-SUPPORT 2104)
4	
5	Running title
6	Empathetic communication facilitation program for early initiation of end-of-life discussions
7	
, 8	Kanwards
0	Keyworus
9	Advance care planning, Empathetic communication, Question prompt list, Advanced cancer,
10	Randomized controlled trial
11	
12	Corresponding Author
13	Maiko Fujimori, PhD, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
14	Postal address: 5-1-1, Tsukiji, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, 104-0045 Japan
15	E-mail: mfujimor@ncc.go.jp
16	Authors
17	Kyoko Obama, RN, PhD
18	Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
19	
20	Maiko Fujimori, PhD
21	Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
22	
23	Masako Okamura, MD, PhD
24	Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
25	
26	Midori Kadowaki, RN, PhD
27	Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
28	
29	Taro UEn this hepring reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30	SUSMED, Inc, Tokyo, Japan
31	
32 33 34	Narikazu Boku, MD, PhD Department of Oncology and General Medicine, IMSUT Hospital, The Institute of Medical Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
35	
<ul><li>36</li><li>37</li><li>38</li></ul>	Masanori Mori, MD Division of Palliative and Supportive Care, Seirei Mikatahara Hospital, Hamamatsu, Japan
<ol> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> </ol>	Tatsuo Akechi, MD, PhD Department of Psychiatry and Cognitive-Behavioral Medicine, Nagoya City University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Nagoya, Japan
43 44 45	Takuhiro Yamaguchi, PhD Division of Biostatistics, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, Japan
46 47 48	Shunsuke Oyamada, PhD Department of Biostatistics, JORTC Data Center, Tokyo, Japan
49 50 51	Ayumi Okizaki, PhD Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
52 53 54	Tempei Miyaji, MSc Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
55 56 57	Naomi Sakurai Cancer Survivors Recruiting Project, General Incorporated Association, Tokyo, Japan
58 59	Yosuke Uchitomi, MD, PhD Institute for Cancer Control, National Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan
~ ~	

60

# 61 **Abstract**

62 Introduction In patients with incurable advanced cancer, preferences about treatment and how to spend their final days are not adequately discussed. This process of discussion is called "advanced 63 care planning" (ACP), and timely intervention is recommended. As the communication attitude of 64 healthcare providers is a critical factor in ACP facilitation, improving their communication attitudes 65 66 may reduce patient distress, improve care satisfaction, and reduce unnecessarily aggressive 67 treatment. Digital mobile devices are being developed for behavioral interventions due to their low 68 space and time restrictions, and the ease of sharing information. The purpose of this study is to 69 evaluate the effectiveness of a facilitation program utilizing a mobile app developed to improve 70 communication between cancer patients and healthcare providers regarding ACP. 71 Methods and analysis This study utilizes a parallel-group, evaluator-blind, randomized controlled 72 trial design. We plan to recruit 264 adult patients with incurable advanced cancer. Intervention group 73 participants will use a mobile app ACP program and undergo a 30-minute interview with a trained intervention provider to discuss with the oncologist at the next patient visit. Control group 74 75 participants will continue their usual treatment. The primary outcome is the oncologist's 76 communication behavior score assessed using audio recordings of the consultation. The secondary 77 outcomes include communication between patients and oncologists and the patients' distress, quality 78 of life, care goals and preferences, and medical care utilization. We will use a full analysis set with 79 the registered participant population who received at least a part of the intervention. 80 **Ethics and dissemination** The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Scientific Advisory Board of the Japan Supportive, Palliative and Psychosocial Oncology Group (Registration 81 82 No. 2104) and the Institutional Review Board of the National Cancer Center Hospital (registration

- 83 No. 2020-500). The results of the RCT will be published in peer-reviewed scientific journals and
- 84 presented at scientific meetings.
- 85
- 86 Trial status
- 87 The study is currently recruiting participants, with enrollment scheduled to run through March 2023
- and follow-up scheduled through September 2023.
- 89 Trial registration number: The protocol was registered on August 31, 2021, at the UMIN Clinical
- 90 Trials Registry (UMIN000045305) and on September 16, 2021, at ClinicalTrials.gov
- 91 (NCT05045040).
- 92
- 93 Data statement
- 94 The study protocol, data definition tables, and dataset will be uploaded to the UMIN-Individual Case
- 95 Data Repository at <u>https://www.umin.ac.jp/icdr/index-j.html</u>.
- 96
- 97 **Protocol version**
- 98 The protocol was updated to version 2.0 on May 19, 2022.
- 99
- 100

# 101 Strengths and limitations of this study

- Randomized controlled trials using mobile apps for behavior change and psychological
   interventions are increasing, and this study is unique in its focus on facilitating communication
   about advanced care planning (ACP).
- The intervention will include mobile apps which can be used in environments the participants find
   relaxing and engaging. The benefit is particularly significant for patients with advanced cancer
   who need to express their values and what is crucial to them.
- There is currently no gold standard for evaluating ACP discussions between patients and
   healthcare providers. The methods facilitate ACP discussions in various aspects of this study to
   produce a variety of practical insights.
- The timing of introducing ACP discussions must be individualized to each patient, and it is
   anticipated that some participants may find this intervention burdensome. Therefore, more careful
   ACP referrals are needed, and qualitative exploration of study dropouts is needed.
- Multiple intervention components make it difficult to determine which is most effective.
   Individualized assessments of app usage, intervention adherence, and patient satisfaction could
   clarify the challenges and help determine next steps.

117

# **III8 INTRODUCTION**

119 Cancer is a leading causes of death in developed countries, with an estimated 10 million cancer 120 deaths worldwide in 2020, [1] accounting for a one-in-six risk of dying from cancer. However, 121 healthcare providers do not adequately discuss treatment preferences with patients with incurable 122 advanced cancer, nor how they may spend their final days. [2] Delayed discussions, such as after the 123 patient's condition deteriorates, are associated with unprofitable treatment and delayed coordination 124 with community health services. [3] Communicating with patients with incurable advanced cancer is 125 a considerably challenging tasks, especially regarding preferred end-of-life care appropriate to their 126 treatment, although discussion helps patients and their families prepare for the end of life. Patients 127 receiving communication intervention are more likely to have shared their end-of-life care 128 preferences with healthcare providers, and consequently expressed higher satisfaction with them. [4] 129 This discussion, called advanced care planning (ACP), is practiced based on clinical guidelines 130 worldwide. [5–7] based on clinical guidelines. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network 131 (NCCN) guidelines recommend beginning the ACP discussion when a patient's estimated prognosis 132 is one year or less. [8] 133 Since barriers to ACP include a lack of supportive and empathetic attitudes and inadequate 134 information delivery by healthcare providers, [9] improving healthcare providers' communication 135 attitudes toward patients is essential for facilitating ACP. Likewise, ACP may improve 136 communication regarding end-of-life care between cancer patients and healthcare providers [10–13] and make palliative care more accessible to patients. [14] Thus, ACP may reduce patients' anxiety 137 138 and depression, [15] increase satisfaction with care, [15] and reduce unnecessarily aggressive 139 treatment. [16] The ACP intervention components include communication support using question

140 prompt lists (QPL) for patients, [10 12 17] communication skill training (CST) for healthcare

- 141 providers, [15 18] a combination of CST for healthcare providers and patients, [19] and step-by-step
- 142 in-depth counseling to patients by trained facilitators. [14 20]
- 143 We previously developed a face-to-face behavioral intervention program using QPL and CST to

144 improve the introduction of ACP discussion between healthcare providers and their cancer patients

- 145 being given bad news. [21] Combining a 2.5 hr individualized communication skills training for
- 146 healthcare providers with a 30 min coaching intervention for patients, we found statistically
- 147 significant improvements in empathic communication and information sharing among healthcare
- 148 providers. In addition, patients in the intervention group were more satisfied with the consultation.
- 149 [21 22] However, from the perspective of implementing a communication intervention, face-to-face
- 150 programs held in hospitals could create significant time and space burdens for both patients and
- 151 healthcare providers.

152 To overcome these problems, we developed an ACP program mobile application (app). We 153 revised the intervention program [21] to include an app with reference to previous QPL studies, [23– 154 25] the goal concordant care framework, [26] the good death, [27 28] and digital health-based 155 intervention. [29] Because of the advantages of digital health-based interventions, such as fewer 156 space and time constraints and easier real-time information sharing compared to face-to-face 157 interventions, more medical apps are being developed for behavioral interventions such as physical 158 activity [27 28] and psychoeducation [30] among cancer patients. Intervention via apps can reduce 159 the chance of patient contact, which is useful in the COVID-19 pandemic. The study's purpose is to 160 evaluate the effectiveness of a facilitation program utilizing a mobile app for improving 161 communication between cancer patients and ACP healthcare providers regarding.

7 / 28

#### 162

# 163 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

### 164 Study design

165 This study comprises a parallel-group, evaluator-blind, randomized controlled trial.

166

## 167 **Patient and public involvement**

A cancer survivor from a patient advocacy group participated, giving suggestions regarding the study design and materials that were completed via a series of reviews. The study protocol has been reviewed by researchers, healthcare providers, patients, and the public through the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Japan Supportive, Palliative and Psychosocial Oncology Group (J-SUPPORT, the study ID: 2104). Five cancer patients who were attending a study field hospital volunteered to participate in the pretest; their comments were used to refine the study procedures.

174

#### 175 **Study population**

176 Participants are recruited from the Departments of Oncology, Hepatobiliary Medicine, Respiratory 177 Medicine, and Gastroenterology at the National Cancer Center Hospital (Tokyo), Japan. Inclusion 178 criteria are patients 20 years or older with incurable advanced cancer whose attending oncologist has 179 indicated that they meet the Surprise Question [15 31] (answering "no" to the question "Would you 180 be surprised if this patient die within a year?"); they must have an Eastern Cooperative Oncology 181 Group performance status score 0-2, provide written consent to participate in the study, and be able 182 to read, write, and understand Japanese. Exclusion criteria are patients who have been judged by the 183 attending oncologist to have a serious cognitive decline, such as delirium or dementia, an estimated

184 prognosis of fewer than 3 months, judged by an attending oncologist to be unsuitable for this study, 185 participating in other psychological or communication support interventions at the time of

186 enrollment.

187

## 188 Enrollment and randomization

189 Participant management, including enrollment, randomization, and data collection via Electronic 190 Patient-Reported Outcome (ePRO) and PRO, will be conducted online using the central registration 191 system linked to the app developed in collaboration with SUSMED, Inc (Tokyo, Japan), a medical 192 app developer. Research assistants explain the research to the candidates and obtain written consent. 193 After obtaining baseline data, participants are randomly assigned using a minimizing method to 194 either an intervention group or a usual care group in 1:1 with stratification factors of the clinical 195 department (respiratory medicine, gastroenterology, hepatobiliary medicine, and oncology), gender 196 (male and female), and age (at age 64 years or younger and 65 years or older). Allocation results are 197 blinded to the primary outcome evaluators. 198 Detailed allocation procedures will not be shared with researchers at participating sites, data 199 centers, or statistical analysts, and will be defined in an internal document at the site of the person 200 responsible for allocation. Participants will install the app on their mobile devices upon enrollment. 201 Participants allocated to the control group will use an app that contains only ePRO, while the 202 intervention group will use an app that contains the intervention program in addition to ePRO. If the 203 app cannot be installed on the participant's mobile device for some reason, an iPad with the app 204 installed will be available for loan.

205

#### 206 **Procedures**

207	Five visits are planned: baseline evaluation (T0), an outpatient visit at least one week later (T1),
208	and follow-up surveys at 1 week (T2), 12 weeks (T3), and 24 weeks (T4) after the T1 visit, as shown
209	in Figure 1. The purpose of each visit was mainly to evaluate how the intervention program impacts
210	communication between participants and their oncologists during the consultation at T1, the
211	psychological burden of the participants around 2 weeks after the consultation at T2, and the
212	patients' preferred end-of-life care settings and care preferences and their actual healthcare
213	utilization at T3 and T4. Intervention group participants receive interventions before T1. Usual care
214	(control) group participants receive care as usual. The schedule for outcome measurement is shown
215	in Table 1. At the T1 visit, the consultation is audio recorded. The research assistant reminds and
216	asks participants to respond to ePRO according to the response schedule.

217

#### 218 Intervention program

219 The intervention program, which is completed between T0 and T1, consists of two parts: QPL and 220 identifying participants' values (Table 2). Participants receive a brief explanation of the intervention 221 program and how to use the app from an intervention provider. Participants are encouraged to 222 complete all content on the app before an interview with an intervention provider. In the interview, 223 an intervention provider reviews the items selected by a participant and assists them in considering 224 priorities and verbalizing what is weighty to discuss with the oncologist. The interview is provided 225 on the phone or face-to-face at the hospital, which is designed to take 30–60 minutes. In the 226 outpatient visit following the interview, the intervention provider lets the oncologist know prior to 227 the visit what the participant would like to discuss with their oncologist. Intervention providers are

228	clinical psychologists, nurses, or psychiatrists who have participated in intensive training using the
229	intervention manual. The intervention provider records and summarizes the intervention interviews,
230	which are reviewed at weekly conferences.

231

#### 232 Assessment measures

- Table 1 shows the schedule for outcome measurement.
- 234

## 235 **Primary outcome measure**

236 The score of oncologists' communication behaviors (reassurance and emotional support

- subscale from the SHARE scoring manual)
- 238 The conversation between the participants and the oncologists at visit T1 is audio-recorded, and
- the oncologist's communication behavior is scored using the SHARE scoring manual (Table 3).
- 240 SHARE is a conceptual communication skills model comprising 26 items and four subscales: S
- 241 (supportive environment; 2 items), H (how to deliver bad news; 7 items), A (additional information;
- 242 (8 items), and RE (reassurance and emotional support; 9 items). We focus on RE, which assesses
- 243 oncologists' behavior in providing reassurance and their empathetic responses to participants'
- emotions. [32] Scores range from 0 (*not applicable at all*) to 4 (*strongly applicable*). Scoring is
- conducted by multiple evaluators blinded to the assignment. Evaluators will be trained in
- 246 conversation analysis with a manual, and inter-evaluators and intra-evaluators agreements will be
- 247 checked in advance. We will adopt the items with a match rate  $\geq 80\%$ .
- 248

#### 249 **Secondary outcome measures**

### 250 Oncologists' communication behaviors

251 Oncologists' communication behaviors at visit T1 are evaluated using the S, H, and A subscales of 252 the SHARE manual. The scoring method is the same as for the RE subscale used in the primary 253 outcome.

254

#### 255 Communication behaviors between participants and oncologists

256 The audio-recorded conversations between the participant and oncologists are coded and the 257 communication behaviors are counted using a computer version of the RIAS (the Roter interaction 258 process analysis system). [33] The system is widely used in the US, the UK, and Japan. [34 35] 259 Manuals have been translated into Japanese and validated for use in examining cancer patients. [36] 260 RIAS has 42 categories for coding the in-consultation communication behaviors. Two blinded 261 trained coders assign one of the 42 codes to each utterance of the participants and the oncologists. To 262 facilitate data interpretation, 21 categories related to the communication behaviors of interest in this 263 study are grouped into four clusters based on the conceptual communication skills model used in 264 previous studies. [32 37] Table 4 shows the categories that make up each of these clusters, and all 265 RIAS categories are shown in the Appendix. The number of utterances in each cluster is also evaluated. Coders are trained and certified at the official training site, the RIAS Study Group Japan 266 267 Chapter. Ten percent of the total consultations (25 consultations) will be double-coded and inter-268 coder reliability is examined regarding the degree of agreement for the identification of utterances 269 and coding of each utterance. It should be verified in advance during the training period that the 270 correlation coefficient meets 0.8. The reliability proved to be high (0.7-0.8) in previous studies. [34] 271 38]

272

#### 273 Number of conversations about ACP

- 274 The number of conversations about ACP (prognosis, palliative care, remaining anticancer
- treatment, end-of-life treatment, recuperation issues, and preparation for the future) during the
- consultation is counted based on a conversation analysis manual developed by the previous study.

277 [19]

278

### 279 Psychological Distress

280 Psychological distress is obtained at all five scheduled visits. The Hospital Anxiety and

281 Depression Scale (HADS) is a 14-item self-report questionnaire developed for patients with medical

illnesses. [39] It consists of anxiety and depression subscales (0 to 21 points each) with a 4-point

scale, with higher scores indicating greater anxiety and depression. The Japanese version of the

HADS has been validated in a cancer patient population. [40]

285

286 Quality of Life

287 Quality of life is obtained at T0, T2, T3, and T4. The European Organization for Research and

288 Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire Core 30 (EORTC-QLQ-C30) is a four-domain,

289 30-item questionnaire consisting of functional scales, global health, and quality of life scales,

symptom scales/items, and financial impact. [41] Scores for all scales range from 0 to 100. A high

score on the functional scale would indicate high functioning, a high score on the global health and

- 292 quality of life scale would indicate high health status, while a high score on the symptom scale and
- 293 financial impact would indicate a high level of symptoms or problems. The reliability and validity of
- the Japanese version have already been confirmed. [42]

295

## 296 **Participants' care goals and preferred places for spending their final days**

297 Participants will be asked about their goals and the places where they would prefer to spend their 298 final days at T0, T3, and T4. We developed two original scales based on the conceptual diagram of 299 care consistent with incurable cancer patient's goals presented by Halpern [26] to assess 1) 300 participants' preferred treatment options after completion of standard care (care goal) and 2) 301 participants' preferred place where they would spend their final days. The treatment options are as 302 follows: 1) I would like to receive treatment to alleviate my symptoms without any cancer treatment 303 so that I can live a peaceful life, 2) I would like to receive less burdensome cancer treatment to 304 alleviate symptoms so that I can continue my activity of daily living as much as possible. 3) I would 305 like to receive cancer treatment even if it is somewhat burdensome so that I can finish crucial events 306 or things that I have to do, 4) I would like to receive all cancer treatments, no matter what the 307 burden, to prolong my life even for a day. The options for participants' preferred place where they 308 would spend their final days are as follows: 1) home, 2) a nearby hospital, 3) a palliative care 309 hospital or ward, 4) the hospital where they are receiving treatment, and 5) others. The proportion of 310 participants preferring unnecessarily aggressive treatment or impractical places of care is observed in 311 each survey visit in an exploratory manner. We chose these outcomes for their comparability with 312 previous studies. [5 43]

313

## 314 **Participant satisfaction with their oncologists' consultation**

The Patient Satisfaction Survey (PSQ) [38 44 45] is conducted at T1. The 11-point scale (0, *not satisfied at all*, to 10, *very satisfied*) measures five categories of satisfaction with their oncology

317	consultations: 1) needs addressed, 2) active involvement in the interaction, 3) adequacy of
318	information, 4) emotional support received, and 5) the interaction overall. [43]

319

### 320 Feasibility of the intervention

321 The timing of each data collection is shown in Table 1. The intervention's feasibility is evaluated 322 according to the participants' assessment of the app's usability, the time taken for interventions, and 323 app log records. The app's usability is determined by the following five questions: 1) Were the 324 questions you wanted to ask identified by the time you saw your oncologist? 2) Did you understand 325 and use the app? 3) Was the app program helpful? 4) Were you comfortable with the app program? 326 5) Was the telephone or in-person assistance helpful? 327 Participants rate each item on an 11-point scale (0, not satisfied at all, to 10, very satisfied). The 328 intervention provider records the time taken for the intervention on the intervention report form. App 329 log records, including time spent browsing and the operation status of the intervention program, are 330 provided by the app developer.

331

#### 332 Medical care utilization

Medical care utilization is obtained from the electrical medical record of each participant at the 6month follow-up. If the participant is not alive at 6 months, a medical record survey based on information at the time of death will be conducted. We will obtain the presence or absence of anticancer treatment and a reason for termination of treatment if the treatment is discontinued, unscheduled outpatient visits, hospitalization, ICU admission, use of end-of-life care consultations, and use of palliative care services.

#### 339

## 340 Medical and social background

The participant's medical and social background information includes cancer type, length of time since diagnosis, age, gender, educational background, employment history, financial status, marital status, household status (lives with others, such as children or those requiring nursing care), methods and times of hospital visits, and whether there is a family member or other person who can accompany them.

346

#### 347 Harms

No particularly serious physical adverse events are anticipated for participants in this study. 348 349 However, using the app may cause a psychological burden as participants think about preparing for 350 when they will have difficulty continuing cancer treatments. Hence, newly diagnosed anxiety 351 disorders or depression resulting from a psychological burden caused by the intervention will be 352 considered an adverse event. If a participant reports that the intervention is causing a psychological 353 burden or requests discontinuation of the intervention, the intervention will be stopped and the event 354 will be reported promptly to their attending oncologists. Participants in the intervention group are 355 scheduled to see an oncologist within one week after the intervention. Researchers will regularly 356 check for updates to their medical records, if necessary, and case reports provided at regular team 357 meetings so researchers can review the course of psychological distress, discuss changes in 358 participants' conditions caused by the intervention, and determine what should be reported to their 359 attending oncologists.

360

## 361 **Compensation**

Any unexpected health problems participants may experience due to their participation in this study will be adequately treated based on standard medical care covered by public health insurance programs, such as National Health Insurance. Participants receive a gift card worth 500 Japanese yen at T1.

366

#### 367 Sample size calculation

368 The results of a previous preliminary study showed that the effect size of the primary endpoint was 369 3.1. [22] In this study, the principal investigators agreed that an effect size of 2.5 would be 370 considered clinically meaningful, given that this is an app-based intervention. Based on a 371 significance level of two-sided 5% and a power of 80%, 250 subjects would be required. Since the 372 National Cancer Center Hospital has many clinical trials, it may not be allow to participate in this 373 study due to the conditions required of other clinical trials. If the participants overlap with a clinical 374 trial, they may drop out of this study. At the National Cancer Center Hospital, the participation rate 375 of patients who would be eligible for the study is approximately 30%. Therefore, the planned 376 enrollment is 264 patients, assuming a 5% dropout rate due to clinical trial enrollment and other 377 reasons during this study.

378

## 379 Statistical Analysis

We will estimate the point estimates and 95% confidence intervals of the mean for each group and between-group differences for the primary endpoint. Two-tailed tests will determine significance at 5%. We will conduct the analysis using a general linear model with the clinical department, gender,

383 and age as the adjustment factors for allocation. If the number of cases in each stratum is small, we 384 will consider whether to adopt all adjustment factors. We will use a full analysis set consisting of the 385 registered participant population who received at least part of the protocol treatment; however, 386 participants deemed ineligible for the study after registration will be excluded from the analysis set. 387 All statistical procedures, including the secondary endpoint and handling of missing data, will be 388 detailed in the statistical analysis plan before data evaluation. The occurrence of discontinued cases 389 after randomization will be assessed in both groups. Due to the nature of the intervention, the 390 program may cause psychological burdens for some intervention group patients experiencing 391 deteriorating physical conditions. Thus, patients' reasons for discontinuation must be obtained (to the 392 extent possible) so potential bias can be examined

- 393
- **Data monitoring and management**

395 An independent data monitoring team will report monitoring results semi-annually. The PRO data 396 obtained will not be reported to individual participants or their oncologists to improve clinical care. 397 Weekly meetings will be held between the research office and the monitoring team to discuss the 398 progress of case enrollment and to report on cases. Data monitoring will be conducted using the 399 entry data in EDC, Viedoc 4 (Viedoc Technologies, Sweden) and the central registration system by 400 SUSMED, Inc (Tokyo, Japan). All paper data related to the study, including research assistant notes, 401 intervention case reports, patient-reported questionnaires, and consent forms, will be stored securely 402 in a lockable cabinet in the principal investigator's office, as will audio-recorded data stored on an 403 encrypted external hard drive. Only authorized researchers directly involved in the study will have 404 access to the data. All data supporting the study results will be stored for a minimum of five years

and will be available upon request to the corresponding author. A data monitoring plan is developed
and kept by the data management team. No audit is required, and no data monitoring committee will
be established. No interim analysis is planned.

408

# 409 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

410 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Scientific Advisory Board of J-SUPPORT 411 (registration No. 2104) and by the Institutional Review Board of the National Cancer Center Hospital 412 (registration No. 2020-500). If significant protocol modifications are necessary, the investigators will 413 discuss and report them to the committee for approval. The study will be conducted following the 414 ethical guidelines for clinical studies published by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and 415 Technology and the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, the modified Act on the Protection of 416 Personal Information, and the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The results of the RCT will 417 be published in peer-reviewed scientific journals and presented at scientific meetings. After 418 completing this RCT, our team will explore possibilities for expanding the app's availability. 419

## 420 Trial status

421 The study is currently recruiting participants; enrollment is scheduled through March 2023, with422 follow-up through September 2023.

423

# 424 **DISCUSSION**

This study uses the mobile app to improve communication between patients and healthcare
providers regarding ACP. Although the apps for behavior change and psychological intervention are

427	increasing, this study is unique in its focus on facilitating communication related to ACP. Enhancing
428	patients' autonomous motivation is one of the mechanisms that can improve ACP discussion. [46]
429	The advantage of the app program is that participants can find an environment and time where they
430	can relax and actively engage in ACP. This is especially significant for cancer patients in the ACP
431	program who need to think about their future treatment and life and express their values and what is
432	crucial to them. The scoping review by McMahan et al. reported a lack of studies on healthcare
433	systems and policies in the context of ACP. [5] It is expected that a healthcare system will be
434	constructed so that ACP can reach the overall population in need. [47] The strength of ACP
435	implemented with apps is the ease of adaptation to the healthcare system, which is promising in a
436	world where COVID-19 situations are uncertain.
437	For the evaluation of ACP discussions, there is currently no gold standard for assessing
438	discussions between patients and healthcare providers and their outcomes. Previous studies have
439	used family assessments [15 20] and the originally developed composite communication assessment.
440	[19] We expect the outcomes of this study will provide multiple communication components
441	confirming the facilitation of various aspects of ACP discussions. We hypothesized that introducing
442	ACP discussions early in cancer treatment would improve communication with healthcare providers
443	and lead to ongoing discussions, which would help improve health outcomes and end-of-life care.
444	However, these outcomes could only be evaluated in an exploratory manner in this study, and it is
445	urgent to evaluate patient-centered outcomes, such as goal-concordant care, in the future. [43]
446	Although the eligibility criteria are based on ACP guidelines, depending on the participant's
447	readiness, some participants may feel it is too early to consider future treatment and end-of-life while
448	undergoing cancer treatment. There has been much discussion about the appropriate timing of ACP,

449	which is likely to be triggered by a patient's deteriorating health or reduced treatment options. [48]
450	However, there is no evidence regarding the appropriate timing for introducing ACP discussions,
451	[48] and it is assumed that some participants may find this intervention burdensome. Moreover,
452	healthcare providers might hesitate to initiate the discussion for fear of causing anxiety to the patient;
453	thus, more careful ACP referrals and a qualitative exploration of study dropouts are required.
454	The study has several methodological limitations. Although not all eligible patients may own a
455	mobile device compatible with the app, we determined device access would not limit eligibility.
456	Hence, to allow for a diverse group of participants, iPads able to run the program app were on loan
457	as alternative means of participation. While patients unfamiliar with app use could participate in this
458	study, consideration should be given to patients who are unable to use the app when adapting to the
459	real world.
460	Second, the intervention package consists of multiple components, including the introductory
461	session with the app, and patients' choice of questions to ask and share with their oncologists. We
462	cannot indicate which components are most effective in improving communication. Individualized
463	evaluation of app usage, intervention adherence, and patient satisfaction should be conducted to
464	understand the challenges ahead for the next step.
465	Finally, we hypothesize that the intervention program will improve communication between
466	patients and oncologists, leading to ongoing discussions and improving the quality of end-of-life
467	care, but with the limitation that it is a partial and indirect evaluation of ACP. Although the primary
468	outcome was selected after careful consideration, there is no established method for evaluating ACP,
469	and standardized measurement is still a challenge.
470	

# 471 Acknowledgments

- 472 We thank Ms. A. Akama and Mr. N. Akama for their support with data management. We thank
- 473 Dr. K. Sudo, Dr. C. Morizane, Dr. T. Yoshida, Ms. T. Mashiko, Mr. Y. Watanabe, Mr. T. Motohashi,
- 474 and Dr. Shimazu for their advice about our study. We also thank Ms. K. Shinozaki, Ms. M. Okubo,
- 475 Ms. I. Tanaka, Ms. H. Kouno, Ms. H. Masubuchi, Ms. C. Kida, Ms. K. Hata, Ms. A. Sato, Mr. S.
- 476 Goto, and Ms. M. Kanamaru for data collection and logistic assistance.

477

## 478 Authors' contributions

479 YU is the principal investigator. YU and MF conceived the concept of the study. YU, MF, NB,

480 TA, MM, NS, TU, AO, TM, and MK were involved in the study design. TY and SO developed the

- 481 statistical analysis plan. AO and TM played roles in data management. KO, MK, MO, and MF
- 482 contributed to data collection. YU, MF, and MO supervised the conduct of this study. KO, MO, and
- 483 MF drafted the manuscript. YU, NB, TA, MM, and the other authors contributed substantially to the
- 484 revision of the manuscript. All authors have approved the manuscript as submitted and agreed to

485 accept responsibility for any part of the work.

486

### 487 **Funding**

488 This study is funded by the Health Labour Sciences Research Grant from The Ministry of Health

- 489 Labour and Welfare Japan (Funding ID: 20EA1010) and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B)
- 490 from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Funding ID: 19H03878) to PI Yosuke
- 491 Uchitomi. These funders were not involved in the design of this study and will not play any role in
- 492 its conduct, analysis, interpretation of data, or decision to submit results. The work is endorsed by the

Japan Supportive, Palliative and Psychosocial Oncology Group (J-SUPPORT) as the J-SUPPORT
2104 study, funded by the National Cancer Center Research and Development Fund (30A-11).

## 496 **Competing interests**

Competing interests: All authors declare that they have no competing interests regarding this 497 498 work. BN reports grants from Ono Pharmaceutical and Takeda Pharmaceutical, and personal fees 499 from Ono Pharmaceutical, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Daiichi Sankyo, and Taiho Pharmaceutical. TA 500 reports grants from Daiichi Sankyo, Eisai, Fujifilm RI Pharma, MSD, Otsuka Pharmaceutical, and Shionogi, personal fees from Igaku-Shoin, AstraZeneca, Chugai Pharmaceutical, Daiichi Sankyo, 501 502 Sumitomo Dainippon Pharma, Eisai, Janssen Pharmaceutical, Kyowa Kirin, Eli Lilly, MSD, Meiji 503 Seika Pharma, Mochida Pharmaceutical, NIPRO, Nippon Zoki Pharmaceutical, Otsuka 504 Pharmaceutical, Pfizer, Takeda Pharmaceutical and Viatris, and pending patents (2019-017498 & 505 2020-135195). TY reports grants or contracts from AC Medical Inc., A2 Healthcare Corporation, EP 506 Croit Co., Ltd., ClinChoice., Japan Tobacco Inc., Japan Media Corporation, Medidata Solutions, 507 Inc., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Asahi Intecc Co., Ltd., 3H Clinical Trial Inc., Medrio, Inc., 508 Nipro Corporation, Intellim Corporation, Welby Inc., 3H Medi Solution Inc., Nipro Corporation, BaseConnect Inc., Nobori Ltd., Puravida Technologies LLC., and Hemp Kitchen Inc. and grants to 509 510 the affiliated institutions from Kyowa Kirin Co., Ltd., Tsumura & CO., Daiichi Sankyo Company, 511 Limited., Otsuka Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., and Eisai Co., Ltd., and consulting fees from EPS 512 Corporation., Japan Tobacco Inc., Medidata Solutions, Inc., Ono Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Kowa 513 Company, Ltd., Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., Tsumura & Co., Daiichi Sankyo Company, 514 Limited., Eisai Co., Ltd., Asahi Intecc Co., Ltd., Asahi Kasei Pharma Corporation, 3H Clinical Trial

- 515 Inc., Intellim Corporation, Takeda, AstraZeneca, Sonire Therapeutics Inc., Seikagaku Corporation,
- and Merck & Co., Inc., and personal fees from Nipro Corporation.
- 517

## 518 **Trial registration number**

519 UMIN000045305; NCT05045040

# 520 **REFERENCES**

- 5211Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of522incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin
- 523 2021;71:209–49. doi: 10.3322/caac.21660 [Published online first:209–49].
- Bennardi M, Diviani N, Gamondi C, et al. Palliative care utilization in oncology and hematooncology: A systematic review of cognitive barriers and facilitators from the perspective of
  healthcare professionals, adult patients, and their families. *BMC Palliat Care* 2020;19:47.
  doi: 10.1186/s12904-020-00556-7 [Published online first:47].
- Abedini NC, Hechtman RK, Singh AD, et al. Interventions to reduce aggressive care at end
  of life among patients with cancer: A systematic review. *Lancet Oncol* 2019;20:e627–36. doi:
  10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30496-6.
- 531 4 Cripe LD, Vater LB, Lilly JA et al.. Goals of care communication and higher-value care for
  532 patients with advanced-stage cancer: A systematic review of the evidence. *Patient Educ*533 *Couns* 2022;105:1138–51
- 5 McMahan RD, Tellez I, Sudore RL. Deconstructing the complexities of advance care
  planning outcomes: What do we know and where do we go? A scoping review. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2021;69:234–44. doi: 10.1111/jgs.16801 [Published online first:234–44].
- Jimenez G, Tan WS, Virk AK et al.. Overview of Systematic Reviews of Advance Care
  Planning: Summary of Evidence and Global Lessons. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2018;56:436–
  459.e25
- 540 7 Gilligan T, Coyle N, Frankel RM, et al. Patient-clinician communication: American Society
  541 of Clinical Oncology consensus guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2017;35:3618–32. doi:
- 542 <u>10.1200/JCO.2017.75.2311</u> [Published online first:3618–32].
- 543 8 National Comprehensive Cancer Network. *Palliat Care. Version 2* 2021.
- Parajuli J, Tark A, Jao YL, et al. Barriers to palliative and hospice care utilization in older
  adults with cancer: A systematic review. *J Geriatr Oncol* 2020;11:8–16. doi:
- 546 <u>10.1016/j.jgo.2019.09.017</u> [Published online first:8–16].

547 10 Brandes K, Linn AJ, Butow PN, et al. The characteristics and effectiveness of Question 548 Prompt List interventions in oncology: A systematic review of the literature. Psycho-549 Oncology 2015;24:245-52. doi: 10.1002/pon.3637 [Published online first: 2014/08/02]. 550 Temel JS, Greer JA, El-Jawahri A, et al. Effects of early integrated palliative care in patients 11 551 with lung and GI cancer: A randomized clinical trial. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:834-41. doi: 552 10.1200/JCO.2016.70.5046 [Published online first:834-41]. Bouleuc C, Savignoni A, Chevrier M, et al. A question prompt list for advanced cancer 553 12 554 patients promoting advance care planning: A French randomized trial. J Pain Symptom 555 Manage 2021;61:331-341.e8. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2020.07.026 [Published online 556 first: 2020/08/03]. 557 Houben CHM, Spruit MA, Groenen MTJ, et al. Efficacy of advance care planning: A 13 558 systematic review and meta-analysis. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2014;15:477-89. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2014.01.008 [Published online first:477-89]. 559 560 14 Korfage IJ, Carreras G, Arnfeldt Christensen CM, et al. Advance care planning in patients 561 with advanced cancer: A 6-country, cluster-randomised clinical trial. PLOS Med 2020;17:e1003422. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003422 [Published online first: 2020/11/14]. 562 563 15 Bernacki R, Paladino J, Neville BA, et al. Effect of the serious illness care program in 564 outpatient oncology: A cluster randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2019;179:751-59. 565 doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.0077 [Published online first: 2019/03/15]. 566 16 Starr LT, Ulrich CM, Corey KL, et al. Associations among end-of-life discussions, healthcare utilization, and costs in persons with advanced cancer: A systematic review. Am J Hosp 567 568 Palliat Care 2019;36:913-26. doi: 10.1177/1049909119848148 [Published online first:913-569 26]. 570 Walczak A, Butow PN, Tattersall MH, et al. Encouraging early discussion of life expectancy 17 571 and end-of-life care: A randomised controlled trial of a nurse-led communication support 572 program for patients and caregivers. Int J Nurs Stud 2017;67:31-40. doi: 573 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2016.10.008 [Published online first: 2016/12/03]. 574 Bickell NA, Back AL, Adelson K, et al. Effects of a communication intervention randomized 18 controlled trial to enable goals-of-care discussions. JCO Oncol Pract 2020;16:e1015-28. doi: 575 10.1200/OP.20.00040 [Published online first:20200506]. 576 577 19 Epstein RM, Duberstein PR, Fenton JJ, et al. Effect of a patient-centered communication 578 intervention on oncologist-patient communication, quality of life, and health care utilization 579 in advanced cancer: The VOICE randomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncol 2017;3:92-100. doi: 580 10.1001/jamaoncol.2016.4373 [Published online first: 2016/09/10]. 581 20 Johnson SB, Butow PN, Bell ML, et al. A randomised controlled trial of an advance care 582 planning intervention for patients with incurable cancer. Br J Cancer 2018;119:1182–90. doi: 583 10.1038/s41416-018-0303-7 [Published online first: 2018/10/30].

584 21 Fujimori M, Sato A, Jinno S, et al. Integrated communication support program for oncologists, caregivers and patients with rapidly progressing advanced cancer to promote 585 586 patient-centered communication: J-SUPPORT 1904 study protocol for a randomised 587 controlled trial. BMJ Open 2020;10:e036745. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036745 [Published 588 online first: 2020/09/25]. 589 A randomized controlled trial with a cluster of oncologists evaluating of an integrated 22 590 communication support program for oncologists, caregivers, and patients with rapidly 591 progressing advanced cancer on patient-centered conversation: J-SUPPORT 1704 study. J 592 Clin Oncol. ASCO Annual Meeting 2021. 593 Walczak A, Mazer B, Butow PN, et al. A question prompt list for patients with advanced 23 594 cancer in the final year of life: Development and cross-cultural evaluation. Palliat Med 595 2013;27:779-88. doi: 10.1177/0269216313483659 [Published online first: 2013/05/01]. 596 Rodenbach RA, Brandes K, Fiscella K, et al. Promoting end-of-life discussions in advanced 24 597 cancer: Effects of patient coaching and question prompt lists. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:842-51. 598 doi: 10.1200/JCO.2016.68.5651 [Published online first: 2017/01/31]. 599 Sato A, Fujimori M, Shirai Y et al. Assessing the need for a question prompt list that 25 600 encourages end-of-life discussions between patients with advanced cancer and their physicians: A focus group interview study. Palliat Support Care 2022;20:564-9 601 602 26 Halpern SD. Goal-concordant care - Searching for the Holy Grail. N Engl J Med 603 2019;381:1603-06. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1908153 [Published online first: 2019/10/24]. 604 27 Roberts AL, Fisher A, Smith L, et al. Digital health behaviour change interventions targeting 605 physical activity and diet in cancer survivors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J 606 Cancer Surviv 2017;11:704–19. doi: 10.1007/s11764-017-0632-1 [Published online 607 first:704–19]. 608 Stockwell S, Schofield P, Fisher A, et al. Digital behavior change interventions to promote 28 physical activity and/or reduce sedentary behavior in older adults: A systematic review and 609 610 meta-analysis. Exp Gerontol 2019;120:68-87. doi: 10.1016/j.exger.2019.02.020 [Published 611 online first:68-87]. 612 29 Akechi T, Yamaguchi T, Uchida M, et al. Smartphone problem-solving and behavioural activation therapy to reduce fear of recurrence among patients with breast cancer 613 614 (SMartphone Intervention to LEssen fear of cancer recurrence: SMILE project): Protocol for 615 a randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open 2018;8:e024794. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-024794 [Published online first:e024794]. 616 Wang Y, Lin Y, Chen J, et al. Effects of Internet-based psycho-educational interventions on 617 30 618 mental health and quality of life among cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-619 analysis. Support Care Cancer 2020;28:2541-52. doi: 10.1007/s00520-020-05383-3 620 [Published online first:2541–52].

62131Moss AH, Lunney JR, Culp S, et al. Prognostic significance of the "surprise" question in622cancer patients. J Palliat Med 2010;13:837–40. doi: 10.1089/jpm.2010.0018 [Published

- 623 online first: 2010/07/20].
- Fujimori M, Shirai Y, Asai M, et al. Development and preliminary evaluation of
  communication skills training program for oncologists based on patient preferences for
  communicating bad news. *Palliat Support Care* 2014;12:379–86. doi:
- 627 <u>10.1017/S147895151300031X</u> [Published online first: 2013/11/05].
- 62833Roter D, Larson S. The Roter interaction analysis system (RIAS): Utility and flexibility for629analysis of medical interactions. *Patient Educ Couns* 2002;46:243–51
- 632 <u>10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00173-3</u> [Published online first: 2002/07/30].
- Takayama T, Yamazaki Y, Katsumata N. Relationship between outpatients' perceptions of
  physicians' communication styles and patients' anxiety levels in a Japanese oncology setting. *Soc Sci Med* 2001;53:1335–50. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(00)00413-5 [Published online first:
  2001/10/26].
- 637 36 Ong LM, Visser MR, Kruyver IP, et al. The Roter Interaction Analysis System (RIAS) in
   638 oncological consultations: Psychometric properties. *Psychooncology* 1998;7:387–401. doi:
   639 <u>10.1002/(SICI)1099-1611(1998090)7:5<387::AID-PON316>3.0.CO;2-G</u> [Published online
   640 first: 1998/11/11].
- Fujimori M, Shirai Y, Asai M, et al. Effect of communication skills training program for
  oncologists based on patient preferences for communication when receiving bad news: A
  randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2014;32:2166–72. doi: <u>10.1200/JCO.2013.51.2756</u>
  [Published online first: 2014/06/11].
- 645 38 Ong LM, Visser MR, Lammes FB et al. Doctor-patient communication and cancer patients'
  646 quality of life and satisfaction. *Patient Educ Couns* 2000;41:145–56
- 647 39 Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*648 1983;67:361–70.
- Kugaya A, Akechi T, Okuyama T, et al. Screening for psychological distress in Japanese
  cancer patients. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 1998;28:333–38.
- Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, et al. The European Organization for Research and
  Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: A quality-of-life instrument for use in international clinical
  trials in oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1993;85:365–76.
- Kobayashi K, Takeda F, Teramukai S, et al. A cross-validation of the European Organization
  for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30 (EORTC QLQ-C30) for Japanese with lung
  cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 1998;34:810–5. doi: <u>10.1016/S0959-8049(97)00395-X</u> [Published
- 657 online first: 1998/11/03].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.15.22281288; this version posted November 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medicative a license to display the prepri
perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license.

658	43	Sudore RL, Heyland DK, Lum HD et al. Outcomes That Define Successful Advance Care
659		Planning: A Delphi Panel Consensus. J Pain Symptom Manage 2018;55:245-255.e8
660	44	Blanchard CG, Ruckdeschel JC, Fletcher BA, et al. The impact of oncologists' behaviors on
661		patient satisfaction with morning rounds. Cancer 1986;58:387-93. doi: 10.1002/1097-
662		0142(19860715)58:2<387::aid-cncr2820580233>3.0.co;2-3 [Published online first:
663		1986/07/15].
664	45	Zandbelt LC, Smets EM, Oort FJ, et al. Satisfaction with the outpatient encounter: A
665		comparison of patients' and physicians' views. J Gen Intern Med 2004;19:1088-95. doi:
666		<u>10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30420.x</u> [Published online first: 2004/11/30].
667	46	Lin CP, Evans CJ, Koffman J, et al. The conceptual models and mechanisms of action that
668		underpin advance care planning for cancer patients: A systematic review of randomised
669		controlled trials. Palliat Med 2019;33:5-23. doi: 10.1177/0269216318809582 [Published
670		online first:5–23].
671	47	Periyakoil VS, Gunten CFV, Arnold R, et al. Caught in a loop with advance care planning
672		and advance directives: How to move forward? J Palliat Med 2022;25:355-60. doi:
673		<u>10.1089/jpm.2022.0016</u> .
674	48	Johnson S, Butow P, Kerridge I, et al. Advance care planning for cancer patients: A
675		systematic review of perceptions and experiences of patients, families, and healthcare
676		providers. Psycho-Oncology 2016;25:362-86. doi: 10.1002/pon.3926 [Published online
677		first:362–86].
(70		

678



Figure 1. CONSORT diagram

Table 1. Schedule for outcome measurement

	то	T1	T2	Т3	T4
Outcomes	Baseline	Next oncologist visit scheduled after one week	Follow up at 1 week	Follow up at 12 weeks	Follow up at 24 weeks
Primary outcome measure					
Oncologist's communication beha	viors				
SHARE score (RE subscale)		$\bigcirc$			
Secondary outcome measures					
Oncologist's communication beha	viors				
SHARE score (S, H, and A subscales)		0			
Communication behavior between	n participan	t and oncologist			
Number of communication behaviors evaluated by RIAS		0			
Number of conversations about ACP		0			
Psychological distress					
HADS	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	0
Quality of life					
EORTC-QLQ-C30	0		0	0	0
Participant care goals and preferre	ed place for	sending their final	days		
Care Goals and Preferred Place for Spending Their Final Days	$\bigcirc$			$\bigcirc$	0
Participant satisfaction with their of	oncologists	consultation			
PSQ		0			
Feasibility of the intervention					
Usefulness, helpfulness, and comfort level of the intervention program		O			
Application log records					Ô
Demographics and clinical chara	cteristics				
Medical care utilization					$\bigcirc$
Medical and social background	0				

© Evaluated only in patients in the intervention group.

ACP, advance care planning; EORTC-QLQ-C30, European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire Core 30; HADS, Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; PSQ, Patient satisfaction questionnaire; RIAS, Roter interaction analysis system; SHARE communication model comprising four subscales categorized: S, Supportive environment; H, How to deliver bad news; A, Additional information; RE, Reassurance and Emotional support.

Contents	Co	omponent Descriptions			
OPL part	PL part Eight topics (number of items for each topic):				
with 45	1.	1. Diagnosis and stage of disease (4)			
questions	2.	Current treatment (7)			
categorized	3.	Symptom management and palliative care (4)			
into the 8	4.	Future treatment (6)			
topics	5.	Future living arrangements (9)			
-	6.	When standard treatment is no longer available (7)			
	7.	Prognosis for the future (5)			
	8.	Support for family (3).			
Identifying	Th	ree questions:			
the	1.	Things you value in terms of treatment and spending your days.			
participant's		Question-1: This is a list of common examples of things people value in terms of			
values part		treatment and spending the last days. Please select the one (or more) that you feel			
		you would value.			
		Options: 18 domains of the Good Death Inventory (e.g., "Physical and psychological			
		comfort" "Not Being a burden to others" "Good relationship with family")			
	2.	Goals in terms of treatment and spending the last days developed based on the			
		Goal Concordant Care framework.			
		Question-2: Please think about if you were to become ill or have difficulty			
		continuing anticancer treatment as recommended by your doctor, then think about			
		your goals for your further treatment and how you would like to spend your days.			
		The following are some general examples of goals for treatment and spending time.			
		Please choose one that most closely matches your idea.			
		Options: 1) I would like to receive treatment that relieves symptoms so that I can			
		live a peaceful life, but I do not want to receive any cancer treatment that has any			
		side effects or burdens, 2) I would like to receive cancer treatment that has few side			
		effects and burdens so that I can continue my life as before, 3) I have important			
		things I need to do, so I would like to receive cancer treatment even if there are side			
		effects or burdens so that I can accomplish them, and 4) I would like to receive all			
		cancer treatments, no matter what side effects or burdens they may cause, so that			
	h	i can live as long as possible.			
	3.	Praces to spend the last days:			
		Question-3: choose where they would like to spend their days			
		Options: nome, nospital near their nome, palliative care unit/hospice, hospital they			
		are visiting, or other.			

Table 2. Intervention Program (QPL + Identifying patients' value)

Categories	Definitions		Subscores (range: 0–4 for each item)
S: Supportive	Setting up the	1)	Greeting a patient cordially
environment	supporting environment	2)	Taking sufficient time
	of the consultation		
H: How to	Make consideration for	1)	Encouraging a patient to ask questions
deliver bad	how to deliver the bad	2)	Not beginning bad news without preamble
news	news	3)	Asking how much you know about patient's illness
			before breaking bad news
		4)	Not using technical words (using actual images and
			test data, Writing on paper to explain)
		5)	Checking to see that patients understand
		6)	Checking to see whether talk is fast paced
		7)	Clearly communicating the main points of bad news
A: Additional	Discuss about additional	1)	Answering patient's fully
information	information	2)	Explaining the status of patient's illness
		3)	Telling the prospects of cancer cure
		4)	Providing information on support services
		5)	Discussing patient's daily activities and work in the future
		6)	Explaining a second opinion
		7)	Checking guestions
		8)	Discussing the patient's future treatment and care
RE:	Provision reassurance	1)	Asking about patient's worry and concern
Reassurance	and addressing the	2)	Saying words to prepare mentally
and Emotional	patient's emotion with	3)	Remaining silent for concern for patient feelings
support	empathetic responses	4)	Accepting patient's expressing emotions
		5)	Saying words that soothe patient feelings
		6)	Telling in a way with hope
		7)	Telling what patient can hope for
		8)	Assuming responsibility for patient's care until the end
		9)	Discussing patient values

colorists' Table 3 On the SUADE adir icatio .1

<b>RIAS clusters (N of categories)</b>	Definitions	Categories
Setting up the interview (1)	Social behavior	Personal remarks and social conversation
Reassurance and empathic	Emotional	Empathy
response (9)	responses,	Legitimizing
		Asks for reassurance
		Showing partnership
		Agreement
		Encourages or shows optimism
		Concern and worry
		Approval
		Asks psychosocial feelings
Medical and the other	Providing	Information giving:
information giving (4)	information	Medical condition
	related to medical	I nerapeutic regimen
	Care	Psychosocial reelings
		Medical condition/thorapoutic regimen
How to deliver the bad news (7)	Attitudes when	Ouestion asking (open-ended):
now to deliver the bad news (7)	communicating	Medical condition
	had news	Lifestyle information
	bud news	Orientations and instruction
		Asks for opinion
		Asks for permission
		Asks for understanding
		Paraphrasing or checking

Table 4. Communication behaviors of both participants and oncologists: the Roter interaction process analysis system

RIAS, Roter interaction analysis system

Name of category groups	Categories	
(N of categories)	-	
Affective categories (16)	1) Personal remarks and social conversation	
<b>2</b> • • •	2) Laugh, tells jokes	
	3) Approval	
	4) Gives compliment (general)	
	5) Disapproval (direct)	
	6) Criticism (general)	
	7) Agreement	
	8) Back-channel responses	
	9) Remediation	
	10) Empathy	
	11) Legitimizing	
	12) Concern and worry	
	13) Encourages or shows optimism	
	14) Asks for reassurance	
	15) Showing partnership (oncologist only)	
	16) Self-disclosure (oncologist only)	
Instrumental (task) categories (25)	1) Orientations and instruction	
	2) Paraphrasing or checking	
	3) Asks for understanding	
	4) Bid for repetition	
	5) Asks for opinion (oncologist only)	
	<ul> <li>Asks for permission (oncologist only)</li> <li>Transition words</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Request for services or medication (natient only)</li> </ul>	
	c) request for services of medication (patient only)	
	Information giving:	
	9) Medical condition	
	11) Lifestyle information	
	12) Psychosocial feelings	
	13) Other information	
	Question action (anon and all)	
	Question asking (open-ended):	
	15) Therapeutic regimen	
	16) Lifestyle information	
	17) Psychosocial feelings	
	18) Other information	
	Ouestion asking (closed):	
	19) Medical condition	
	20) Therapeutic regimen	
	21) Lifestyle information	
	22) Psychosocial feelings	
	23) Other Information	
	Counseling (oncologist only):	
	24) Medical condition/therapeutic regimen	
	25) Lifestyle and psychosocial	

### Table A1 The RIAS all categories (Noro et al. 2011)

Other (1)

1) Unintelligible utterances

RIAS, Roter interaction analysis system.

Noro, I., Abe, K., & Ishikawa, H. (2011). Medical Communication Analysis Methods -The Roter method of interaction process analysis system (RIAS)- [Iryo comyunikeishion bunseki no houho (in Japanese)] (2nd ed.). Sankeisha CO.,LTD.