

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Involving patients in cancer multidisciplinary team decisions: an impossible task?

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-061654
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Feb-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Hamilton, David; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute; Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Heaven, Benjamin; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Thomson, Richard; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Wilson, Janet; University of Newcastle, Population Health Sciences Institute Exley, Catherine; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Head & neck surgery < OTOLARYNGOLOGY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **Title: Involving patients in cancer multidisciplinary team decisions:**  
6 **an impossible task?**  
7

8 **DW Hamilton**

9 Consultant Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Honorary Senior Lecturer  
10 Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN  
11 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX  
12  
13

14 **B Heaven**

15 Formerly Newcastle University, has now left academia  
16

17 **R G Thomson**

18 Emeritus Professor  
19 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX  
20  
21

22 **JA Wilson**

23 Emerita Professor of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
24 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX  
25  
26

27 **C Exley**

28 Professor of Qualitative Health Research  
29 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX  
30  
31

32 Corresponding Author:

33 DW Hamilton

34 Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN

35 [David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk)  
36

37 **Keywords**

38 Decision Making, Shared

39 Communication

40 Cancer

41 Anthropology, Cultural

42 Informed consent

43 Autonomy  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

### Objectives

To describe how patients are engaged with cancer decisions in the context of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and how MDT recommendations are operationalised in the context of a shared decision.

### Design

Ethnographic qualitative study

### Setting

Four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

### Participants

Patients with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer; non-participant observation of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT clinics, informal interviews, and formal, semi-structured interviews with 20 patients and 9 MDT staff members

### Results

MDT discussions often conclude with a firm recommendation for treatment. When delivered to a patient in clinic this recommendation is often accepted by the patient, but this response may result from the disempowered position in which they find themselves. Whilst patient behaviour may thus appear to endorse clinicians' views that a paternalistic approach is desired by patients (creating a "cycle of paternalism"), the rigidity of the MDT treatment recommendation can act as a barrier to discussion of options and the exploration of patient values.

### Conclusions

The current model of MDT decision making does not support shared decision making and may actively undermine it. A model should be developed whereby the individual patient

1  
2  
3 perspective has more input into MDT discussions, and where decisions are made on potential  
4 treatment options rather than providing a single recommendation for discussion with the  
5 patient. Deeper consideration should be given to how the MDT incorporates the patient  
6 perspective and/or delivers its discussion of options to the patient. In order to achieve these  
7 objectives, a new model of MDT working is required.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 Word count: 3732  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

## Introduction

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) decision making is internationally mandated to support appropriate high-quality treatment of patients with cancer <sup>1</sup>. In the UK, MDT working was established following the Calman-Hine report <sup>2</sup> and improves many aspects of cancer treatment such as staging, recruitment to trials <sup>1</sup>, adherence to treatment guidelines <sup>3</sup>, use of effective evidence-based therapy, timeliness of care <sup>4</sup> and access to the allied members of the healthcare team <sup>5</sup>. However the practice is time consuming and expensive, costing at least £100 million a year in the UK for data preparation and the same amount again for attendance in the UK <sup>6</sup>. To date no MDT cost-benefit analysis has been performed. The effect on cancer survival is less clear; in head and neck cancer MDT working is reported to have a positive effect on survival <sup>7-9</sup>, but it is difficult to determine whether survival changes over time are causally related.

MDT members report that consideration of the patient as a person in decision making as a vital part of the decision-making process. In a survey of 2054 MDT members, 95% of respondents felt that “Patient views should always inform the decision-making process” and “Patient views/preferences should be presented to the MDT by somebody who has met the patient” <sup>10</sup>. Omitting patient preference information has an effect on the implementation of MDT recommendations <sup>11-13</sup>. MDT meetings are often dominated by discussion among doctors rather than including other MDT members who may know the patient better or have a more patient-centred perspective <sup>14-16</sup> creating a predominance of the biomedical model of disease <sup>17</sup>. This means that the stated aim of many MDT members - to have the patient central to the MDT treatment discussion - is at odds with the reality of the MDT process. We have previously described that if MDT meetings are to become more patient-centred, merely introducing increasing amounts of information about the patient into the MDT is not

1  
2  
3 sufficient<sup>18</sup>. Although we know that the direct viewpoint of the patient within the MDT is  
4  
5 lacking<sup>19</sup>, there is to date no account of how patients engage with decisions about their  
6  
7 treatment in the context of MDTs. This work aims to address that knowledge gap.  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **Methods**

13  
14  
15  
16 This qualitative study used non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews to  
17  
18 critically examine how decisions were made in and around the MDT with a particular focus  
19  
20 on patient centredness. All data were collected by one researcher (DWH), a head and neck  
21  
22 surgeon. Non-participant observation enables the researcher to study participants in their  
23  
24 natural environment, and adds value to retrospective accounts gleaned only through  
25  
26 participant interviews<sup>20</sup>.  
27  
28  
29

## 30 31 **Patient and Public Involvement**

32  
33  
34 Two head and neck patient groups were consulted during development of the research  
35  
36 question, study design and protocol development, but patients were not involved in data  
37  
38 gathering and analysis.  
39  
40

## 41 42 **Ethical Approval**

43  
44  
45 Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2  
46  
47 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and  
48  
49 Development governance permissions were obtained. All participant gave informed consent  
50  
51 to be included in the study.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Sampling

Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Concepts arising from the patient-derived data drove the subsequent data collection and analysis. A range of staff members who were part of the MDT were also recruited for interview. Purposive sampling<sup>21</sup> guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection and analysis occurring in tandem. Thus, further sampling was guided by the emerging analysis<sup>22</sup> and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency<sup>23</sup> was achieved.

## Observations

Non-participant observations of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT outpatient clinics were conducted. Patient with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer whose treatment options were being discussed in the MDT were included. They were excluded if they did not understand written or spoken English, or they did not have the capacity to consent. The MDT meetings and clinics were all audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Detailed field notes were also made at the time of observation, then transcribed immediately afterwards.

## Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients and staff. The development of the interview guide was iterative; as data collection continued, the content of the guide evolved in order to explore emerging themes. Informal interviews with staff members of the MDT also took place and were incorporated into written field notes. Pseudonyms are used for reporting data throughout to protect the anonymity of respondents.

## Analysis

The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory<sup>21</sup>. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were analysed using the same coding framework. Line by line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework; when the coding framework was altered, all transcripts were re-coded. The codes used were conceptual, rather than descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package. Emerging findings (and ‘memos’) were discussed in the research team to develop the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling

## Results

The research was conducted in four head and neck cancer (HNC) centres in the north east of England. In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present; following this, one or more members of the MDT met with the patient in clinic.

### MDT recommendation for “best treatment”

The MDT meeting discussion often tends towards debate on which treatment is “best” for a patient amongst the available options. In the following interview extract, a maxillofacial surgeon describes his view of the aim of the MDT discussion:

[The team] need to leave the MDT [meeting] with the treatment options ...prioritised. So a rank order of [the] best treatment clinically – slightly irrespective of the patient’s wishes. From a clinical point of view to try and get best outcome, this would be our first, this would be our second, this would be third and fourth and fifth. Then you discuss it with the patient and say, “This is what we think.”

1  
2  
3 In this data extract, the surgeon clearly states his view that the aim of the MDT discussion is  
4 to decide the “clinically” best treatment for the patient and even goes as far to say that this  
5 could be “irrespective” of the patient’s wishes. Teams frequently conclude their discussion  
6 of treatment options in the MDT meeting with an agreement for the recommendation which is  
7 to be delivered to the patient:  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 Mr Black (ENT surgeon): I have a database of the [laser resections] I have  
16 done .... tonsil and soft palate tumours, and it’s just....it’s something we  
17 need to take notice of  
18

19  
20 Mr Red (ENT surgeon): Yeah, I think we’ll need to, we’ll have to discuss  
21 it another time or we’ll take up the whole morning on one case. But, I think  
22 there are arguments for and against...  
23

24 Dr Orange (oncologist): I would suggest he has radiotherapy, because he  
25 will have a slightly better functional outcome, and he’s 80 and ...because of  
26 his age, and because of the possibly better function....would you Dr  
27 Yellow?  
28

29 Dr Yellow (oncologist): Yes  
30

31 Mr Red: I think there is a consensus view of the MDT, would be for  
32 radiotherapy  
33

34 MR Black: OK  
35

36 (Observation, MDT meeting)  
37  
38

39 Although, during this discussion, options of radiotherapy and laser were available to the  
40 patient, the position of the MDT meeting was to provide a recommendation for radiotherapy.  
41 This recommendation for “best treatment” is often conveyed to the patient on its own or in  
42 preference to other options (we have described this further in our previous paper <sup>18</sup>)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

### 49 **The “cycle of paternalism”**

50

51  
52 Anxious patients, faced with complex decisions in the setting of a potentially life-limiting  
53 disease often turn to their clinicians for guidance. This, in turn, leads to patients endorsing  
54 the paternalistic approach as they are given little or no information about the available  
55 treatment choices and therefore tend to delegate responsibility of the decision to the clinician:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Pt: You know, they're the doctors, they're the professional people. And I'm  
4 just Joe Bloggs off the street. ...For a lot of years, I was a steel erector. I  
5 wouldn't expect you as a doctor coming along and doing what I could do.  
6 Do I?  
7

8  
9 Interviewer: You feel a decision should be the doctor's decision?  
10

11 Pt: Oh, definitely, without a doubt. It's got to be the doctor's decision.  
12 How could I make a decision like that?  
13

14 Here, the patient delegates the decision to the MDT without question; he is allowing the  
15 MDT's assessment of 'best' treatment to act as the sole basis for a treatment decision. If  
16 decision delegation is accepted as the method by which MDTs convey and make decisions, a  
17 paternalistic decision making process results. In this model, the patient accepts that the  
18 MDT's assessment of 'best' (and hence the treatment recommendation) is appropriate. It  
19 creates a "cycle of paternalism" with grateful patients accepting firm recommendations from  
20 clinicians and clinicians reassured that they are doing their best for their patients.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **Delivery of the MDT treatment recommendation**

31  
32 Firm MDT recommendations can sometimes place the clinician in a difficult position when  
33 discussing options. The following extract is the clinic appointment for Vincent Lowry (the  
34 MDT meeting extract was included above). Here Mr Black (who favoured laser in the MDT  
35 meeting, referred to here as "surgery") was delivering the MDT recommendation for  
36 radiotherapy to the patient:  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Mr Black: After a lot of discussion, the consensus.... would be to give you  
47 radiation therapy.... that was what we jointly decided. And we think with  
48 that treatment there is a very good chance of controlling your disease  
49 completely....  
50

51  
52 Pt: Well, I'll do as you say  
53

54 Daughter: So there's no other operation, it would just be radiotherapy?  
55

56 Mr Black: We discussed this at length at the meeting.... and the majority  
57 of people... felt that to be frank, except for me, felt that radiation would be  
58 the way forward. And.... that's what we are offering to you as first line  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 treatment. Unless you have any reservations, then we can think about other  
4 options.  
5

6 Pt: I'll do as you say....  
7

8 Daughter: Right. So he would have to come into hospital every day? He's  
9 a really bad traveller...  
10

11 Pt: You know when I come here I get all tensed up and travelling....  
12

13 Mr Black: Really? Is it likely you may then stop the treatment midway for  
14 whatever reason, because that would backfire very badly.  
15

16 Pt: I wouldn't do that  
17

18 Mr Black: I know you asked about the surgical option. I promised people I  
19 wouldn't say anything. But it is feasible to take it out surgically, and there  
20 is an option available, but the consensus at the MDT was to go ahead with  
21 radiation. Unless, as a family or yourself very strongly object to it and feel  
22 that you can't go ahead with that, then of course the surgical options is  
23 always there. But as a group we felt that the best way forward was to offer  
24 you radiation  
25

26 Pt: Well. I'll go with you  
27

28 (Observation, MDT Clinic)  
29

30  
31  
32 The final treatment decision was to deliver radiation, but the interaction above reveals the  
33 challenges of being tasked by the MDT to give a single recommendation when it is used in a  
34 decision discussion with a patient. Once new information was gleaned from the patient in  
35 clinic (being a "really bad traveller") Mr Black struggled with how to deal with the  
36 recommendations: was it a rule to be followed? The data presented also show that the level  
37 of patient involvement is often to either accept or "object" to the MDT recommendation. Not  
38 only is the patient given no basis for these objections, limiting patient involvement in such a  
39 way does not constitute shared decision-making. Here, the rigidity of the treatment  
40 recommendation acted as a barrier to an open discussion about the treatment options  
41 available to the patient and thus inhibited shared decision making.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Patient engagement with MDT recommendations

Modern clinical practice cannot assume that the sole role of the patient is the acceptance of a single firm treatment recommendations. John Winton was a 61 year old patient with an advanced cancer of his larynx. In the MDT it was decided that surgery would provide him with the best chance of survival but would remove his voice box. Radiotherapy is available, carries a lower chance of cure, but allows him to retain his voice box. The following data are from his clinic appointment:

Mr Black (ENT surgeon): This tumour in your throat is a fairly big tumour, and it's spread to the neck as well. We believe that there are two possible ways that we can manage this. At some parts of the scan, there is evidence that the tumour may have gone into the Adam's apple cartilage.... If that is the case, surgery would be the only option to get rid of the tumour. But surgery would involve you losing your voicebox, losing part of the swallowing passage, you would need a big neck operation....Once we do the surgery, your speech will be different, you won't be speaking the same. You will have a hole in the centre of your neck, a tracheostomy

Pt: Nah, nah [shakes head]

Mr Black: You wouldn't fancy that?

Pt: No

Mr Black: That's the surgical option. On the other side is the option of radiation therapy

Pt: I would rather take a chance with that

(Observation, MDT Clinic)

Here, and throughout the course of this consultation, the patient made a decision to reject surgery, which reduces his length of survival from his cancer in order to preserve his voice box. He was adamant he did not want a complete removal of the voice box and part of the throat (pharyngolaryngectomy) and the decision was eventually made to use radiotherapy. However, in the subsequent interview, Mr Winton discussed the rationale for his decision:

Pt: Well you see my mother died of cancer... my father died of cancer, and I've seen the way cancer works. I'm not being cheeky.... once they cut you

1  
2  
3 open, it's like your letting fresh air into a bulb, it then just spreads, and they  
4 stitch you back up again and "We've cured it", right, for how long? And  
5 then it comes back again...

6  
7  
8 Interviewer: And what's important to you when you're making that  
9 decision?

10  
11 Pt: Surviving as long as I can..., I mean if you get the year, 18 months it's  
12 better than getting two weeks isn't it?

13  
14 His consultation, which was limited in exploring what mattered to him, leads to a decision  
15 that is potentially at odds with his aspirations revealed above. His aim of treatment (survival)  
16 is not matched by the actual treatment decision (radiotherapy). This patient perspective could  
17 not be incorporated into the previous MDT discussion (which happened before the clinic  
18 appointment), but equally the subsequent clinic appointment did not explore his preferences  
19 and what underpinned them, risking a treatment decision at odds with his preferences and  
20 values. If Mr Black had explored the options for treatment with the patient more, this  
21 mismatch of treatment preferences and values could have been identified, and perhaps  
22 deconstructed. Such information about values and preferences is essential to good shared  
23 decision making, however very difficult to incorporate into the MDT decision making  
24 structure.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 Discussion

42  
43  
44  
45 The outcome of an MDT discussion is frequently a "best" or preferred treatment  
46 recommendation to act as the basis of a treatment decision to be delivered in the MDT clinic.  
47  
48 Often patients accept this recommendation in the clinic (perhaps precisely because it is  
49 presented as the "best" treatment). However, this acquiescence may be due to the  
50 disempowered position in which patients find themselves as they confront a terrifying  
51 diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn, clinicians often view the  
52 acceptance of an MDT recommendation as delegation of the decision by the patient to the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 clinician, an assumption which can promulgate a ‘cycle of paternalism’, where anxious  
4 patients have little real choice other than to accept the clear guidance offered by the expert  
5 team. Arguably, this paternalistic model of decision making is the inevitable result of the  
6 current MDT structure of working which does not adequately include the patient view, values  
7 or preferences which are key to a shared treatment decision.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 The rigidity of the MDT recommendation can act as a barrier to an open discussion of the  
17 available options. If the patient role is limited to either acceptance or refusal of a single  
18 recommendation, true engagement is impossible. A truncated discussion of a single MDT  
19 recommendation for treatment prohibits shared decision-making using the “three talk model”  
20 ,as central to this model is a discussion of the options for treatment. A shared decision-  
21 making consultation allows the patient and clinician to explore the risks, benefits and  
22 consequences of a treatment alternatives; a move from initial to informed preferences; and  
23 exploration of patient values to reach a shared decision<sup>24</sup>.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The structure of MDT working has not significantly changed since its inception in 1996.  
36  
37 NHS patients do not routinely attend their MDT meetings, modern cancer care mandates that  
38 all patients are discussed in this setting<sup>25</sup> and interventions to increase the number of patients  
39 discussed in an MDT are still sought after<sup>26</sup>.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **The MDT recommendation**

46  
47  
48 If the MDT meeting and clinic follow a paternalistic pathway, the way in which their  
49 recommendation is used is clear: it is delivered to the patient with an assumption that it will  
50 be accepted. Outwith the MDT decision process, a treatment recommendation from an  
51 individual clinician can be modified depending on the ongoing interaction with the patient  
52 and the preferences expressed. An MDT recommendation, on the other hand, is problematic  
53 for MDT members who attempt to combine it with the values or preferences of the patient. Is  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 it set in stone, an obligatory ‘best’ which must be adhered to? If the patient disagrees with  
4 the recommendation, what action should the MDT member take? In this way, MDT  
5 recommendations are inflexible, especially in the light of new information from the patient  
6 which was not clear or known in the MDT meeting. In other words, information about values  
7 and preferences are vital to a shared decision but difficult to incorporate into the MDT  
8 decision making structure. As we have previously described <sup>18</sup>, MDTs often build the  
9 “evidential patient” in the MDT meeting discussion. This may include information about a  
10 patient’s values and preferences, but these are impossible to incorporate into a meeting  
11 discussion without the patient present and without making assumptions about the patient.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Modernising MDT decision-making**

26  
27  
28 If we are to modernise the MDT decision making structure to improve patient involvement,  
29 the role of the MDT discussion and the structure of the clinic must recognise that patients  
30 often “distribute” decisions. Rapley <sup>27</sup> describes how patients demonstrate a ‘relational  
31 autonomy’ by distributing their decision amongst people, encounters, places and information  
32 sources. Promoting relational autonomy means that involving patients in decisions requires  
33 more than presenting options and awaiting a verdict, instead emphasising the importance of  
34 the interaction with the clinician, encouraging questions, correcting misunderstanding,  
35 constructing preferences and allowing disagreement <sup>28</sup>. Indeed, the MDT decision-making  
36 structure gives ample opportunity for MDT members to distribute their decision amongst  
37 colleagues, but does not afford the same opportunity to patients  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 If the patient is to be a true participant in shared decision making, an alternative model of  
53 MDT decision making is required. Some teams may explore the idea of a patient attending  
54 their own MDT meeting: this idea is popular amongst patient advocates <sup>29</sup>, but not clinicians  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59 <sup>10 29</sup>. There is little data documenting the patient experience of involvement in MDTs, as it is  
60

1  
2  
3 rarely routine practice. Small studies have concluded that patients attending their own MDT  
4 allows for better information giving but not necessarily improved involvement in decision  
5 making <sup>30 31</sup>. MDT members often feel that patients attending their own meeting would  
6 inhibit the discussion and cause patient anxiety <sup>29</sup>; relationships within the MDT are often  
7 longstanding with pre existing hierarchies which can present barriers to new user  
8 integration<sup>32</sup>. However, the concept of a patient prepared with information about the disease  
9 and MDT team structure, with a supporter or team member as advocate, attending a  
10 sympathetic MDT, is worth further exploration.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Of key importance is that the MDT meeting is not a discussion of which option is ‘best’ for a  
24 particular patient, but should instead aim to determine which valid treatment options are  
25 available. In particular, palliative options (or options of ‘doing nothing’) are often  
26 inadequately explored <sup>33</sup>. Clinic structures should be flexible to allow patients to distribute  
27 their decision-making amongst information sources and people. The patient may be enabled  
28 to come to the initial consultation more informed and prepared for the discussion. There may  
29 be a role for pre MDT clinic with the patient meeting a surgeon, oncologist or specialist  
30 nurse, or a post MDT clinic to convey options and explore values and preferences, maybe  
31 with more than one clinician. The MDT meeting may take place in a small ‘combined clinic’  
32 setting around the interaction with the patient. The MDT members provide support, resources  
33 and personnel to discuss the treatment options, communicate the risk and uncertainty, elicit  
34 values and explore them; a decision aid may support this work <sup>34</sup>. The team may consider  
35 providing an individual who is independent of the clinical team to act as a decision coach or  
36 navigator <sup>35</sup>. MDT members should be encouraged to update their training in supporting  
37 patients in shared decision making, consent and communication.

1  
2  
3 It is time for the development and design of alternative models of team decision making  
4 which have a central role for the patient. Further work to develop new model of delivering  
5 team decision-making would be multifactorial, incorporating the development of the structure  
6 of the MDT meeting and clinic, support and training for MDT members and patients and the  
7 development of tools to be used in combination with team decisions. Qualitative approaches  
8 should explore stakeholders' views of intervention components, which should be co-designed  
9 with patients. Evaluation of such interventions requires novel trial design, comparing  
10 methods of decision making and evaluating decision quality. MDT decision making is now  
11 ubiquitous and therefore the urgent need of reform to meet the principles of shared decision  
12 making should be a priority for clinical teams and cancer researchers.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Author Contributions**

#### 28 **DW Hamilton**

29 Protocol development, ethical approval, data gathering, data analysis, manuscript preparation

#### 30 **B Heaven**

31 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

#### 32 **R G Thomson**

33 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation

#### 34 **JA Wilson**

35 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation

#### 36 **C Exley**

37 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 38 **Competing interests**

39  
40  
41 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at  
42 [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) (available on request from the corresponding author) and  
43 declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that  
44 might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT,  
45 JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Funding

This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of Health

## Data sharing statement

No additional data available

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- This ethnographic study provides an in-depth analysis of the complexities of patient involvement and interaction with MDT decision making
- The methods (direct observation and semi structured interviews) allow a rich, data-driven analysis of a complex decision-making environment
- Head and neck cancer involves the trade off of function for survival and is thus a useful model when exploring complex decision making
- All data involve patients with one cancer area in a small number of centres; whilst the MDT model predominates there are alternative structures of team decision making
- Some of the challenges described in this work may not be encountered by other cancers and other centres using the MDT model

## References

1. Licitra L, Keilholz U, Tahara M, et al. Evaluation of the benefit and use of multidisciplinary teams in the treatment of head and neck cancer. *Oral Oncol* 2016;59:73-9. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2016.06.002
2. Calman KC, Hine D. A Policy Framework for Commissioning Cancer Services In: Health Do, ed., 1995.

3. Kelly SL, Jackson JE, Hickey BE, et al. Multidisciplinary clinic care improves adherence to best practice in head and neck cancer. *American journal of otolaryngology* 2013;34(1):57-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2012.08.010
4. Patil RD, Meinzen-Derr JK, Hendricks BL, et al. Improving access and timeliness of care for veterans with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A multidisciplinary team's approach. *Laryngoscope* 2016;126(3):627-31. doi: 10.1002/lary.25528
5. Starmer H, Sanguineti G, Marur S, et al. Multidisciplinary head and neck cancer clinic and adherence with speech pathology. *Laryngoscope* 2011;121(10):2131-5. doi: 10.1002/lary.21746
6. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer: what is the evidence? *Bmj* 2010;340:c951. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c951
7. Wang YH, Kung PT, Tsai WC, et al. Effects of multidisciplinary care on the survival of patients with oral cavity cancer in Taiwan. *Oral Oncol* 2012;48(9):803-10. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2012.03.023
8. Birchall M, Bailey D, King P, et al. Effect of process standards on survival of patients with head and neck cancer in the south and west of England. *British journal of cancer* 2004;91(8):1477-81. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6602118
9. Friedland PL, Bozic B, Dewar J, et al. Impact of multidisciplinary team management in head and neck cancer patients. *British journal of cancer* 2011;104(8):1246-8. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2011.92
10. NCAT. Multidisciplinary team members' views about MDT working: results from a survey commissioned by the National Cancer Action Team. London Kings College, 2009.
11. Rajan S, Foreman J, Wallis MG, et al. Multidisciplinary decisions in breast cancer: does the patient receive what the team has recommended? *British journal of cancer* 2013;108(12):2442-7. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2013.267
12. Blazeby JM, Wilson L, Metcalfe C, et al. Analysis of clinical decision-making in multidisciplinary cancer teams. *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO* 2006;17(3):457-60. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdj102
13. Wood JJ, Metcalfe C, Paes A, et al. An evaluation of treatment decisions at a colorectal cancer multi-disciplinary team. *Colorectal disease : the official journal of the Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland* 2008;10(8):769-72. doi: 10.1111/j.1463-1318.2007.01464.x
14. Taylor C, Atkins L, Richardson A, et al. Measuring the quality of MDT working: an observational approach. *BMC cancer* 2012;12:202. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-202
15. Rowlands S, Callen J. A qualitative analysis of communication between members of a hospital-based multidisciplinary lung cancer team. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2013;22(1):20-31. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12004

16. Lanceley A, Savage J, Menon U, et al. Influences on multidisciplinary team decision-making. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18(2):215-22. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1525-1438.2007.00991.x
17. Kidger J, Murdoch J, Donovan JL, et al. Clinical decision-making in a multidisciplinary gynaecological cancer team: a qualitative study. *Bjog-Int J Obstet Gy* 2009;116(4):511-17. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2008.02066.x
18. Hamilton DW, Heaven B, Thomson RG, et al. Multidisciplinary team decision-making in cancer and the absent patient: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(7):e012559. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012559 [published Online First: 2016/07/23]
19. Taylor C, Finnegan-John J, Green JS. "No decision about me without me" in the context of cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative interview study. *BMC health services research* 2014;14:488. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0488-2
20. Strauss AL. *Continual permutations of action*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter 1993.
21. Charmaz K, editor. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: SAGE, 2006.
22. Strauss AL, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research : grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications 1990.
23. Dey I. *Grounding grounded theory : guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. San Diego: Academic Press 1999.
24. Elwyn G, Durand MA, Song J, et al. A three-talk model for shared decision making: multistage consultation process. *Bmj* 2017;359:j4891. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4891 [published Online First: 2017/11/08]
25. NICE. *Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancer - the Manual*. London, 2004.
26. Maharaj AD, Evans SM, Zalberg JR, et al. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative study using the theoretical domains framework. *BMJ quality & safety* 2021;30(10):792-803. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2020-011793 [published Online First: 2020/11/29]
27. Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. *Social Health Illn* 2008;30(3):429-44. doi: SHIL1064 [pii] 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01064.x [published Online First: 2008/01/16]
28. Entwistle VA, Carter SM, Cribb A, et al. Supporting patient autonomy: the importance of clinician-patient relationships. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25(7):741-5. doi: 10.1007/s11606-010-1292-2
29. Butow P, Harrison JD, Choy ET, et al. Health professional and consumer views on involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. *Cancer* 2007;110(9):1937-44. doi: 10.1002/cncr.23007

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
30. Bellardita L, Donegani S, Spatuzzi AL, et al. Multidisciplinary Versus One-on-One Setting: A Qualitative Study of Clinicians' Perceptions of Their Relationship With Patients With Prostate Cancer. *Journal of oncology practice / American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2011;7(1):e1-5. doi: 10.1200/JOP.2010.000020
31. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan. *Breast* 2007;16(2):178-89. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2006.10.002
32. Martin GP, Finn R. Patients as team members: opportunities, challenges and paradoxes of including patients in multi-professional healthcare teams. *Sociol Health Illn* 2011;33(7):1050-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01356.x
33. Nelson A, Longo M, Byrne A, et al. Chemotherapy decision-making in advanced lung cancer: a prospective qualitative study. *BMJ Support Palliat Care* 2020 doi: 10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002395 [published Online First: 2020/08/23]
34. Stacey D, Legare F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* 2017(4) doi: ARTN CD001431  
10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5
35. Stacey D, Murray MA, Legare F, et al. Decision coaching to support shared decision making: a framework, evidence, and implications for nursing practice, education, and policy. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs* 2008;5(1):25-35. doi: WVN108 [pii]  
10.1111/j.1741-6787.2007.00108.x [published Online First: 2008/02/13]



## Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) Checklist

- 1) **Title:** Page 1
- 2) **Abstract:** Page 2-3
- 4) **Purpose or research question:** page 4-5
- 5) **Qualitative approach and research paradigm:** Pages 5-7
- 6) **Researcher characteristics and reflexivity:** Page 5
- 7) **Context:** page 6 and page 7
- 8) **Sampling strategy:** page 7
- 9) **Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects:** page 5
- 10) **Data collection methods:** page 6
- 11) **Data collection instruments and technologies:** page 6
- 12) **Units of study:** page 6
- 13) **Data processing:** page 6-7
- 14) **Data analysis:** page 7
- 15) **Techniques to enhance trustworthiness:** page 7
- 16) **Synthesis and interpretation:** page 7-12
- 17) **Links to empirical data:** Page 7-12
- 18) **Integration with prior work, implications, transferability and contributions to the field:** page 12-16
- 20) **Conflict of interest:** page 16
- 21) **Funding:** page 17



# BMJ Open

## How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-061654.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-May-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Hamilton, David; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute; Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Heaven, Benjamin; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Thomson, Richard; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Wilson, Janet; University of Newcastle, Population Health Sciences Institute Exley, Catherine; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication, Ear, nose and throat/otolaryngology, Health services research, Qualitative research
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Head & neck surgery < OTOLARYNGOLOGY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
**Title: How do patients make decisions in the context of a  
multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck  
cancer centres**

10  
11  
**DW Hamilton**

12 Consultant Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Honorary Senior Lecturer  
13 Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN  
14 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

15  
16  
**B Heaven**

17 Formerly Newcastle University, has now left academia

18  
19  
**R G Thomson**

20 Emeritus Professor  
21 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

22  
23  
**JA Wilson**

24 Emerita Professor of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
25 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

26  
27  
**C Exley**

28 Professor of Qualitative Health Research  
29 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

30  
31  
Corresponding Author:

32 DW Hamilton

33 Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN

34 [David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk)

35  
36  
Keywords

37 Decision Making, Shared

38 Communication

39 Cancer

40 Anthropology, Cultural

41 Informed consent

42 Autonomy

## Abstract

### Objectives

To describe how patients are engaged with cancer decisions in the context of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and how MDT recommendations are operationalised in the context of a shared decision.

### Design

Ethnographic qualitative study

### Setting

Three head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

### Participants

Patients with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer; non-participant observation of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT clinics, informal interviews, and formal, semi-structured interviews with 20 patients and 9 MDT staff members

### Methods

Ethnographic methods including non-participant observation of MDT meetings and clinic appointments, informal interviews, field notes and formal semi-structured interviews with patients and MDT members

### Results

MDT discussions often conclude with a firm recommendation for treatment. When delivered to a patient in clinic this recommendation is often accepted by the patient, but this response may result from the disempowered position in which they find themselves. Whilst patient behaviour may thus appear to endorse clinicians' views that a paternalistic approach is desired by patients (creating a "cycle of paternalism"), the rigidity of the MDT treatment

1  
2  
3 recommendation can act as a barrier to discussion of options and the exploration of patient  
4  
5 values.  
6  
7

## 8 Conclusions

9  
10 The current model of MDT decision making does not support shared decision making and  
11  
12 may actively undermine it. A model should be developed whereby the individual patient  
13  
14 perspective has more input into MDT discussions, and where decisions are made on potential  
15  
16 treatment options rather than providing a single recommendation for discussion with the  
17  
18 patient. Deeper consideration should be given to how the MDT incorporates the patient  
19  
20 perspective and/or delivers its discussion of options to the patient. In order to achieve these  
21  
22 objectives, a new model of MDT working is required.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Word count: 3732  
28  
29

## 30 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 31  
32  
33
- 34 • This ethnographic study provides an in-depth analysis of the complexities of patient  
35 involvement and interaction with MDT decision making  
36
  - 37 • The methods (direct observation and semi structured interviews) allow a rich, data-  
38 driven analysis of a complex decision-making environment  
39
  - 40 • Head and neck cancer involves the trade off of function for survival and is thus a  
41 useful model when exploring complex decision making  
42
  - 43 • All data involve patients with one cancer area in a small number of centres; whilst the  
44 MDT model predominates there are alternative structures of team decision making  
45  
46 Internationally, there are multiple models of MDT decision making. Although the  
47 structure discussed here predominates in the UK, the issues faced will not be  
48  
49 applicable to all teams  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) decision making is internationally mandated to support appropriate high-quality treatment of patients with cancer <sup>1</sup>. In the UK, MDT working was established following the Calman-Hine report <sup>2</sup> and improves many aspects of cancer treatment such as staging, recruitment to trials <sup>1</sup>, adherence to treatment guidelines <sup>3</sup>, use of effective evidence-based therapy, timeliness of care <sup>4</sup> and access to the allied members of the healthcare team <sup>5</sup>. However the practice is time consuming and expensive, costing at least £100 million a year in the UK for data preparation and the same amount again for attendance in the UK <sup>6</sup>. To date no MDT cost-benefit analysis has been performed. The effect on cancer survival is less clear; in head and neck cancer MDT working is reported to have a positive effect on survival <sup>7-9</sup>, but it is difficult to determine whether survival changes over time are causally related.

MDT members report that consideration of the patient as a person in decision making as a vital part of the decision-making process. In a survey of 2054 MDT members, 95% of respondents felt that “Patient views should always inform the decision-making process” and “Patient views/preferences should be presented to the MDT by somebody who has met the patient” <sup>10</sup>. Omitting patient preference information has an effect on the implementation of MDT recommendations <sup>11-13</sup>. MDT meetings are often dominated by discussion among doctors rather than including other MDT members who may know the patient better or have a more patient-centred perspective <sup>14-17</sup> creating a predominance of the biomedical model of disease <sup>18-20</sup>. This means that the stated aim of many MDT members - to have the patient central to the MDT treatment discussion - is at odds with the reality of the MDT process. We have previously described that if MDT meetings are to become more patient-centred, merely introducing increasing amounts of information about the patient into the MDT is not

1  
2  
3 sufficient<sup>21</sup>. Although we know that the direct viewpoint of the patient within the MDT is  
4  
5 lacking<sup>22</sup>, there is to date no account of how patients engage with decisions about their  
6  
7 treatment in the context of MDTs. This work aims to explore the experience of making  
8  
9 decisions in the context of an MDT, with a particular emphasis on the patient experience of  
10  
11 the decision process.  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 16 17 **Methods**

18  
19  
20 This qualitative study used non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews to  
21  
22 critically examine how decisions were made in and around the MDT with a particular focus  
23  
24 on patient centredness. All data were collected by one researcher (DWH), a head and neck  
25  
26 surgeon. Non-participant observation enables the researcher to study participants in their  
27  
28 natural environment, and adds value to retrospective accounts gleaned only through  
29  
30 participant interviews<sup>23</sup>.  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 36 **Patient and Public Involvement**

37  
38 Two head and neck patient groups were consulted during development of the research  
39  
40 question, study design and protocol development, but patients were not involved in data  
41  
42 gathering and analysis.  
43  
44  
45

## 46 47 **Ethical Approval**

48  
49 Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2  
50  
51 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and  
52  
53 Development governance permissions were obtained. All participant gave informed consent  
54  
55 to be included in the study.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Sampling

Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Concepts arising from the patient-derived data drove the subsequent data collection and analysis. A range of staff members who were part of the MDT were also recruited for interview. Purposive sampling<sup>24</sup> guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection and analysis occurring in tandem. Cases were included which would test the concepts and themes which were emerging. For example, in the early cases, palliative options were often not discussed or offered in the clinic, and so patients were included who had options for treatment, one of which was palliative, were included. Concepts explored through sampling also included uncertainty, assessment of best and trust. Thus, further sampling was guided by the emerging analysis<sup>25</sup> and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency<sup>26</sup> was achieved. This means that data collection ceases when sufficient or adequate depth of understanding has been reached; this allows for a greater number and breadth of concepts to be explored in this complex setting using multiple data collection techniques

## Observations

Non-participant observations of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT outpatient clinics were conducted. Patient with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer whose treatment options were being discussed in the MDT were included. They were excluded if they did not understand written or spoken English, or they did not have the capacity to consent. The MDT meetings and clinics were all audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Detailed field notes were also made at the time of observation, then transcribed immediately afterwards.



## Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients and staff. The development of the interview guide was iterative; as data collection continued, the content of the guide evolved in order to explore emerging themes. In particular, the interview guide evolved to explore concepts of uncertainty (and how it is communicated), conversations around and attitudes towards palliative care, trust (between members of the MDT and between doctor and patient) and risk communication (see supplemental file). Informal interviews with staff members of the MDT also took place and were incorporated into written field notes. Pseudonyms are used for reporting data throughout to protect the anonymity of respondents.

## Analysis

The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory<sup>24</sup>. Only one coder was used because of the complexity of the multiple data sources during this ethnographic study. However emerging concepts and themes were discussed formally in the wider research team. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were analysed using the same coding framework. The codes used were conceptual, rather than descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. Line by line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework. Hence coding was both inductive and deductive and when the coding framework was altered, all transcripts were re-coded. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package. Emerging findings (and 'memos') were formally discussed in the research team to develop the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling

## Results

The research was conducted in three head and neck cancer (HNC) centres in the north east of England. A total of 35 MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments MDT meetings and clinics were observed for 30 patients (23 males and seven females, aged 38-87 years). Additionally 23 interviews were conducted with patients and nine interviews with MDT members (see table one). In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present and was attended by surgeons, oncologists, radiologists, pathologists, speech and language therapists, dieticians and administrative staff. Following the meeting, one surgeon met with the patient in clinic. Sometimes other members were present with the surgeon, and other times they were alone. If considering non-surgical options, the patient would meet an oncologist. Each MDT would discuss between 10 and 30 patients; the majority of these patients were then seen in the accompanying clinic

PATIENTS: Group 1	Centre	Age	Tumour site	Observation		Int 1	Int 2
				MDT	Clinic		
James Cain	A	68	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Frances Cotton	A	82	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Philip Vase	A	61	Parotid	1	1	x	x
Fred Barnes	A	71	Lip	1	1	x	x
Deborah Dolphin	A	54	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Vincent Lowry	A	80	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
David Forcett	A	72	Pinna	1	1	x	x
Stanley Wright	A	87	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Daniel Carding	A	64	Larynx	1	1	1	x
John Winton	A	61	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Bobby Older	A	52	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Samuel Black	A	55	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Keith Down	A	62	Larynx	1	1	1	x
William Runman	B	73	Pharynx	3	1	1	x
Andrew Driver	B	49	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Donna Childs	B	52	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
David Jobling	B	63	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Sophie Leicester	B	49	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Edward Doman	B	73	Mouth	3	1	1	x
Eric Francais	B	65	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Gary Duck	B	57	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Jean Dixon	B	63	Pharynx	1	2	1	1
Jane Doe	C	69	Pharynx	1	2	1	x
Margaret Brigstock	C	81	Mandible	1	2	x	x
Roy Dayson	C	60	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Dana O'Malley	C	67	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Gary Nicholson	C	46	Pharynx	1	2	x	x
Tracey Burnham	C	38	Larynx	1	1	x	x
James Matfield	C	70	Larynx	1	4	1	x
David Dale	C	84	Larynx	1	1	x	x
<b>PATIENTS: Group 2 (interview only)</b>							
Kevin Hair	A	82	Pharynx				
David Newman	A	57	Larynx				
Frank Sunnyman	A	52	Pharynx				
Phil Gardener	B	65	Larynx				
<b>STAFF (interview only)</b>		<b>Staff role</b>					
Mr Red	A	ENT surgeon					
Dr Orange	A	Oncologist					
Mr Surton	A	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Miss Salt	A	Speech and Language Therapist					
Tessa Darling	A	Clinical Nurse Specialist					
Mr Halifax	B	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Mr Blaydon	B	ENT surgeon					
Mr North	B	ENT surgeon					
Dr Goodier	C	Oncologist					

Table one: details of included participants

### "Best" treatment

The MDT meeting discussion often tends towards debate on which treatment is "best" for a patient amongst the available options. In the following interview extract, a maxillofacial surgeon describes his view of the aim of the MDT discussion:

[The team] need to leave the MDT [meeting] with the treatment options ...prioritised. So a rank order of [the] best treatment clinically – slightly irrespective of the patient's wishes. From a clinical point of view to try and get best outcome, this would be our first, this would be our second, this would be third and fourth and fifth. Then you discuss it with the patient and say, "This is what we think."

In this data extract, the surgeon clearly states his view that the aim of the MDT discussion is to decide the "clinically" best treatment for the patient and even goes as far to say that this could be "irrespective" of the patient's wishes. Teams frequently conclude their discussion of treatment options in the MDT meeting with an agreement for the recommendation (ie the MDT's perception of "best" treatment). This recommendation is to be delivered to the patient. In the following extract, the MDT members are discussing the merits of surgery (laser) vs radiotherapy

Mr Black (ENT surgeon): I have a database of the [laser resections] I have done .... tonsil and soft palate tumours, and it's just....it's something we need to take notice of

Mr Red (ENT surgeon): Yeah, I think we'll need to, we'll have to discuss it another time or we'll take up the whole morning on one case. But, I think there are arguments for and against...

Dr Orange (oncologist): I would suggest he has radiotherapy, because he will have a slightly better functional outcome, and he's 80 and ...because of his age, and because of the possibly better function....would you Dr Yellow?

Dr Yellow (oncologist): Yes

1  
2  
3 Mr Red: I think there is a consensus view of the MDT, would be for  
4 radiotherapy  
5

6 MR Black: OK  
7

8 (Observation, MDT meeting)  
9

10 Although, during this discussion, options of radiotherapy and laser were available to the  
11 patient, the position of the MDT meeting was to provide a recommendation for radiotherapy.  
12  
13 Here, we see the members of the MDT preparing their ‘party line’ which is to be delivered to  
14 the patient in clinic. This recommendation for “best treatment” is often conveyed to the  
15 patient on its own or in preference to other options  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **The “cycle of paternalism”**

24  
25  
26 Anxious patients, faced with complex decisions can lead leads to patients endorsing the  
27 paternalistic approach as they are given little or no information about the available treatment  
28 choices and therefore tend to delegate responsibility of the decision to the clinician:  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Pt: You know, they’re the doctors, they’re the professional people. And I’m  
35 just Joe Bloggs off the street. ...For a lot of years, I was a steel erector. I  
36 wouldn’t expect you as a doctor coming along and doing what I could do.  
37 Do I?  
38

39 Interviewer: You feel a decision should be the doctor’s decision?  
40

41 Pt: Oh, definitely, without a doubt. It’s got to be the doctor’s decision.  
42 How could I make a decision like that?  
43  
44

45 Here, the patient delegates the decision to the MDT without question; he is allowing the  
46 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ treatment to act as the sole basis for a treatment decision. If  
47 decision delegation is accepted as the method by which MDTs convey and make decisions, a  
48 paternalistic decision making process results. In this model, the patient accepts that the  
49 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ (and hence the treatment recommendation) is appropriate. It  
50 creates a “cycle of paternalism” with grateful patients accepting firm recommendations from  
51 clinicians and clinicians reassured that they are doing their best for their patients.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Delivery of the MDT treatment recommendation

Firm MDT recommendations can sometimes place the clinician in a difficult position when discussing options. The following extract is the clinic appointment for Vincent Lowry (the MDT meeting extract was included above). Here Mr Black (who favoured laser in the MDT meeting, referred to here as “surgery”) was delivering the MDT recommendation for radiotherapy to the patient:

Mr Black: After a lot of discussion, the consensus.... would be to give you radiation therapy.... that was what we jointly decided. And we think with that treatment there is a very good chance of controlling your disease completely....

Pt: Well, I'll do as you say

Daughter: So there's no other operation, it would just be radiotherapy?

Mr Black: We discussed this at length at the meeting.... and the majority of people... felt that to be frank, except for me, felt that radiation would be the way forward. And.... that's what we are offering to you as first line treatment. Unless you have any reservations, then we can think about other options.

Pt: I'll do as you say....

Daughter: Right. So he would have to come into hospital every day? He's a really bad traveller...

Pt: You know when I come here I get all tensed up and travelling....

Mr Black: Really? Is it likely you may then stop the treatment midway for whatever reason, because that would backfire very badly.

Pt: I wouldn't do that

Mr Black: I know you asked about the surgical option. I promised people I wouldn't say anything. But it is feasible to take it out surgically, and there is an option available, but the consensus at the MDT was to go ahead with radiation. Unless, as a family or yourself very strongly object to it and feel that you can't go ahead with that, then of course the surgical option is always there. But as a group we felt that the best way forward was to offer you radiation

Pt: Well. I'll go with you

(Observation, MDT Clinic)

1  
2  
3 The final treatment decision was to deliver radiation, but the interaction above reveals the  
4 challenges of being tasked by the MDT to give a single recommendation when it is used in a  
5 decision discussion with a patient. Once new information was gleaned from the patient in  
6 clinic (being a “really bad traveller”) Mr Black struggled with how to deal with the  
7 recommendations: was it a rule to be followed? Here, the rigidity of the treatment  
8 recommendation acted as a barrier to an open discussion about the treatment options  
9 available to the patient and thus inhibited shared decision making.

### 19 **Patient engagement with MDT recommendations**

20  
21  
22  
23 Modern clinical practice cannot assume that the sole role of the patient is the acceptance of a  
24 single firm treatment recommendations. John Winton was a 61 year old patient with an  
25 advanced cancer of his larynx. In the MDT it was decided that surgery (total laryngectomy)  
26 should be delivered as a single recommendation. Radiotherapy is available, carries a lower  
27 chance of cure, but allows him to retain his voice box. The following data are from his clinic  
28 appointment:  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Mr Black (ENT surgeon): This tumour in your throat is a fairly big tumour,  
38 and it's spread to the neck as well. We believe that there are two possible  
39 ways that we can manage this. At some parts of the scan, there is evidence  
40 that the tumour may have gone into the Adam's apple cartilage.... If that is  
41 the case, surgery would be the only option to get rid of the tumour. But  
42 surgery would involve you losing your voicebox, losing part of the  
43 swallowing passage, you would need a big neck operation....Once we do  
44 the surgery, your speech will be different, you won't be speaking the same.  
45 You will have a hole in the centre of your neck, a tracheostomy

46  
47  
48  
49 Pt: Nah, nah [shakes head]

50  
51 Mr Black: You wouldn't fancy that?

52  
53 Pt: No

54  
55 Mr Black: That's the surgical option. On the other side is the option of  
56 radiation therapy

57  
58  
59 Pt: I would rather take a chance with that  
60

1  
2  
3 (Observation, MDT Clinic)  
4

5 Here, and throughout the course of this consultation, the patient made a decision to reject  
6 surgery, which reduces his length of survival from his cancer in order to preserve his voice  
7 box. He was adamant he did not want a complete removal of the voice box and part of the  
8 throat (pharyngolaryngectomy) and the decision was eventually made to use radiotherapy.  
9

10 However, in the subsequent interview, Mr Winton discussed the rationale for his decision:  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Pt: Well you see my mother died of cancer... my father died of cancer, and  
18 I've seen the way cancer works. I'm not being cheeky.... once they cut you  
19 open, it's like your letting fresh air into a bulb, it then just spreads, and they  
20 stitch you back up again and "We've cured it", right, for how long? And  
21 then it comes back again...  
22

23  
24 Interviewer: And what's important to you when you're making that  
25 decision?  
26

27 Pt: Surviving as long as I can..., I mean if you get the year, 18 months it's  
28 better than getting two weeks isn't it?  
29

30 His consultation, which was limited in exploring what mattered to him, leads to a decision  
31 that is potentially at odds with his aspirations revealed above. His aim of treatment (survival)  
32 is not matched by the actual treatment decision (radiotherapy). This patient perspective could  
33 not be incorporated into the previous MDT discussion (which happened before the clinic  
34 appointment), but equally the subsequent clinic appointment did not explore his preferences  
35 and what underpinned them, risking a treatment decision at odds with his preferences and  
36 values. If Mr Black had explored the options for treatment with the patient more, this  
37 mismatch of treatment preferences and values could have been identified, and perhaps  
38 deconstructed. Such information about values and preferences is essential to good shared  
39 decision making, however very difficult to incorporate into the MDT decision making  
40 structure.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Discussion

This study has found that patient engagement with the outcome of an MDT discussion (a recommendation for “best” treatment) is problematic. Often patients accept this recommendation in the clinic (perhaps precisely because it is presented as the “best” treatment). However, this acquiescence may be due to the disempowered position in which patients find themselves as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn, clinicians often view the acceptance of an MDT recommendation as delegation of the decision by the patient to the clinician, an assumption which can promulgate a ‘cycle of paternalism’, where anxious patients have little real choice other than to accept the clear guidance offered by the expert team. However, limiting patient involvement to acceptance or rejection of a firm recommendation leads to decisions which are not in line with patient values and can not be considered patient-centred, shared decision making.

The rigidity of the MDT recommendation can act as a barrier to an open discussion of the available options. If the patient role is limited to either acceptance or refusal of a single recommendation, true engagement is impossible. A truncated discussion of a single MDT recommendation for treatment prohibits shared decision-making using the “three talk model” , as central to this model is a discussion of the options for treatment. A shared decision-making consultation allows the patient and clinician to explore the risks, benefits and consequences of a treatment alternatives; a move from initial to informed preferences; and exploration of patient values to reach a shared decision <sup>27</sup>.

The structure of MDT working has not significantly changed since its inception in 1996. NHS patients rarely attend their MDT meetings, modern cancer care mandates that all

1  
2  
3 patients are discussed in this setting<sup>28</sup> and interventions to increase the number of patients  
4  
5 discussed in an MDT are still sought after<sup>29</sup>.  
6  
7

### 8 **The MDT recommendation**

9

10  
11 If the MDT meeting and clinic follow a paternalistic pathway, the way in which their  
12 recommendation is used is clear: it is delivered to the patient with an assumption that it will  
13 be accepted. In the paternalistic tradition, physicians are considered to be best placed to  
14 evaluate the trade-offs and pitfalls of treatment, and applied these to the decision process  
15 based on their evaluation of the best interests of the patient <sup>30</sup>. However, often in cancer care  
16 (particularly head and neck cancer), treatment options are available for a patient: which of  
17 these is “best” depends on the value you apply to the various aspects of the treatment. For  
18 example, is the priority of treatment cure or preservation of quality of life? What functional  
19 impact will a patient endure to achieve tumour control? What aspects of functional decline  
20 (such as speech, swallow or aesthetics) are most important? The answers to these questions  
21 are based on values: clinicians and patient do not share values <sup>31-33</sup>. Thus MDTs must ensure  
22 that treatment decisions are driven by patient values. Although patients may justifiably  
23 actively delegate some or all of the responsibility for the decision to the MDT members, at  
24 the same time, the MDT have a duty to ensure that this is not due to disempowerment or lack  
25 of access to the information required to take an active part in decision making. Hence the  
26 clinician has a role to, at the very least, support the patient to understand what is important to  
27 them before accepting the role as decision maker on the patient’s behalf  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Outwith the MDT decision process, a treatment recommendation from an individual clinician  
53 can be modified depending on the ongoing interaction with the patient and the preferences  
54 expressed. An MDT recommendation, on the other hand, is problematic for MDT members  
55 who attempt to combine it with the values or preferences of the patient. Is it set in stone, an  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 obligatory ‘best’ which must be adhered to? If the patient disagrees with the  
4  
5 recommendation, what action should the MDT member take? In this way, MDT  
6  
7 recommendations are inflexible, especially in the light of new information from the patient  
8  
9 which was not clear or known in the MDT meeting. In other words, information about values  
10  
11 and preferences are vital to a shared decision but difficult to incorporate into the MDT  
12  
13 decision making structure. As we have previously described <sup>21</sup>, MDTs often build the  
14  
15 “evidential patient” in the MDT meeting discussion. This may include information about a  
16  
17 patient’s values and preferences, but these are impossible to incorporate into a meeting  
18  
19 discussion without the patient present and without making assumptions about the patient.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Modernising MDT decision-making**

26  
27  
28 If we are to modernise the MDT decision making structure to improve patient involvement,  
29  
30 the role of the MDT discussion and the structure of the clinic must recognise that patients  
31  
32 often “distribute” decisions. Rapley <sup>34</sup> describes how patients demonstrate a ‘relational  
33  
34 autonomy’ by distributing their decision amongst people, encounters, places and information  
35  
36 sources. Promoting relational autonomy means that involving patients in decisions requires  
37  
38 more than presenting options and awaiting a verdict, instead emphasising the importance of  
39  
40 the interaction with the clinician, encouraging questions, correcting misunderstanding,  
41  
42 constructing preferences and allowing disagreement <sup>35</sup>. Indeed, the MDT decision-making  
43  
44 structure gives ample opportunity for MDT members to distribute their decision amongst  
45  
46 colleagues, but does not afford the same opportunity to patients  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 If the patient is to be a true participant in shared decision making, an alternative model of  
53  
54 MDT decision making is required. Some teams have explored the idea of a patient attending  
55  
56 their own MDT meeting, with many patients reporting a positive experience<sup>36</sup>: this idea is  
57  
58 popular amongst patient advocates <sup>37</sup>, but clinicians have mixed views <sup>10 37 38</sup>. Small studies  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 have concluded that patients attending their own MDT allows for better information giving <sup>39</sup>  
4  
5 <sup>40</sup>and the opportunity to ask questions and contribute information such as preference <sup>41</sup>;  
6  
7 however included patients may have higher health literacy<sup>42</sup> raising the possibility that  
8  
9 including patients has potential to widen health inequality. MDT members often feel that  
10  
11 patients attending their own meeting would inhibit the discussion and cause patient anxiety  
12  
13 <sup>37</sup>; relationships within the MDT are often longstanding with pre existing hierarchies which  
14  
15 can present barriers to new user integration<sup>43</sup> Nevertheless, if patients are to be included in  
16  
17 MDT meetings, clarity is required on how patients, their supporters and healthcare teams are  
18  
19 supported to make it a positive and worthwhile experience<sup>44</sup>.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Of key importance is that the MDT meeting is not a discussion of which option is 'best' for a  
26  
27 particular patient, but should instead aim to determine which valid treatment options are  
28  
29 available. In particular, palliative options (or options of 'doing nothing') are often  
30  
31 inadequately explored <sup>45</sup>. Clinic structures should be flexible to allow patients to distribute  
32  
33 their decision-making amongst information sources and people. The patient may be enabled  
34  
35 to come to the initial consultation more informed and prepared for the discussion. There may  
36  
37 be a role for pre MDT clinic with the patient meeting a surgeon, oncologist or specialist  
38  
39 nurse, or a post MDT clinic to convey options and explore values and preferences, maybe  
40  
41 with more than one clinician. The MDT meeting may take place in a small 'combined clinic'  
42  
43 setting around the interaction with the patient. The MDT members provide support, resources  
44  
45 and personnel to discuss the treatment options, communicate the risk and uncertainty, elicit  
46  
47 values and explore them; a decision aid may support this work <sup>46</sup>. The team may consider  
48  
49 providing an individual who is independent of the clinical team to act as a decision coach or  
50  
51 navigator <sup>47</sup>. MDT members should be encouraged to update their training in supporting  
52  
53 patients in shared decision making, consent and communication. This study provides a novel  
54  
55 and rich account of the difficulties that patients face when making a decision in the context of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 an MDT. MDT decision making is mandated internationally however the specific structure  
4 of the decision process varies widely. Although the structure presented here (MDT meeting  
5 without a patient present, recommendation delivered to the patient separately) is common,  
6 other models of MDT decision making may not face similar challenges. Also, ethnographic  
7 methods, in providing depth to explore a smaller number of concepts in more detail, may lack  
8 the breadth of findings to make this piece of work widely applicable. Nevertheless, whilst  
9 the setting may not be universally generalisable, we hope that the emergent conclusions will  
10 be.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 It is time for the development and design of alternative models of team decision making  
23 which have a central role for the patient. Further work to develop new model of delivering  
24 team decision-making would be multifactorial, incorporating the development of the structure  
25 of the MDT meeting and clinic, support and training for MDT members and patients and the  
26 development of tools to be used in combination with team decisions. Qualitative approaches  
27 should explore stakeholders' views of intervention components, which should be co-designed  
28 with patients. Evaluation of such interventions requires novel trial design, comparing  
29 methods of decision making and evaluating decision quality. MDT decision making is now  
30 ubiquitous and therefore the urgent need of reform to meet the principles of shared decision  
31 making should be a priority for clinical teams and cancer researchers.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 **Author Contributions**

### 47 **DW Hamilton**

48 Protocol development, ethical approval, data gathering, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 49 **B Heaven**

50 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 51 **R G Thomson**

52 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 53 **JA Wilson**

1  
2  
3 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation  
4

#### 5 **C Exley**

6 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation  
7

#### 8 **Competing interests**

9

10  
11 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at  
12 [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) (available on request from the corresponding author) and  
13 declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that  
14 might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT,  
15 JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work  
16  
17

#### 18 **Funding**

19

20  
21 This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health  
22 Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the  
23 National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of  
24 Health  
25

#### 26 **Data sharing statement**

27

28  
29 No additional data available  
30  
31

#### 32 **References**

33

- 34  
35  
36 1. Licitra L, Keilholz U, Tahara M, et al. Evaluation of the benefit and use of  
37 multidisciplinary teams in the treatment of head and neck cancer. *Oral Oncol*  
38 2016;59:73-9. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2016.06.002  
39  
40 2. Calman KC, Hine D. A Policy Framework for Commissioning Cancer Services In: Health  
41 Do, ed., 1995.  
42  
43 3. Kelly SL, Jackson JE, Hickey BE, et al. Multidisciplinary clinic care improves adherence  
44 to best practice in head and neck cancer. *American journal of otolaryngology*  
45 2013;34(1):57-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2012.08.010  
46  
47 4. Patil RD, Meinzen-Derr JK, Hendricks BL, et al. Improving access and timeliness of care  
48 for veterans with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A multidisciplinary team's  
49 approach. *Laryngoscope* 2016;126(3):627-31. doi: 10.1002/lary.25528  
50  
51 5. Starmer H, Sanguineti G, Marur S, et al. Multidisciplinary head and neck cancer clinic and  
52 adherence with speech pathology. *Laryngoscope* 2011;121(10):2131-5. doi:  
53 10.1002/lary.21746  
54  
55 6. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer:  
56 what is the evidence? *Bmj* 2010;340:c951. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c951  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 7. Wang YH, Kung PT, Tsai WC, et al. Effects of multidisciplinary care on the survival of  
4 patients with oral cavity cancer in Taiwan. *Oral Oncol* 2012;48(9):803-10. doi:  
5 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2012.03.023  
6
- 7  
8 8. Birchall M, Bailey D, King P, et al. Effect of process standards on survival of patients with  
9 head and neck cancer in the south and west of England. *British journal of cancer*  
10 2004;91(8):1477-81. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6602118  
11
- 12 9. Friedland PL, Bozic B, Dewar J, et al. Impact of multidisciplinary team management in  
13 head and neck cancer patients. *British journal of cancer* 2011;104(8):1246-8. doi:  
14 10.1038/bjc.2011.92  
15
- 16 10. NCAT. Multidisciplinary team members' views about MDT working: results from a  
17 survey commissioned by the National Cancer Action Team. London Kings  
18 College, 2009.  
19
- 20 21 11. Rajan S, Foreman J, Wallis MG, et al. Multidisciplinary decisions in breast cancer: does  
22 the patient receive what the team has recommended? *British journal of cancer*  
23 2013;108(12):2442-7. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2013.267  
24
- 25 26 12. Blazeby JM, Wilson L, Metcalfe C, et al. Analysis of clinical decision-making in multi-  
27 disciplinary cancer teams. *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European*  
28 *Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO* 2006;17(3):457-60. doi:  
29 10.1093/annonc/mdj102  
30
- 31 32 13. Wood JJ, Metcalfe C, Paes A, et al. An evaluation of treatment decisions at a colorectal  
33 cancer multi-disciplinary team. *Colorectal disease : the official journal of the*  
34 *Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland* 2008;10(8):769-72. doi:  
35 10.1111/j.1463-1318.2007.01464.x  
36
- 37 38 14. Taylor C, Atkins L, Richardson A, et al. Measuring the quality of MDT working: an  
39 observational approach. *BMC cancer* 2012;12:202. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-202  
40
- 41 42 15. Rowlands S, Callen J. A qualitative analysis of communication between members of a  
43 hospital-based multidisciplinary lung cancer team. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2013;22(1):20-  
44 31. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12004  
45
- 46 47 16. Lanceley A, Savage J, Menon U, et al. Influences on multidisciplinary team decision-  
48 making. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18(2):215-22. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1525-  
49 1438.2007.00991.x  
50
- 51 52 17. Soukup T, Murtagh G, Lamb BW, et al. Degrees of Multidisciplinary Underpinning  
53 Care Planning for Patients with Cancer in Weekly Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:  
54 Conversation Analysis. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2021;14:411-24. doi:  
55 10.2147/JMDH.S270394 [published Online First: 2021/02/27]  
56
- 57 58 18. Kidger J, Murdoch J, Donovan JL, et al. Clinical decision-making in a multidisciplinary  
59 gynaecological cancer team: a qualitative study. *Bjog-Int J Obstet Gy*  
60 2009;116(4):511-17. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2008.02066.x
19. Horlait M, Baes S, Dhaene S, et al. How multidisciplinary are multidisciplinary team  
meetings in cancer care? An observational study in oncology departments in Flanders,



- 1  
2  
3 Belgium. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2019;12:159-67. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S196660  
4 [published Online First: 2019/03/14]  
5  
6  
7 20. Horlait M, De Regge M, Baes S, et al. Exploring non-physician care professionals' roles  
8 in cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*  
9 2022;17(2):e0263611. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263611 [published Online First:  
10 2022/02/04]  
11  
12 21. Hamilton DW, Heaven B, Thomson RG, et al. Multidisciplinary team decision-making in  
13 cancer and the absent patient: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(7):e012559. doi:  
14 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012559 [published Online First: 2016/07/23]  
15  
16 22. Taylor C, Finnegan-John J, Green JS. "No decision about me without me" in the context  
17 of cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative interview study. *BMC health*  
18 *services research* 2014;14:488. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0488-2  
19  
20  
21 23. Strauss AL. *Continual permutations of action*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter 1993.  
22  
23 24. Charmaz K, editor. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through*  
24 *Qualitative Analysis*. London: SAGE, 2006.  
25  
26 25. Strauss AL, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research : grounded theory procedures and*  
27 *techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications 1990.  
28  
29 26. Dey I. *Grounding grounded theory : guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. San Diego:  
30 Academic Press 1999.  
31  
32 27. Elwyn G, Durand MA, Song J, et al. A three-talk model for shared decision making:  
33 multistage consultation process. *Bmj* 2017;359:j4891. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4891  
34 [published Online First: 2017/11/08]  
35  
36 28. NICE. *Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancer - the Manual*. London, 2004.  
37  
38 29. Maharaj AD, Evans SM, Zalberg JR, et al. Barriers and enablers to the implementation  
39 of multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative study using the theoretical domains  
40 framework. *BMJ quality & safety* 2021;30(10):792-803. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2020-  
41 011793 [published Online First: 2020/11/29]  
42  
43 30. Charles C, Gafni A, Whelan T. Decision-making in the physician-patient encounter:  
44 revisiting the shared treatment decision-making model. *Social science & medicine*  
45 1999;49(5):651-61. doi: S0277953699001458 [pii] [published Online First:  
46 1999/08/19]  
47  
48 31. Hamilton DW, Bins JE, McMeekin P, et al. Quantity vs quality of life in laryngeal  
49 cancer: a time trade off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology* 2012;37(Suppl. 1):108.  
50  
51 32. Hamilton DW, Pedersen A, Blanchford H, et al. A comparison of attitudes to laryngeal  
52 cancer treatment outcomes: A time trade-off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology*  
53 2018;43(1):117-23. doi: 10.1111/coa.12906  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 33. Slevin ML, Stubbs L, Plant HJ, et al. Attitudes to chemotherapy: comparing views of  
4 patients with cancer with those of doctors, nurses, and general public. *Bmj*  
5 1990;300(6737):1458-60. [published Online First: 1990/06/02]  
6  
7  
8 34. Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. *Sociol Health*  
9 *Illn* 2008;30(3):429-44. doi: SHIL1064 [pii]  
10 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01064.x [published Online First: 2008/01/16]  
11  
12  
13 35. Entwistle VA, Carter SM, Cribb A, et al. Supporting patient autonomy: the importance of  
14 clinician-patient relationships. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25(7):741-5. doi:  
15 10.1007/s11606-010-1292-2  
16  
17 36. Diekmann A, Heuser C, Ernstmann N, et al. How do breast cancer patients experience  
18 multidisciplinary tumor conferences? - A description from the patient perspective.  
19 *Breast* 2019;44:66-72. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2018.12.012 [published Online First:  
20 2019/01/23]  
21  
22  
23 37. Butow P, Harrison JD, Choy ET, et al. Health professional and consumer views on  
24 involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease  
25 and treatment plan. *Cancer* 2007;110(9):1937-44. doi: 10.1002/cncr.23007  
26  
27  
28 38. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Schellenberger B, et al. Patient Participation in Multidisciplinary  
29 Tumor Conferences from the Providers' Perspective: Is It Feasible in Routine Cancer  
30 Care? *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2020;13:1729-39. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S283166  
31 [published Online First: 2020/12/05]  
32  
33 39. Bellardita L, Donegani S, Spatuzzi AL, et al. Multidisciplinary Versus One-on-One  
34 Setting: A Qualitative Study of Clinicians' Perceptions of Their Relationship With  
35 Patients With Prostate Cancer. *Journal of oncology practice / American Society of*  
36 *Clinical Oncology* 2011;7(1):e1-5. doi: 10.1200/JOP.2010.000020  
37  
38  
39 40. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast  
40 cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan.  
41 *Breast* 2007;16(2):178-89. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2006.10.002  
42  
43  
44 41. Bohmeier B, Schellenberger B, Diekmann A, et al. Opportunities and limitations of  
45 shared decision making in multidisciplinary tumor conferences with patient  
46 participation - A qualitative interview study with providers. *Patient education and*  
47 *counseling* 2021;104(4):792-99. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2020.09.007 [published Online  
48 First: 2020/10/15]  
49  
50 42. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Kowalski C, et al. Health literacy and patient participation in  
51 multidisciplinary tumor conferences in breast cancer care: a multilevel modeling  
52 approach. *BMC cancer* 2019;19(1):330. doi: 10.1186/s12885-019-5546-z [published  
53 Online First: 2019/04/10]  
54  
55 43. Martin GP, Finn R. Patients as team members: opportunities, challenges and paradoxes of  
56 including patients in multi-professional healthcare teams. *Sociol Health Illn*  
57 2011;33(7):1050-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01356.x  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 44. Schellenberger B, Heuser C, Diekmann A, et al. Questions and emotional expressions  
4 from patients and companions while participating in multidisciplinary tumor  
5 conferences in breast and gynecological cancer centers. *Patient education and*  
6 *counseling* 2021 doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2021.12.010 [published Online First: 2021/12/27]  
7  
8  
9 45. Nelson A, Longo M, Byrne A, et al. Chemotherapy decision-making in advanced lung  
10 cancer: a prospective qualitative study. *BMJ Support Palliat Care* 2020 doi:  
11 10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002395 [published Online First: 2020/08/23]  
12  
13 46. Stacey D, Legare F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or  
14 screening decisions. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* 2017(4) doi: ARTN CD001431  
15  
16 10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5  
17  
18 47. Stacey D, Murray MA, Legare F, et al. Decision coaching to support shared decision  
19 making: a framework, evidence, and implications for nursing practice, education, and  
20 policy. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs* 2008;5(1):25-35. doi: WVN108 [pii]  
21  
22 10.1111/j.1741-6787.2007.00108.x [published Online First: 2008/02/13]  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Staff Interview Schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- What do you see as the best way of making decisions in head and neck cancer?
- The MDT
  - What is it for? What is its primary aim?
  - What works well, and what works not so well?
  - How could it be improved?
  - No decision about me without me in the MDT.... Is this possible?
- Treatment decision
  - Why do you regard a treatment as the best for a patient?
  - What factors do you take into account when making treatment decisions?
- Patient involvement in decisions/shared decision making
  - What does it mean to you?
  - Do you think there are barriers to patient involvement? What are they? Why do they exist?
  - Why do clinicians struggle to involve their patients effectively?
  - Do you think we need to improve patient involvement? Why?
- Uncertainty/conflict
  - Is it a problem or is it healthy/required?
  - How should uncertainty and conflict be presented to the patient? Should they know that you don't know?
  - If there are options, how should they be communicated?
- Decision for treatment
  - What is the role of the patient in the treatment decision?
  - How much of a role should the patient have? Can patients know enough?
  - How much of a role should a patient have in the decision
    - Should we give power of veto?
    - Should you allow a patient to make a decision which is considered wrong?
    - how much should a patient know before treatment
  - How much of a role should the family have
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Do we palliate enough? Do we treat too many people radically?
  - What are the barriers to good palliation?
  - Do you think we have a range of palliative options available to us?
  - Do you have prognostic information available to you?
  - Would you use this information if it was available? How would you use it?

## New patient interview 1 schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

The interview will cover the following broad areas:

- Previous experience of making healthcare decisions
  - What does shared decision making mean?
  - Have you had to make big healthcare decisions before?
- Experience of making this decision
  - What was your process of making the decision? Talk me through it
  - What did you draw upon?
  - What factors did you take into account?
  - Did you turn to anybody/anything for information or help?
  - How did you come to your final decision?
  - What was the MDT like?
  - Did you understand what was going on?
  - Could it be improved?
- Information given about the disease and treatment options
  - Do you think you had enough information?
  - Where do you get your information from?
  - Do you think you need more information?
  - Did you understand all the information
- Patient involvement in the decision about care
  - Should patients be involved in decisions about their care?
  - How should we involve patients?
  - Were you involved? How?
  - Would you have liked more say/less say?
  - How this made the participant feel, and further exploration
- What are your expectations of treatment?
  - Are you expecting side effects? What sort?
  - Do you have any idea of your prognosis? Do you want to know?
  - Where will you be in 6 months time?
- In the perfect world, how do you think decisions should be made?

## New patient interview 2 schedule/retrospective patient interview schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- Experience of the treatment
  - What has happened so far, story of the treatment
  - Correlation with expectations – worse, better
- New normal
  - Do you have a good quality of life?
  - How do you cope with swallowing?
  - How is your voice, how do you get on with communication?
- MDT and decision process
  - When you look back did you understand the treatment decision?
  - Did you understand the consequences of the decision?
  - Did you have enough information to base the decision on?
  - Should they have allowed you more or less control over the decision?
  - Do you wish the decision had been made differently?
  - Do you feel you made the right or the wrong decision?
  - Do you have any regrets?
  - How could they improve the clinic/the decision process?
  - In the perfect world, how do you think treatment decisions should be made?
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Were you ever aware of the chances of the treatment being successful?
  - Would you want to be aware?
  - Was palliation ever an option for you? Is it now?
- Information giving
  - Do you think you had enough information about treatment?
  - Did you understand what you were entering yourself into?
  - Should they give more information? Could they?

Topic	Page	Short description
1: Title	1	How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres
2: Abstract	2-3	Included in manuscript
3: Problem formulation	4-5	MDT working is common and expensive, but the impact on shared decision making and patient involvement in decisions remains relatively unexplored
4: Purpose or research question	4-5	To examine critically patient engagement in the MDT treatment decision making process in head and neck cancer, and to evaluate the experience and practice of decision-making by patients and clinicians
5: Qualitative approach and research paradigm	5-7	Ethnographic methods (non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews). Analysis followed principles of constructivist grounded theory
6 Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	5	All data were collected by the lead author (DWH) whilst performing his PhD. At the time, he was a trainee surgeon and had taken time out of programme for research. The dual role of surgical trainee and researcher allowed easy access to the setting and language, making ethnography and observations easier and potentially more 'natural'. Co-authors BH and CE were involved in analysis in order to minimise the effect of the researcher's status on the emerging conclusions
7 Context	6&7	The research was conducted in four head and neck cancer centres in the north east of England. In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present; following this, one or more members of the MDT met with the patient in clinic
8 Sampling strategy	7	Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Purposive sampling guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection and analysis occurring in tandem. Thus, further sampling was guided by the emerging analysis and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency was achieved.
9 Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	5	Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and Development governance permissions were obtained. All participants provided informed consent.
10 Data collection methods	6	Non-participant observation; semi structured interviews with patients and staff; field notes; reflective notes. Iterative process with emerging themes explored through further data collection. All

		emerging analysis and memos discussed with co-authors (CE and BH)
11 Data collection instruments and technologies	6	Interview guides (iteratively developed) used for interviews. Field notes and notes from informal discussions. Audiorecording and word-for-word transcription of all formal interviews, MDT meeting and MDT clinic
12 Units of study	6	34 observations of MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments (for 30 patients; 13 of these patients were interviewed once, three were interviewed twice). Interviews with four further treated patients and nine members of staff.
13 Data processing	6-7	All audiorecordings were transcribed word for word and anonymised. All reflective notes and field notes were anonymised. Patients and staff given pseudonyms. MDT meeting data transcribed by the main author (DWH) and all recording transcribed by others were checked by DWH. Audio recordings destroyed after transcription. Data kept on University computers, password protected
14 Data analysis	7	The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were analysed using the same coding framework. Line by line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework; when the coding framework was altered, all transcripts were re-coded. The codes used were conceptual, rather than descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package. Emerging findings (and 'memos') were discussed in the research team (particularly with CE and BH) to develop the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling
15 Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	7	All emerging themes and analysis were discussed in the research team with CE and BH involved in analysis. Findings presented in departmental meetings
16 Synthesis and interpretation	7-12	The outcome of an MDT discussion is frequently a "in the clinic as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn,.
17 Links to empirical data	7-12	Data presented in the results section linked to empirical data throughout
18 Integration with prior work, implications, transferability and contributions to the field	12-16	The discussion section discusses the findings in the context of prior work and the contributions to the field



19 Limitations	3, 18-19	Strengths and limitations are discussed in the discussion section and there is a list of strengths and limitations at the beginning of the manuscript
20 Conflict of interest	16	All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at <a href="http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf">www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf</a> (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work
21 Funding	17	This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of Health



# BMJ Open

## How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-061654.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Hamilton, David; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute; Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, ENT Heaven, Benjamin; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Thomson, Richard; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Wilson, Janet; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Exley, Catherine; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication, Ear, nose and throat/otolaryngology, Health services research, Qualitative research
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Head & neck surgery < OTOLARYNGOLOGY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**Title: How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

**DW Hamilton**

Consultant Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Honorary Senior Lecturer  
Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

16  
17  
18

**B Heaven**

Formerly Newcastle University, has now left academia

19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**R G Thomson**

Emeritus Professor  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**JA Wilson**

Emerita Professor of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

29  
30  
31  
32

**C Exley**

Professor of Qualitative Health Research  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

Corresponding Author:

DW Hamilton

Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN

[David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk)

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Keywords**

Decision Making, Shared

Communication

Cancer

Anthropology, Cultural

Informed consent

Autonomy

## Abstract

### Objectives

To describe how patients are engaged with cancer decisions in the context of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and how MDT recommendations are operationalised in the context of a shared decision.

### Design

Ethnographic qualitative study

### Setting

Three head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

### Participants

Patients with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer; non-participant observation of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT clinics, informal interviews, and formal, semi-structured interviews with 20 patients and 9 MDT staff members

### Methods

Ethnographic methods including non-participant observation of MDT meetings and clinic appointments, informal interviews, field notes and formal semi-structured interviews with patients and MDT members

### Results

MDT discussions often conclude with a firm recommendation for treatment. When delivered to a patient in clinic this recommendation is often accepted by the patient, but this response may result from the disempowered position in which they find themselves. Whilst patient behaviour may thus appear to endorse clinicians' views that a paternalistic approach is desired by patients (creating a "cycle of paternalism"), the rigidity of the MDT treatment

1  
2  
3 recommendation can act as a barrier to discussion of options and the exploration of patient  
4  
5 values.  
6  
7

## 8 Conclusions

9  
10 The current model of MDT decision making does not support shared decision making and  
11  
12 may actively undermine it. A model should be developed whereby the individual patient  
13  
14 perspective has more input into MDT discussions, and where decisions are made on potential  
15  
16 treatment options rather than providing a single recommendation for discussion with the  
17  
18 patient. Deeper consideration should be given to how the MDT incorporates the patient  
19  
20 perspective and/or delivers its discussion of options to the patient. In order to achieve these  
21  
22 objectives, a new model of MDT working is required.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Word count: 3732  
28  
29

## 30 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 31  
32  
33
- 34 • This ethnographic study provides an in-depth analysis of the complexities of patient  
35 involvement and interaction with MDT decision making  
36  
37
  - 38 • The methods (direct observation and semi structured interviews) allow a rich, data-  
39 driven analysis of a complex decision-making environment  
40  
41
  - 42 • Head and neck cancer involves the trade off of function for survival and is thus a  
43 useful model when exploring complex decision making  
44  
45
  - 46 • As is commonplace in qualitative researcher one researcher led the sampling,  
47 collecting and analysis, but the whole team were involved in discussions about  
48 interpretation of the data  
49  
50
  - 51 • Although the structure of MDT decision making discussed here predominates in the  
52 UK, the issues faced will not be applicable to all teams  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) decision making is internationally mandated to support appropriate high-quality treatment of patients with cancer <sup>1</sup>. In the UK, MDT working was established following the Calman-Hine report <sup>2</sup> and improves many aspects of cancer treatment such as staging, recruitment to trials <sup>1</sup>, adherence to treatment guidelines <sup>3</sup>, use of effective evidence-based therapy, timeliness of care <sup>4</sup> and access to the allied members of the healthcare team <sup>5</sup>. However the practice is time consuming and expensive, costing at least £100 million a year in the UK for data preparation and the same amount again for attendance in the UK <sup>6</sup>. To date no MDT cost-benefit analysis has been performed.

MDT members report that consideration of the patient as a person in decision making as a vital part of the decision-making process. In a survey of 2054 MDT members, 95% of respondents felt that “Patient views should always inform the decision-making process” and “Patient views/preferences should be presented to the MDT by somebody who has met the patient” <sup>7</sup>. Omitting patient preference information has an effect on the implementation of MDT recommendations <sup>8-10</sup>. MDT meetings are often dominated by discussion among doctors rather than including other MDT members who may know the patient better or have a more patient-centred perspective <sup>11-14</sup> creating a predominance of the biomedical model of disease <sup>15-17</sup>. This means that the stated aim of many MDT members - to have the patient central to the MDT treatment discussion - is at odds with the reality of the MDT process

We have previously described that if MDT meetings are to become more patient-centred, merely introducing increasing amounts of information about the patient into the MDT is not sufficient <sup>18</sup>. Although we know that the direct viewpoint of the patient within the MDT is lacking <sup>19</sup>, there is to date no account of how patients engage with decisions about their treatment in the context of MDTs. This work aims to explore the experience of making

1  
2  
3 decisions in the context of an MDT, with a particular emphasis on the patient experience of  
4  
5 the decision process.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Methods**

11  
12  
13 This qualitative study used non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews to  
14  
15 critically examine how decisions were made in and around the MDT with a particular focus  
16  
17 on patient centredness. All data were collected by one researcher (DWH), a head and neck  
18  
19 surgeon. Non-participant observation enables the researcher to study participants in their  
20  
21 natural environment, and adds value to retrospective accounts gleaned only through  
22  
23 participant interviews <sup>20</sup>.  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Patient and Public Involvement**

29  
30  
31 Two head and neck patient groups were consulted during development of the research  
32  
33 question, study design and protocol development, but patients were not involved in data  
34  
35 gathering and analysis.  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **Ethical Approval**

40  
41  
42 All participants gave written informed consent to be interviewed. Observational data (MDT  
43  
44 meeting and clinic) were audiorecorded, then the patient was approached, two to three days  
45  
46 after the event, to consent for inclusion in the study. If they agreed to be included, then the  
47  
48 recordings were transcribed word for word. If they refused, all data collected so far were  
49  
50 securely destroyed. This consent procedure was developed to avoid approaching the patient  
51  
52 on the day of the treatment decision when they were already being given a lot of information.  
53  
54  
55  
56 Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and  
4  
5 Development governance permissions were obtained.  
6  
7

## 8 **Sampling**

9  
10  
11 Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their  
12  
13 care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Concepts arising  
14  
15 from the patient-derived data drove the subsequent data collection and analysis. A range of  
16  
17 staff members who were part of the MDT were also recruited for interview. Purposive  
18  
19 sampling <sup>21</sup> guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection  
20  
21 and analysis occurring in tandem. Cases were included which would test the concepts and  
22  
23 themes which were emerging. For example, in the early cases, palliative options were often  
24  
25 not discussed or offered in the clinic, and so patients were included who had options for  
26  
27 treatment, one of which was palliative, were included. Concepts explored through sampling  
28  
29 also included uncertainty, assessment of best and trust. Thus, further sampling was guided  
30  
31 by the emerging analysis <sup>22</sup> and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency <sup>23</sup> was  
32  
33 achieved. This means that data collection ceases when sufficient or adequate depth of  
34  
35 understanding has been reached; this allows for a greater number and breadth of concepts to  
36  
37 be explored in this complex setting using multiple data collection techniques  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Observations**

46  
47  
48 Non-participant observations of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT outpatient clinics were  
49  
50 conducted. Patient with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer whose  
51  
52 treatment options were being discussed in the MDT were included. They were excluded if  
53  
54 they did not understand written or spoken English, or they did not have the capacity to  
55  
56 consent. The MDT meetings and clinics were all audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Detailed field notes were also made at the time of observation, then transcribed immediately  
4  
5 afterwards.  
6  
7

## 8 **Interviews**

9  
10  
11 Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients and staff. The development of the  
12  
13 interview guide was iterative; as data collection continued, the content of the guide evolved  
14  
15 in order to explore emerging themes<sup>24</sup>. In particular, the interview guide evolved to explore  
16  
17 concepts of uncertainty (and how it is communicated), conversations around and attitudes  
18  
19 towards palliative care, trust (between members of the MDT and between doctor and patient)  
20  
21 and risk communication (see supplemental file). Informal interviews with staff members of  
22  
23 the MDT also took place and were incorporated into written field notes. Pseudonyms are  
24  
25 used for reporting data throughout to protect the anonymity of respondents.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 **Analysis**

32  
33  
34 The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed  
35  
36 with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory<sup>21</sup>. Only one coder  
37  
38 was used because of the complexity of the multiple data sources during this ethnographic  
39  
40 study. However emerging concepts and themes were discussed formally in the wider  
41  
42 research team. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were  
43  
44 analysed using the same coding framework. The codes used were conceptual, rather than  
45  
46 descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. Line by  
47  
48 line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during  
49  
50 axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework.  
51  
52 Hence coding was both inductive and deductive and when the coding framework was altered,  
53  
54 all transcripts were re-coded. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Emerging findings (and ‘memos’) were formally discussed in the research team to develop  
4  
5 the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Results**

11  
12  
13 The research was conducted in three head and neck cancer (HNC) centres in the north east of  
14  
15 England. A total of 35 MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments MDT meetings and clinics  
16  
17 were observed for 30 patients (23 males and seven females, aged 38-87 years). Additionally  
18  
19 23 interviews were conducted with patients and nine interviews with MDT members (see  
20  
21 table one). In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present and was  
22  
23 attended by surgeons, oncologists, radiologists, pathologists, speech and language therapists,  
24  
25 dieticians and administrative staff. Following the meeting, one surgeon met with the patient  
26  
27 in clinic. Sometimes other members were present with the surgeon, and other times they  
28  
29 were alone. If considering non-surgical options, the patient would meet an oncologist. Each  
30  
31 MDT would discuss between 10 and 30 patients; the majority of these patients were then seen  
32  
33 in the accompanying clinic  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

PATIENTS: Group 1	Centre	Age	Tumour site	Observation		Int 1	Int 2
				MDT	Clinic		
Patient 1	A	68	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Patient 2	A	82	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 3	A	61	Parotid	1	1	x	x
Patient 4	A	71	Lip	1	1	x	x
Patient 5	A	54	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 6	A	80	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 7	A	72	Pinna	1	1	x	x
Patient 8	A	87	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 9	A	64	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 10	A	61	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 11	A	52	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 12	A	55	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Patient 13	A	62	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 14	B	73	Pharynx	3	1	1	x
Patient 15	B	49	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 16	B	52	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 17	B	63	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 18	B	49	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 19	B	73	Mouth	3	1	1	x
Patient 20	B	65	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 21	B	57	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 22	B	63	Pharynx	1	2	1	1
Patient 23	C	69	Pharynx	1	2	1	x
Patient 24	C	81	Mandible	1	2	x	x
Patient 25	C	60	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 26	C	67	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 27	C	46	Pharynx	1	2	x	x
Patient 28	C	38	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 29	C	70	Larynx	1	4	1	x
Patient 30	C	84	Larynx	1	1	x	x
<b>PATIENTS: Group 2 (interview only)</b>							
Patient 31	A	82	Pharynx				
Patient 32	A	57	Larynx				
Patient 33	A	52	Pharynx				
Patient 34	B	65	Larynx				
<b>STAFF (interview only)</b>		<b>Staff role</b>					
Mr Red	A	ENT surgeon					
Dr Orange	A	Oncologist					
Mr Surton	A	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Miss Salt	A	Speech and Language Therapist					
Tessa Darling	A	Clinical Nurse Specialist					
Mr Halifax	B	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Mr Blydon	B	ENT surgeon					
Mr North	B	ENT surgeon					
Dr Goodier	C	Oncologist					

Table one: details of included participants

## "Best" treatment

The MDT meeting discussion often tends towards debate on which treatment is "best" for a patient amongst the available options. In the following interview extract, a maxillofacial surgeon describes his view of the aim of the MDT discussion:

[The team] need to leave the MDT [meeting] with the treatment options ...prioritised. So a rank order of [the] best treatment clinically – slightly irrespective of the patient's wishes. From a clinical point of view to try and get best outcome, this would be our first, this would be our second, this would be third and fourth and fifth. Then you discuss it with the patient and say, "This is what we think."

In this data extract, the surgeon clearly states his view that the aim of the MDT discussion is to decide the "clinically" best treatment for the patient and even goes as far to say that this could be "irrespective" of the patient's wishes. Teams frequently conclude their discussion of treatment options in the MDT meeting with an agreement for the recommendation (ie the MDT's perception of "best" treatment). This recommendation is to be delivered to the patient. In the following extract, the MDT members are discussing the merits of surgery (laser) vs radiotherapy

Mr Black (ENT surgeon): I have a database of the [laser resections] I have done .... tonsil and soft palate tumours, and it's just....it's something we need to take notice of

Mr Red (ENT surgeon): Yeah, I think we'll need to, we'll have to discuss it another time or we'll take up the whole morning on one case. But, I think there are arguments for and against...

Dr Orange (oncologist): I would suggest he has radiotherapy, because he will have a slightly better functional outcome, and he's 80 and ...because of his age, and because of the possibly better function....would you Dr Yellow?

Dr Yellow (oncologist): Yes

1  
2  
3 Mr Red: I think there is a consensus view of the MDT, would be for  
4 radiotherapy  
5

6 MR Black: OK  
7

8 (Observation, MDT meeting)  
9

10 Although, during this discussion, options of radiotherapy and laser were available to the  
11 patient, the position of the MDT meeting was to provide a recommendation for radiotherapy.  
12

13 Here, we see the members of the MDT preparing their ‘party line’ which is to be delivered to  
14 the patient in clinic. This recommendation for “best treatment” is often conveyed to the  
15 patient on its own or in preference to other options  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **The “cycle of paternalism”**

24  
25  
26 Anxious patients, faced with complex decisions can lead leads to patients endorsing the  
27 paternalistic approach as they are given little or no information about the available treatment  
28 choices and therefore tend to delegate responsibility of the decision to the clinician:  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Pt: You know, they’re the doctors, they’re the professional people. And I’m  
35 just Joe Bloggs off the street. ...For a lot of years, I was a steel erector. I  
36 wouldn’t expect you as a doctor coming along and doing what I could do.  
37 Do I?  
38

39 Interviewer: You feel a decision should be the doctor’s decision?  
40

41 Pt: Oh, definitely, without a doubt. It’s got to be the doctor’s decision.  
42 How could I make a decision like that?  
43  
44

45 Here, the patient delegates the decision to the MDT without question; he is allowing the  
46 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ treatment to act as the sole basis for a treatment decision. If  
47 decision delegation is accepted as the method by which MDTs convey and make decisions, a  
48 paternalistic decision making process results. In this model, the patient accepts that the  
49 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ (and hence the treatment recommendation) is appropriate. It  
50 creates a “cycle of paternalism” with grateful patients accepting firm recommendations from  
51 clinicians and clinicians reassured that they are doing their best for their patients.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Delivery of the MDT treatment recommendation

Firm MDT recommendations can sometimes place the clinician in a difficult position when discussing options. The following extract is the clinic appointment for patient six (the MDT meeting extract was included above). Here Mr Black (who favoured laser in the MDT meeting, referred to here as “surgery”) was delivering the MDT recommendation for radiotherapy to the patient:

Mr Black: After a lot of discussion, the consensus.... would be to give you radiation therapy.... that was what we jointly decided. And we think with that treatment there is a very good chance of controlling your disease completely....

Pt: Well, I'll do as you say

Daughter: So there's no other operation, it would just be radiotherapy?

Mr Black: We discussed this at length at the meeting.... and the majority of people... felt that to be frank, except for me, felt that radiation would be the way forward. And.... that's what we are offering to you as first line treatment. Unless you have any reservations, then we can think about other options.

Pt: I'll do as you say....

Daughter: Right. So he would have to come into hospital every day? He's a really bad traveller...

Pt: You know when I come here I get all tensed up and travelling....

Mr Black: Really? Is it likely you may then stop the treatment midway for whatever reason, because that would backfire very badly.

Pt: I wouldn't do that

Mr Black: I know you asked about the surgical option. I promised people I wouldn't say anything. But it is feasible to take it out surgically, and there is an option available, but the consensus at the MDT was to go ahead with radiation. Unless, as a family or yourself very strongly object to it and feel that you can't go ahead with that, then of course the surgical option is always there. But as a group we felt that the best way forward was to offer you radiation

Pt: Well. I'll go with you

(Observation, MDT Clinic)

1  
2  
3 The final treatment decision was to deliver radiation, but the interaction above reveals the  
4 challenges of being tasked by the MDT to give a single recommendation when it is used in a  
5 decision discussion with a patient. Once new information was gleaned from the patient in  
6 clinic (being a “really bad traveller”) Mr Black struggled with how to deal with the  
7 recommendations: was it a rule to be followed? Here, the rigidity of the treatment  
8 recommendation acted as a barrier to an open discussion about the treatment options  
9 available to the patient and thus inhibited shared decision making.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **Patient engagement with MDT recommendations**

21  
22  
23 Modern clinical practice cannot assume that the sole role of the patient is the acceptance of a  
24 single firm treatment recommendations. Patient 10 was a 61 year old patient with an  
25 advanced cancer of his larynx. In the MDT it was decided that surgery (total laryngectomy)  
26 should be delivered as a single recommendation. Radiotherapy is available, carries a lower  
27 chance of cure, but allows him to retain his voice box. The following data are from his clinic  
28 appointment:  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Mr Black (ENT surgeon): This tumour in your throat is a fairly big tumour,  
38 and it's spread to the neck as well. We believe that there are two possible  
39 ways that we can manage this. At some parts of the scan, there is evidence  
40 that the tumour may have gone into the Adam's apple cartilage.... If that is  
41 the case, surgery would be the only option to get rid of the tumour. But  
42 surgery would involve you losing your voicebox, losing part of the  
43 swallowing passage, you would need a big neck operation....Once we do  
44 the surgery, your speech will be different, you won't be speaking the same.  
45 You will have a hole in the centre of your neck, a tracheostomy  
46  
47  
48

49 Pt: Nah, nah [shakes head]

50  
51 Mr Black: You wouldn't fancy that?

52  
53 Pt: No

54  
55 Mr Black: That's the surgical option. On the other side is the option of  
56 radiation therapy  
57

58  
59 Pt: I would rather take a chance with that  
60

1  
2  
3 (Observation, MDT Clinic)  
4

5 Here, and throughout the course of this consultation, the patient made a decision to reject  
6 surgery, which reduces his length of survival from his cancer in order to preserve his voice  
7 box. He was adamant he did not want a complete removal of the voice box and part of the  
8 throat (pharyngolaryngectomy) and the decision was eventually made to use radiotherapy.  
9  
10 However, in the subsequent interview, patient 10 discussed the rationale for his decision:  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Pt: Well you see my mother died of cancer... my father died of cancer, and  
18 I've seen the way cancer works. I'm not being cheeky.... once they cut you  
19 open, it's like your letting fresh air into a bulb, it then just spreads, and they  
20 stitch you back up again and "We've cured it", right, for how long? And  
21 then it comes back again...  
22

23  
24 Interviewer: And what's important to you when you're making that  
25 decision?  
26

27 Pt: Surviving as long as I can..., I mean if you get the year, 18 months it's  
28 better than getting two weeks isn't it?  
29

30 His consultation, which was limited in exploring what mattered to him, leads to a decision  
31 that is potentially at odds with his aspirations revealed above. His aim of treatment (survival)  
32 is not matched by the actual treatment decision (radiotherapy). This patient perspective could  
33 not be incorporated into the previous MDT discussion (which happened before the clinic  
34 appointment), but equally the subsequent clinic appointment did not explore his preferences  
35 and what underpinned them, risking a treatment decision at odds with his preferences and  
36 values. If Mr Black had explored the options for treatment with the patient more, this  
37 mismatch of treatment preferences and values could have been identified, and perhaps  
38 deconstructed. Such information about values and preferences is essential to good shared  
39 decision making, however very difficult to incorporate into the MDT decision making  
40 structure.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Discussion

This study has found that patient engagement with the outcome of an MDT discussion (a recommendation for “best” treatment) is problematic. Often patients accept this recommendation in the clinic (perhaps precisely because it is presented as the “best” treatment). However, this acquiescence may be due to the disempowered position in which patients find themselves as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn, clinicians often view the acceptance of an MDT recommendation as delegation of the decision by the patient to the clinician, an assumption which can promulgate a ‘cycle of paternalism’, where anxious patients have little real choice other than to accept the clear guidance offered by the expert team. However, limiting patient involvement to acceptance or rejection of a firm recommendation leads to decisions which are not in line with patient values and can not be considered patient-centred, shared decision making.

The rigidity of the MDT recommendation can act as a barrier to an open discussion of the available options. If the patient role is limited to either acceptance or refusal of a single recommendation, true engagement is impossible. A truncated discussion of a single MDT recommendation for treatment prohibits shared decision-making using the “three talk model” , as central to this model is a discussion of the options for treatment. A shared decision-making consultation allows the patient and clinician to explore the risks, benefits and consequences of a treatment alternatives; a move from initial to informed preferences; and exploration of patient values to reach a shared decision <sup>25</sup>.

The structure of MDT working has not significantly changed since its inception in 1996. NHS patients rarely attend their MDT meetings, modern cancer care mandates that all

1  
2  
3 patients are discussed in this setting<sup>26</sup> and interventions to increase the number of patients  
4  
5 discussed in an MDT are still sought after<sup>27</sup>.  
6  
7

### 8 **The MDT recommendation**

9

10  
11 If the MDT meeting and clinic follow a paternalistic pathway, the way in which their  
12 recommendation is used is clear: it is delivered to the patient with an assumption that it will  
13 be accepted. In the paternalistic tradition, physicians are considered to be best placed to  
14 evaluate the trade-offs and pitfalls of treatment, and applied these to the decision process  
15 based on their evaluation of the best interests of the patient <sup>28</sup>. However, often in cancer care  
16 (particularly head and neck cancer), treatment options are available for a patient: which of  
17 these is “best” depends on the value you apply to the various aspects of the treatment. For  
18 example, is the priority of treatment cure or preservation of quality of life? What functional  
19 impact will a patient endure to achieve tumour control? What aspects of functional decline  
20 (such as speech, swallow or aesthetics) are most important? The answers to these questions  
21 are based on values: clinicians and patient do not share values <sup>29-31</sup>. Thus MDTs must ensure  
22 that treatment decisions are driven by patient values. Although patients may justifiably  
23 actively delegate some or all of the responsibility for the decision to the MDT members, at  
24 the same time, the MDT have a duty to ensure that this is not due to disempowerment or lack  
25 of access to the information required to take an active part in decision making. Hence the  
26 clinician has a role to, at the very least, support the patient to understand what is important to  
27 them before accepting the role as decision maker on the patient’s behalf  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Outwith the MDT decision process, a treatment recommendation from an individual clinician  
53 can be modified depending on the ongoing interaction with the patient and the preferences  
54 expressed. An MDT recommendation, on the other hand, is problematic for MDT members  
55 who attempt to combine it with the values or preferences of the patient. Is it set in stone, an  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 obligatory 'best' which must be adhered to? If the patient disagrees with the  
4  
5 recommendation, what action should the MDT member take? In this way, MDT  
6  
7 recommendations are inflexible, especially in the light of new information from the patient  
8  
9 which was not clear or known in the MDT meeting. In other words, information about values  
10  
11 and preferences are vital to a shared decision but difficult to incorporate into the MDT  
12  
13 decision making structure. As we have previously described <sup>18</sup>, MDTs often build the  
14  
15 "evidential patient" in the MDT meeting discussion. This may include information about a  
16  
17 patient's values and preferences, but these are impossible to incorporate into a meeting  
18  
19 discussion without the patient present and without making assumptions about the patient.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Modernising MDT decision-making**

26  
27  
28 If we are to modernise the MDT decision making structure to improve patient involvement,  
29  
30 the role of the MDT discussion and the structure of the clinic must recognise that patients  
31  
32 often "distribute" decisions. Rapley <sup>32</sup> describes how patients demonstrate a 'relational  
33  
34 autonomy' by distributing their decision amongst people, encounters, places and information  
35  
36 sources. Promoting relational autonomy means that involving patients in decisions requires  
37  
38 more than presenting options and awaiting a verdict, instead emphasising the importance of  
39  
40 the interaction with the clinician, encouraging questions, correcting misunderstanding,  
41  
42 constructing preferences and allowing disagreement <sup>33</sup>. Indeed, the MDT decision-making  
43  
44 structure gives ample opportunity for MDT members to distribute their decision amongst  
45  
46 colleagues, but does not afford the same opportunity to patients  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 If the patient is to be a true participant in shared decision making, an alternative model of  
53  
54 MDT decision making is required. Some teams have explored the idea of a patient attending  
55  
56 their own MDT meeting, with many patients reporting a positive experience<sup>34</sup>: this idea is  
57  
58 popular amongst patient advocates <sup>35</sup>, but clinicians have mixed views <sup>7 35 36</sup>. Small studies  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 have concluded that patients attending their own MDT allows for better information giving <sup>37</sup>  
4  
5 <sup>38</sup>and the opportunity to ask questions and contribute information such as preference <sup>39</sup>;  
6  
7 however included patients may have higher health literacy<sup>40</sup> raising the possibility that  
8  
9 including patients has potential to widen health inequality. MDT members often feel that  
10  
11 patients attending their own meeting would inhibit the discussion and cause patient anxiety  
12  
13 <sup>35</sup>; relationships within the MDT are often longstanding with pre existing hierarchies which  
14  
15 can present barriers to new user integration<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, if patients are to be included in  
16  
17 MDT meetings, clarity is required on how patients, their supporters and healthcare teams are  
18  
19 supported to make it a positive and worthwhile experience<sup>42</sup>.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Of key importance is that the MDT meeting is not a discussion of which option is ‘best’ for a  
26  
27 particular patient, but should instead aim to determine which valid treatment options are  
28  
29 available. In particular, palliative options (or options of ‘doing nothing’) are often  
30  
31 inadequately explored <sup>43</sup>. Clinic structures should be flexible to allow patients to distribute  
32  
33 their decision-making amongst information sources and people. The patient may be enabled  
34  
35 to come to the initial consultation more informed and prepared for the discussion. There may  
36  
37 be a role for pre MDT clinic with the patient meeting a surgeon, oncologist or specialist  
38  
39 nurse, or a post MDT clinic to convey options and explore values and preferences, maybe  
40  
41 with more than one clinician. The MDT meeting may take place in a small ‘combined clinic’  
42  
43 setting around the interaction with the patient. The MDT members provide support, resources  
44  
45 and personnel to discuss the treatment options, communicate the risk and uncertainty, elicit  
46  
47 values and explore them; a decision aid may support this work <sup>44</sup>. The team may consider  
48  
49 providing an individual who is independent of the clinical team to act as a decision coach or  
50  
51 navigator <sup>45</sup>. MDT members should be encouraged to update their training in supporting  
52  
53 patients in shared decision making, consent and communication. This study provides a novel  
54  
55 and rich account of the difficulties that patients face when making a decision in the context of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 an MDT. MDT decision making is mandated internationally however the specific structure  
4 of the decision process varies widely. Although the structure presented here (MDT meeting  
5 without a patient present, recommendation delivered to the patient separately) is common,  
6 other models of MDT decision making may not face similar challenges. Also, ethnographic  
7 methods, in providing depth to explore a smaller number of concepts in more detail, may lack  
8 the breadth of findings to make this piece of work widely applicable. Nevertheless, whilst  
9 the setting may not be universally generalisable, we hope that the emergent conclusions will  
10 be.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 It is time for the development and design of alternative models of team decision making  
23 which have a central role for the patient. Further work to develop new model of delivering  
24 team decision-making would be multifactorial, incorporating the development of the structure  
25 of the MDT meeting and clinic, support and training for MDT members and patients and the  
26 development of tools to be used in combination with team decisions. Qualitative approaches  
27 should explore stakeholders' views of intervention components, which should be co-designed  
28 with patients. Evaluation of such interventions requires novel trial design, comparing  
29 methods of decision making and evaluating decision quality. MDT decision making is now  
30 ubiquitous and therefore the urgent need of reform to meet the principles of shared decision  
31 making should be a priority for clinical teams and cancer researchers.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 **Author Contributions**

### 47 **DW Hamilton**

48 Protocol development, ethical approval, data gathering, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 49 **B Heaven**

50 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 51 **R G Thomson**

52 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 53 **JA Wilson**

1  
2  
3 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation  
4

#### 5 **C Exley**

6 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation  
7

#### 8 **Competing interests**

9

10  
11 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at  
12 [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) (available on request from the corresponding author) and  
13 declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that  
14 might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT,  
15 JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work  
16  
17

#### 18 **Funding**

19

20  
21 This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health  
22 Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the  
23 National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of  
24 Health  
25

#### 26 **Data sharing statement**

27

28  
29 No additional data available  
30  
31

#### 32 **References**

33

- 34  
35  
36 1. Licitra L, Keilholz U, Tahara M, et al. Evaluation of the benefit and use of  
37 multidisciplinary teams in the treatment of head and neck cancer. *Oral Oncol*  
38 2016;59:73-9. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2016.06.002  
39  
40 2. Calman KC, Hine D. A Policy Framework for Commissioning Cancer Services In: Health  
41 Do, ed., 1995.  
42  
43 3. Kelly SL, Jackson JE, Hickey BE, et al. Multidisciplinary clinic care improves adherence  
44 to best practice in head and neck cancer. *American journal of otolaryngology*  
45 2013;34(1):57-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2012.08.010  
46  
47 4. Patil RD, Meinzen-Derr JK, Hendricks BL, et al. Improving access and timeliness of care  
48 for veterans with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A multidisciplinary team's  
49 approach. *Laryngoscope* 2016;126(3):627-31. doi: 10.1002/lary.25528  
50  
51 5. Starmer H, Sanguineti G, Marur S, et al. Multidisciplinary head and neck cancer clinic and  
52 adherence with speech pathology. *Laryngoscope* 2011;121(10):2131-5. doi:  
53 10.1002/lary.21746  
54  
55 6. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer:  
56 what is the evidence? *Bmj* 2010;340:c951. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c951  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 7. NCAT. Multidisciplinary team members' views about MDT working: results from a survey  
4 commissioned by the National Cancer Action Team. London Kings College,  
5 2009.  
6
- 7  
8 8. Rajan S, Foreman J, Wallis MG, et al. Multidisciplinary decisions in breast cancer: does  
9 the patient receive what the team has recommended? *British journal of cancer*  
10 2013;108(12):2442-7. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2013.267  
11
- 12 9. Blazeby JM, Wilson L, Metcalfe C, et al. Analysis of clinical decision-making in multi-  
13 disciplinary cancer teams. *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European*  
14 *Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO* 2006;17(3):457-60. doi:  
15 10.1093/annonc/mdj102  
16
- 17 10. Wood JJ, Metcalfe C, Paes A, et al. An evaluation of treatment decisions at a colorectal  
18 cancer multi-disciplinary team. *Colorectal disease : the official journal of the*  
19 *Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland* 2008;10(8):769-72. doi:  
20 10.1111/j.1463-1318.2007.01464.x  
21  
22
- 23 11. Taylor C, Atkins L, Richardson A, et al. Measuring the quality of MDT working: an  
24 observational approach. *BMC cancer* 2012;12:202. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-202  
25
- 26 12. Rowlands S, Callen J. A qualitative analysis of communication between members of a  
27 hospital-based multidisciplinary lung cancer team. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2013;22(1):20-  
28 31. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12004  
29
- 30 13. Lanceley A, Savage J, Menon U, et al. Influences on multidisciplinary team decision-  
31 making. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18(2):215-22. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1525-  
32 1438.2007.00991.x  
33  
34
- 35 14. Soukup T, Murtagh G, Lamb BW, et al. Degrees of Multidisciplinary Underpinning  
36 Care Planning for Patients with Cancer in Weekly Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:  
37 Conversation Analysis. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2021;14:411-24. doi:  
38 10.2147/JMDH.S270394 [published Online First: 2021/02/27]  
39  
40
- 41 15. Kidger J, Murdoch J, Donovan JL, et al. Clinical decision-making in a multidisciplinary  
42 gynaecological cancer team: a qualitative study. *Bjog-Int J Obstet Gy*  
43 2009;116(4):511-17. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2008.02066.x  
44  
45
- 46 16. Horlait M, Baes S, Dhaene S, et al. How multidisciplinary are multidisciplinary team  
47 meetings in cancer care? An observational study in oncology departments in Flanders,  
48 Belgium. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2019;12:159-67. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S196660  
49 [published Online First: 2019/03/14]  
50
- 51 17. Horlait M, De Regge M, Baes S, et al. Exploring non-physician care professionals' roles  
52 in cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*  
53 2022;17(2):e0263611. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263611 [published Online First:  
54 2022/02/04]  
55
- 56 18. Hamilton DW, Heaven B, Thomson RG, et al. Multidisciplinary team decision-making in  
57 cancer and the absent patient: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(7):e012559. doi:  
58 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012559 [published Online First: 2016/07/23]  
59  
60



19. Taylor C, Finnegan-John J, Green JS. "No decision about me without me" in the context of cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative interview study. *BMC health services research* 2014;14:488. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0488-2
20. Strauss AL. *Continual permutations of action*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter 1993.
21. Charmaz K, editor. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: SAGE, 2006.
22. Strauss AL, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research : grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications 1990.
23. Dey I. *Grounding grounded theory : guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. San Diego: Academic Press 1999.
24. Green J, Thorogood N. *Qualitative methods for health research*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE 2009.
25. Elwyn G, Durand MA, Song J, et al. A three-talk model for shared decision making: multistage consultation process. *Bmj* 2017;359:j4891. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4891 [published Online First: 2017/11/08]
26. NICE. *Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancer - the Manual*. London, 2004.
27. Maharaj AD, Evans SM, Zalberg JR, et al. Barriers and enablers to the implementation of multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative study using the theoretical domains framework. *BMJ quality & safety* 2021;30(10):792-803. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2020-011793 [published Online First: 2020/11/29]
28. Charles C, Gafni A, Whelan T. Decision-making in the physician-patient encounter: revisiting the shared treatment decision-making model. *Social science & medicine* 1999;49(5):651-61. doi: S0277953699001458 [pii] [published Online First: 1999/08/19]
29. Hamilton DW, Bins JE, McMeekin P, et al. Quantity vs quality of life in laryngeal cancer: a time trade off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology* 2012;37(Suppl. 1):108.
30. Hamilton DW, Pedersen A, Blanchford H, et al. A comparison of attitudes to laryngeal cancer treatment outcomes: A time trade-off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology* 2018;43(1):117-23. doi: 10.1111/coa.12906
31. Slevin ML, Stubbs L, Plant HJ, et al. Attitudes to chemotherapy: comparing views of patients with cancer with those of doctors, nurses, and general public. *Bmj* 1990;300(6737):1458-60. [published Online First: 1990/06/02]
32. Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. *Social Health Illn* 2008;30(3):429-44. doi: SHIL1064 [pii]  
10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01064.x [published Online First: 2008/01/16]



- 1  
2  
3 33. Entwistle VA, Carter SM, Cribb A, et al. Supporting patient autonomy: the importance of  
4 clinician-patient relationships. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25(7):741-5. doi:  
5 10.1007/s11606-010-1292-2  
6  
7  
8 34. Diekmann A, Heuser C, Ernstmann N, et al. How do breast cancer patients experience  
9 multidisciplinary tumor conferences? - A description from the patient perspective.  
10 *Breast* 2019;44:66-72. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2018.12.012 [published Online First:  
11 2019/01/23]  
12  
13 35. Butow P, Harrison JD, Choy ET, et al. Health professional and consumer views on  
14 involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease  
15 and treatment plan. *Cancer* 2007;110(9):1937-44. doi: 10.1002/cncr.23007  
16  
17 36. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Schellenberger B, et al. Patient Participation in Multidisciplinary  
18 Tumor Conferences from the Providers' Perspective: Is It Feasible in Routine Cancer  
19 Care? *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2020;13:1729-39. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S283166  
20 [published Online First: 2020/12/05]  
21  
22 37. Bellardita L, Donegani S, Spatuzzi AL, et al. Multidisciplinary Versus One-on-One  
23 Setting: A Qualitative Study of Clinicians' Perceptions of Their Relationship With  
24 Patients With Prostate Cancer. *Journal of oncology practice / American Society of*  
25 *Clinical Oncology* 2011;7(1):e1-5. doi: 10.1200/JOP.2010.000020  
26  
27 38. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast  
28 cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan.  
29 *Breast* 2007;16(2):178-89. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2006.10.002  
30  
31 39. Bohmeier B, Schellenberger B, Diekmann A, et al. Opportunities and limitations of  
32 shared decision making in multidisciplinary tumor conferences with patient  
33 participation - A qualitative interview study with providers. *Patient education and*  
34 *counseling* 2021;104(4):792-99. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2020.09.007 [published Online  
35 First: 2020/10/15]  
36  
37 40. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Kowalski C, et al. Health literacy and patient participation in  
38 multidisciplinary tumor conferences in breast cancer care: a multilevel modeling  
39 approach. *BMC cancer* 2019;19(1):330. doi: 10.1186/s12885-019-5546-z [published  
40 Online First: 2019/04/10]  
41  
42 41. Martin GP, Finn R. Patients as team members: opportunities, challenges and paradoxes of  
43 including patients in multi-professional healthcare teams. *Sociol Health Illn*  
44 2011;33(7):1050-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01356.x  
45  
46 42. Schellenberger B, Heuser C, Diekmann A, et al. Questions and emotional expressions  
47 from patients and companions while participating in multidisciplinary tumor  
48 conferences in breast and gynecological cancer centers. *Patient education and*  
49 *counseling* 2021 doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2021.12.010 [published Online First: 2021/12/27]  
50  
51 43. Nelson A, Longo M, Byrne A, et al. Chemotherapy decision-making in advanced lung  
52 cancer: a prospective qualitative study. *BMJ Support Palliat Care* 2020 doi:  
53 10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002395 [published Online First: 2020/08/23]  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 44. Stacey D, Legare F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or  
4 screening decisions. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* 2017(4) doi: ARTN CD001431

5  
6 10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5  
7

8  
9 45. Stacey D, Murray MA, Legare F, et al. Decision coaching to support shared decision  
10 making: a framework, evidence, and implications for nursing practice, education, and  
11 policy. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs* 2008;5(1):25-35. doi: WVN108 [pii]

12  
13 10.1111/j.1741-6787.2007.00108.x [published Online First: 2008/02/13]  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

## Staff Interview Schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- What do you see as the best way of making decisions in head and neck cancer?
- The MDT
  - What is it for? What is its primary aim?
  - What works well, and what works not so well?
  - How could it be improved?
  - No decision about me without me in the MDT.... Is this possible?
- Treatment decision
  - Why do you regard a treatment as the best for a patient?
  - What factors do you take into account when making treatment decisions?
- Patient involvement in decisions/shared decision making
  - What does it mean to you?
  - Do you think there are barriers to patient involvement? What are they? Why do they exist?
  - Why do clinicians struggle to involve their patients effectively?
  - Do you think we need to improve patient involvement? Why?
- Uncertainty/conflict
  - Is it a problem or is it healthy/required?
  - How should uncertainty and conflict be presented to the patient? Should they know that you don't know?
  - If there are options, how should they be communicated?
- Decision for treatment
  - What is the role of the patient in the treatment decision?
  - How much of a role should the patient have? Can patients know enough?
  - How much of a role should a patient have in the decision
    - Should we give power of veto?
    - Should you allow a patient to make a decision which is considered wrong?
    - how much should a patient know before treatment
  - How much of a role should the family have
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Do we palliate enough? Do we treat too many people radically?
  - What are the barriers to good palliation?
  - Do you think we have a range of palliative options available to us?
  - Do you have prognostic information available to you?
  - Would you use this information if it was available? How would you use it?

## New patient interview 1 schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

The interview will cover the following broad areas:

- Previous experience of making healthcare decisions
  - What does shared decision making mean?
  - Have you had to make big healthcare decisions before?
- Experience of making this decision
  - What was your process of making the decision? Talk me through it
  - What did you draw upon?
  - What factors did you take into account?
  - Did you turn to anybody/anything for information or help?
  - How did you come to your final decision?
  - What was the MDT like?
  - Did you understand what was going on?
  - Could it be improved?
- Information given about the disease and treatment options
  - Do you think you had enough information?
  - Where do you get your information from?
  - Do you think you need more information?
  - Did you understand all the information
- Patient involvement in the decision about care
  - Should patients be involved in decisions about their care?
  - How should we involve patients?
  - Were you involved? How?
  - Would you have liked more say/less say?
  - How this made the participant feel, and further exploration
- What are your expectations of treatment?
  - Are you expecting side effects? What sort?
  - Do you have any idea of your prognosis? Do you want to know?
  - Where will you be in 6 months time?
- In the perfect world, how do you think decisions should be made?

## New patient interview 2 schedule/retrospective patient interview schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- Experience of the treatment
  - What has happened so far, story of the treatment
  - Correlation with expectations – worse, better
- New normal
  - Do you have a good quality of life?
  - How do you cope with swallowing?
  - How is your voice, how do you get on with communication?
- MDT and decision process
  - When you look back did you understand the treatment decision?
  - Did you understand the consequences of the decision?
  - Did you have enough information to base the decision on?
  - Should they have allowed you more or less control over the decision?
  - Do you wish the decision had been made differently?
  - Do you feel you made the right or the wrong decision?
  - Do you have any regrets?
  - How could they improve the clinic/the decision process?
  - In the perfect world, how do you think treatment decisions should be made?
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Were you ever aware of the chances of the treatment being successful?
  - Would you want to be aware?
  - Was palliation ever an option for you? Is it now?
- Information giving
  - Do you think you had enough information about treatment?
  - Did you understand what you were entering yourself into?
  - Should they give more information? Could they?

Topic	Page	Short description
1: Title	1	How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres
2: Abstract	2-3	Included in manuscript
3: Problem formulation	4-5	MDT working is common and expensive, but the impact on shared decision making and patient involvement in decisions remains relatively unexplored
4: Purpose or research question	4-5	To examine critically patient engagement in the MDT treatment decision making process in head and neck cancer, and to evaluate the experience and practice of decision-making by patients and clinicians
5: Qualitative approach and research paradigm	5-7	Ethnographic methods (non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews). Analysis followed principles of constructivist grounded theory
6 Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	5	All data were collected by the lead author (DWH) whilst performing his PhD. At the time, he was a trainee surgeon and had taken time out of programme for research. The dual role of surgical trainee and researcher allowed easy access to the setting and language, making ethnography and observations easier and potentially more 'natural'. Co-authors BH and CE were involved in analysis in order to minimise the effect of the researcher's status on the emerging conclusions
7 Context	6&7	The research was conducted in four head and neck cancer centres in the north east of England. In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present; following this, one or more members of the MDT met with the patient in clinic
8 Sampling strategy	7	Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Purposive sampling guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection and analysis occurring in tandem. Thus, further sampling was guided by the emerging analysis and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency was achieved.
9 Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	5	Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and Development governance permissions were obtained. All participants provided informed consent.
10 Data collection methods	6	Non-participant observation; semi structured interviews with patients and staff; field notes; reflective notes. Iterative process with emerging themes explored through further data collection. All

		emerging analysis and memos discussed with co-authors (CE and BH)
11 Data collection instruments and technologies	6	Interview guides (iteratively developed) used for interviews. Field notes and notes from informal discussions. Audiorecording and word-for-word transcription of all formal interviews, MDT meeting and MDT clinic
12 Units of study	6	34 observations of MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments (for 30 patients; 13 of these patients were interviewed once, three were interviewed twice). Interviews with four further treated patients and nine members of staff.
13 Data processing	6-7	All audiorecordings were transcribed word for word and anonymised. All reflective notes and field notes were anonymised. Patients and staff given pseudonyms. MDT meeting data transcribed by the main author (DWH) and all recording transcribed by others were checked by DWH. Audio recordings destroyed after transcription. Data kept on University computers, password protected
14 Data analysis	7	The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were analysed using the same coding framework. Line by line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework; when the coding framework was altered, all transcripts were re-coded. The codes used were conceptual, rather than descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package. Emerging findings (and 'memos') were discussed in the research team (particularly with CE and BH) to develop the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling
15 Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	7	All emerging themes and analysis were discussed in the research team with CE and BH involved in analysis. Findings presented in departmental meetings
16 Synthesis and interpretation	7-12	The outcome of an MDT discussion is frequently a "in the clinic as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn,.
17 Links to empirical data	7-12	Data presented in the results section linked to empirical data throughout
18 Integration with prior work, implications, transferability and contributions to the field	12-16	The discussion section discusses the findings in the context of prior work and the contributions to the field

19 Limitations	3, 18-19	Strengths and limitations are discussed in the discussion section and there is a list of strengths and limitations at the beginning of the manuscript
20 Conflict of interest	16	All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at <a href="http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf">www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf</a> (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work
21 Funding	17	This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of Health



# BMJ Open

## How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-061654.R3
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Hamilton, David; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute; Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, ENT Heaven, Benjamin; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Thomson, Richard; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Wilson, Janet; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute Exley, Catherine; Newcastle University, Population Health Sciences Institute
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Patient-centred medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication, Ear, nose and throat/otolaryngology, Health services research, Qualitative research
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Head & neck surgery < OTOLARYNGOLOGY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

**Title: How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14

**DW Hamilton**

Consultant Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Honorary Senior Lecturer  
Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

15  
16  
17  
18

**B Heaven**

Formerly Newcastle University, has now left academia

19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**R G Thomson**

Emeritus Professor  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**JA Wilson**

Emerita Professor of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

29  
30  
31  
32

**C Exley**

Professor of Qualitative Health Research  
Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX

Corresponding Author:

DW Hamilton

Freeman Hospital, High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE7 7DN

[David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:David.hamilton@ncl.ac.uk)

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Keywords**

Decision Making, Shared

Communication

Cancer

Anthropology, Cultural

Informed consent

Autonomy

## Abstract

### Objectives

To describe how patients are engaged with cancer decisions in the context of multidisciplinary team (MDT) and how MDT recommendations are operationalised in the context of a shared decision.

### Design

Ethnographic qualitative study

### Setting

Four head and neck cancer centres in the north of England

### Participants

Patients with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer; non-participant observation of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT clinics, informal interviews, and formal, semi-structured interviews with 20 patients and 9 MDT staff members

### Methods

Ethnographic methods including non-participant observation of MDT meetings and clinic appointments, informal interviews, field notes and formal semi-structured interviews with patients and MDT members

### Results

MDT discussions often conclude with a firm recommendation for treatment. When delivered to a patient in clinic this recommendation is often accepted by the patient, but this response may result from the disempowered position in which they find themselves. Whilst patient behaviour may thus appear to endorse clinicians' views that a paternalistic approach is desired by patients (creating a "cycle of paternalism"), the rigidity of the MDT treatment

1  
2  
3 recommendation can act as a barrier to discussion of options and the exploration of patient  
4  
5 values.  
6  
7

## 8 Conclusions

9  
10 The current model of MDT decision making does not support shared decision making and  
11  
12 may actively undermine it. A model should be developed whereby the individual patient  
13  
14 perspective has more input into MDT discussions, and where decisions are made on potential  
15  
16 treatment options rather than providing a single recommendation for discussion with the  
17  
18 patient. Deeper consideration should be given to how the MDT incorporates the patient  
19  
20 perspective and/or delivers its discussion of options to the patient. In order to achieve these  
21  
22 objectives, a new model of MDT working is required.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Word count: 3732  
28  
29

## 30 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 31  
32  
33
- 34 • This ethnographic study provides an in-depth analysis of the complexities of patient  
35 involvement and interaction with MDT decision making  
36
  - 37 • The methods (direct observation and semi structured interviews) allow a rich, data-  
38 driven analysis of a complex decision-making environment  
39
  - 40 • Head and neck cancer involves the trade off of function for survival and is thus a  
41 useful model when exploring complex decision making  
42
  - 43 • As is commonplace in qualitative researcher one researcher led the sampling,  
44 collecting and analysis, but the whole team were involved in discussions about  
45 interpretation of the data  
46
  - 47 • Although the structure of MDT decision making discussed here predominates in the  
48 UK, the issues faced will not be applicable to all teams  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Multidisciplinary team (MDT) decision making is internationally mandated to support appropriate high-quality treatment of patients with cancer <sup>1</sup>. In the UK, MDT working was established following the Calman-Hine report <sup>2</sup> and improves many aspects of cancer treatment such as staging, recruitment to trials <sup>1</sup>, adherence to treatment guidelines <sup>3</sup>, use of effective evidence-based therapy, timeliness of care <sup>4</sup> and access to the allied members of the healthcare team <sup>5</sup>. However the practice is time consuming and expensive, costing at least £100 million a year in the UK for data preparation and the same amount again for attendance in the UK <sup>6</sup>. To date no MDT cost-benefit analysis has been performed.

MDT members report that consideration of the patient as a person in decision making as a vital part of the decision-making process. In a survey of 2054 MDT members, 95% of respondents felt that “Patient views should always inform the decision-making process” and “Patient views/preferences should be presented to the MDT by somebody who has met the patient” <sup>7</sup>. Omitting patient preference information has an effect on the implementation of MDT recommendations <sup>8-10</sup>. MDT meetings are often dominated by discussion among doctors rather than including other MDT members who may know the patient better or have a more patient-centred perspective <sup>11-14</sup> creating a predominance of the biomedical model of disease <sup>15-17</sup>. This means that the stated aim of many MDT members - to have the patient central to the MDT treatment discussion - is at odds with the reality of the MDT process

We have previously described that if MDT meetings are to become more patient-centred, merely introducing increasing amounts of information about the patient into the MDT is not sufficient <sup>18</sup>. Although we know that the direct viewpoint of the patient within the MDT is lacking <sup>19</sup>, there is to date no account of how patients engage with decisions about their treatment in the context of MDTs. This work aims to explore the experience of making

1  
2  
3 decisions in the context of an MDT, with a particular emphasis on the patient experience of  
4  
5 the decision process.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Methods**

11  
12  
13 This qualitative study used non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews to  
14  
15 critically examine how decisions were made in and around the MDT with a particular focus  
16  
17 on patient centredness. All data were collected by one researcher (DWH), a head and neck  
18  
19 surgeon. Non-participant observation enables the researcher to study participants in their  
20  
21 natural environment, and adds value to retrospective accounts gleaned only through  
22  
23 participant interviews <sup>20</sup>.  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Patient and Public Involvement**

29  
30  
31 Two head and neck patient groups were consulted during development of the research  
32  
33 question, study design and protocol development, but patients were not involved in data  
34  
35 gathering and analysis.  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **Ethical Approval**

40  
41  
42 All participants gave written informed consent to be interviewed. Observational data (MDT  
43  
44 meeting and clinic) were audiorecorded, then the patient was approached, two to three days  
45  
46 after the event, to consent for inclusion in the study. If they agreed to be included, then the  
47  
48 recordings were transcribed word for word. If they refused, all data collected so far were  
49  
50 securely destroyed. This consent procedure was developed to avoid approaching the patient  
51  
52 on the day of the treatment decision when they were already being given a lot of information.  
53  
54  
55  
56 Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and  
4  
5 Development governance permissions were obtained.  
6  
7

## 8 **Sampling**

9  
10  
11 Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their  
12  
13 care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Concepts arising  
14  
15 from the patient-derived data drove the subsequent data collection and analysis. A range of  
16  
17 staff members who were part of the MDT were also recruited for interview. Purposive  
18  
19 sampling <sup>21</sup> guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection  
20  
21 and analysis occurring in tandem. Cases were included which would test the concepts and  
22  
23 themes which were emerging. For example, in the early cases, palliative options were often  
24  
25 not discussed or offered in the clinic, and so patients were included who had options for  
26  
27 treatment, one of which was palliative, were included. Concepts explored through sampling  
28  
29 also included uncertainty, assessment of best and trust. Thus, further sampling was guided  
30  
31 by the emerging analysis <sup>22</sup> and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency <sup>23</sup> was  
32  
33 achieved. This means that data collection ceases when sufficient or adequate depth of  
34  
35 understanding has been reached; this allows for a greater number and breadth of concepts to  
36  
37 be explored in this complex setting using multiple data collection techniques  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Observations**

46  
47  
48 Non-participant observations of 35 MDT meetings and 37 MDT outpatient clinics were  
49  
50 conducted. Patient with a diagnosis of new or recurrent head and neck cancer whose  
51  
52 treatment options were being discussed in the MDT were included. They were excluded if  
53  
54 they did not understand written or spoken English, or they did not have the capacity to  
55  
56 consent. The MDT meetings and clinics were all audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Detailed field notes were also made at the time of observation, then transcribed immediately  
4  
5 afterwards.  
6  
7

## 8 **Interviews**

9  
10  
11 Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients and staff. The development of the  
12 interview guide was iterative; as data collection continued, the content of the guide evolved  
13 in order to explore emerging themes<sup>24</sup>. In particular, the interview guide evolved to explore  
14 concepts of uncertainty (and how it is communicated), conversations around and attitudes  
15 towards palliative care, trust (between members of the MDT and between doctor and patient)  
16 and risk communication (see supplemental file). Informal interviews with staff members of  
17 the MDT also took place and were incorporated into written field notes. Pseudonyms are  
18 used for reporting data throughout to protect the anonymity of respondents.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 **Analysis**

32  
33  
34 The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed  
35 with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory<sup>21</sup>. Only one coder  
36 was used because of the complexity of the multiple data sources during this ethnographic  
37 study. However emerging concepts and themes were discussed formally in the wider  
38 research team. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were  
39 analysed using the same coding framework. The codes used were conceptual, rather than  
40 descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. Line by  
41 line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during  
42 axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework.  
43 Hence coding was both inductive and deductive and when the coding framework was altered,  
44 all transcripts were re-coded. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Emerging findings (and ‘memos’) were formally discussed in the research team to develop  
4  
5 the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Results**

11  
12  
13 The research was conducted in three head and neck cancer (HNC) centres in the north east of  
14  
15 England. A total of 35 MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments MDT meetings and clinics  
16  
17 were observed for 30 patients (23 males and seven females, aged 38-87 years). Additionally  
18  
19 23 interviews were conducted with patients and nine interviews with MDT members (see  
20  
21 table one). In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present and was  
22  
23 attended by surgeons, oncologists, radiologists, pathologists, speech and language therapists,  
24  
25 dieticians and administrative staff. Following the meeting, one surgeon met with the patient  
26  
27 in clinic. Sometimes other members were present with the surgeon, and other times they  
28  
29 were alone. If considering non-surgical options, the patient would meet an oncologist. Each  
30  
31 MDT would discuss between 10 and 30 patients; the majority of these patients were then seen  
32  
33 in the accompanying clinic  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

PATIENTS: Group 1	Centre	Age	Tumour site	Observation		Int 1	Int 2
				MDT	Clinic		
Patient 1	A	68	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Patient 2	A	82	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 3	A	61	Parotid	1	1	x	x
Patient 4	A	71	Lip	1	1	x	x
Patient 5	A	54	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 6	A	80	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 7	A	72	Pinna	1	1	x	x
Patient 8	A	87	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 9	A	64	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 10	A	61	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 11	A	52	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 12	A	55	Pharynx	1	1	1	1
Patient 13	A	62	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 14	B	73	Pharynx	3	1	1	x
Patient 15	B	49	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 16	B	52	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 17	B	63	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 18	B	49	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 19	B	73	Mouth	3	1	1	x
Patient 20	B	65	Larynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 21	B	57	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 22	B	63	Pharynx	1	2	1	1
Patient 23	C	69	Pharynx	1	2	1	x
Patient 24	C	81	Mandible	1	2	x	x
Patient 25	C	60	Pharynx	1	1	1	x
Patient 26	C	67	Pharynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 27	C	46	Pharynx	1	2	x	x
Patient 28	C	38	Larynx	1	1	x	x
Patient 29	C	70	Larynx	1	4	1	x
Patient 30	C	84	Larynx	1	1	x	x
<b>PATIENTS: Group 2 (interview only)</b>							
Patient 31	A	82	Pharynx				
Patient 32	A	57	Larynx				
Patient 33	A	52	Pharynx				
Patient 34	B	65	Larynx				
<b>STAFF (interview only)</b>		<b>Staff role</b>					
Staff 1	A	ENT surgeon					
Staff 2	A	Oncologist					
Staff 3	A	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Staff 4	A	Speech and Language Therapist					
Staff 5	A	Clinical Nurse Specialist					
Staff 6	B	Maxillofacial surgeon					
Staff 7	B	ENT surgeon					
Staff 8	B	ENT surgeon					
Staff 9	C	Oncologist					

Table one: details of included participants

## "Best" treatment

The MDT meeting discussion often tends towards debate on which treatment is "best" for a patient amongst the available options. In the following interview extract, a maxillofacial surgeon describes his view of the aim of the MDT discussion:

[The team] need to leave the MDT [meeting] with the treatment options ...prioritised. So a rank order of [the] best treatment clinically – slightly irrespective of the patient's wishes. From a clinical point of view to try and get best outcome, this would be our first, this would be our second, this would be third and fourth and fifth. Then you discuss it with the patient and say, "This is what we think."

In this data extract, the surgeon clearly states his view that the aim of the MDT discussion is to decide the "clinically" best treatment for the patient and even goes as far to say that this could be "irrespective" of the patient's wishes. Teams frequently conclude their discussion of treatment options in the MDT meeting with an agreement for the recommendation (ie the MDT's perception of "best" treatment). This recommendation is to be delivered to the patient. In the following extract, the MDT members are discussing the merits of surgery (laser) vs radiotherapy

ENT surgeon 1: I have a database of the [laser resections] I have done .... tonsil and soft palate tumours, and it's just....it's something we need to take notice of

ENT surgeon 2: Yeah, I think we'll need to, we'll have to discuss it another time or we'll take up the whole morning on one case. But, I think there are arguments for and against...

Oncologist 1: I would suggest he has radiotherapy, because he will have a slightly better functional outcome, and he's 80 and ...because of his age, and because of the possibly better function....would you Dr Yellow?

Oncologist 2: Yes

1  
2  
3 ENT surgeon 2: I think there is a consensus view of the MDT, would be  
4 for radiotherapy  
5

6 ENT surgeon 1: OK  
7

8 (Observation, MDT meeting)  
9

10 Although, during this discussion, options of radiotherapy and laser were available to the  
11 patient, the position of the MDT meeting was to provide a recommendation for radiotherapy.  
12

13 Here, we see the members of the MDT preparing their ‘party line’ which is to be delivered to  
14 the patient in clinic. This recommendation for “best treatment” is often conveyed to the  
15 patient on its own or in preference to other options  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **The “cycle of paternalism”**

23  
24  
25 Anxious patients, faced with complex decisions can lead leads to patients endorsing the  
26 paternalistic approach as they are given little or no information about the available treatment  
27 choices and therefore tend to delegate responsibility of the decision to the clinician:  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Pt: You know, they’re the doctors, they’re the professional people. And I’m  
35 just Joe Bloggs off the street. ...For a lot of years, I was a steel erector. I  
36 wouldn’t expect you as a doctor coming along and doing what I could do.  
37 Do I?  
38

39 Interviewer: You feel a decision should be the doctor’s decision?  
40

41 Pt: Oh, definitely, without a doubt. It’s got to be the doctor’s decision.  
42 How could I make a decision like that?  
43  
44

45 Here, the patient delegates the decision to the MDT without question; he is allowing the  
46 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ treatment to act as the sole basis for a treatment decision. If  
47 decision delegation is accepted as the method by which MDTs convey and make decisions, a  
48 paternalistic decision making process results. In this model, the patient accepts that the  
49 MDT’s assessment of ‘best’ (and hence the treatment recommendation) is appropriate. It  
50 creates a “cycle of paternalism” with grateful patients accepting firm recommendations from  
51 clinicians and clinicians reassured that they are doing their best for their patients.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Delivery of the MDT treatment recommendation

Firm MDT recommendations can sometimes place the clinician in a difficult position when discussing options. The following extract is the clinic appointment for patient six (the MDT meeting extract was included above). Here the ENT surgeon (who favoured laser in the MDT meeting, referred to here as “surgery”) was delivering the MDT recommendation for radiotherapy to the patient:

ENT surgeon: After a lot of discussion, the consensus.... would be to give you radiation therapy.... that was what we jointly decided. And we think with that treatment there is a very good chance of controlling your disease completely....

Pt: Well, I'll do as you say

Daughter: So there's no other operation, it would just be radiotherapy?

ENT surgeon: We discussed this at length at the meeting.... and the majority of people... felt that to be frank, except for me, felt that radiation would be the way forward. And.... that's what we are offering to you as first line treatment. Unless you have any reservations, then we can think about other options.

Pt: I'll do as you say....

Daughter: Right. So he would have to come into hospital every day? He's a really bad traveller...

Pt: You know when I come here I get all tensed up and travelling....

ENT surgeon: Really? Is it likely you may then stop the treatment midway for whatever reason, because that would backfire very badly.

Pt: I wouldn't do that

ENT surgeon: I know you asked about the surgical option. I promised people I wouldn't say anything. But it is feasible to take it out surgically, and there is an option available, but the consensus at the MDT was to go ahead with radiation. Unless, as a family or yourself very strongly object to it and feel that you can't go ahead with that, then of course the surgical option is always there. But as a group we felt that the best way forward was to offer you radiation

Pt: Well. I'll go with you

(Observation, MDT Clinic)

1  
2  
3 The final treatment decision was to deliver radiation, but the interaction above reveals the  
4 challenges of being tasked by the MDT to give a single recommendation when it is used in a  
5 decision discussion with a patient. Once new information was gleaned from the patient in  
6 clinic (being a “really bad traveller”) the surgeon struggled with how to deal with the  
7 recommendations: was it a rule to be followed? Here, the rigidity of the treatment  
8 recommendation acted as a barrier to an open discussion about the treatment options  
9 available to the patient and thus inhibited shared decision making.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **Patient engagement with MDT recommendations**

21  
22  
23 Modern clinical practice cannot assume that the sole role of the patient is the acceptance of a  
24 single firm treatment recommendations. Patient 10 was a 61 year old patient with an  
25 advanced cancer of his larynx. In the MDT it was decided that surgery (total laryngectomy)  
26 should be delivered as a single recommendation. Radiotherapy is available, carries a lower  
27 chance of cure, but allows him to retain his voice box. The following data are from his clinic  
28 appointment:  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 ENT surgeon: This tumour in your throat is a fairly big tumour, and it's  
38 spread to the neck as well. We believe that there are two possible ways that  
39 we can manage this. At some parts of the scan, there is evidence that the  
40 tumour may have gone into the Adam's apple cartilage.... If that is the  
41 case, surgery would be the only option to get rid of the tumour. But surgery  
42 would involve you losing your voicebox, losing part of the swallowing  
43 passage, you would need a big neck operation....Once we do the surgery,  
44 your speech will be different, you won't be speaking the same. You will  
45 have a hole in the centre of your neck, a tracheostomy  
46  
47  
48

49 Pt: Nah, nah [shakes head]

50  
51 ENT surgeon: You wouldn't fancy that?

52  
53 Pt: No

54  
55 ENT surgeon: That's the surgical option. On the other side is the option of  
56 radiation therapy  
57

58  
59 Pt: I would rather take a chance with that  
60

1  
2  
3 (Observation, MDT Clinic)  
4

5 Here, and throughout the course of this consultation, the patient made a decision to reject  
6 surgery, which reduces his length of survival from his cancer in order to preserve his voice  
7 box. He was adamant he did not want a complete removal of the voice box and part of the  
8 throat (pharyngolaryngectomy) and the decision was eventually made to use radiotherapy.  
9  
10 However, in the subsequent interview, patient 10 discussed the rationale for his decision:  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Pt: Well you see my mother died of cancer... my father died of cancer, and  
18 I've seen the way cancer works. I'm not being cheeky.... once they cut you  
19 open, it's like your letting fresh air into a bulb, it then just spreads, and they  
20 stitch you back up again and "We've cured it", right, for how long? And  
21 then it comes back again...  
22

23  
24 Interviewer: And what's important to you when you're making that  
25 decision?  
26

27 Pt: Surviving as long as I can..., I mean if you get the year, 18 months it's  
28 better than getting two weeks isn't it?  
29

30 His consultation, which was limited in exploring what mattered to him, leads to a decision  
31 that is potentially at odds with his aspirations revealed above. His aim of treatment (survival)  
32 is not matched by the actual treatment decision (radiotherapy). This patient perspective could  
33 not be incorporated into the previous MDT discussion (which happened before the clinic  
34 appointment), but equally the subsequent clinic appointment did not explore his preferences  
35 and what underpinned them, risking a treatment decision at odds with his preferences and  
36 values. If the surgeon had explored the options for treatment with the patient more, this  
37 mismatch of treatment preferences and values could have been identified, and perhaps  
38 deconstructed. Such information about values and preferences is essential to good shared  
39 decision making, however very difficult to incorporate into the MDT decision making  
40 structure.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Discussion

This study has found that patient engagement with the outcome of an MDT discussion (a recommendation for “best” treatment) is problematic. Often patients accept this recommendation in the clinic (perhaps precisely because it is presented as the “best” treatment). However, this acquiescence may be due to the disempowered position in which patients find themselves as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn, clinicians often view the acceptance of an MDT recommendation as delegation of the decision by the patient to the clinician, an assumption which can promulgate a ‘cycle of paternalism’, where anxious patients have little real choice other than to accept the clear guidance offered by the expert team. However, limiting patient involvement to acceptance or rejection of a firm recommendation leads to decisions which are not in line with patient values and can not be considered patient-centred, shared decision making.

The rigidity of the MDT recommendation can act as a barrier to an open discussion of the available options. If the patient role is limited to either acceptance or refusal of a single recommendation, true engagement is impossible. A truncated discussion of a single MDT recommendation for treatment prohibits shared decision-making using the “three talk model” , as central to this model is a discussion of the options for treatment. A shared decision-making consultation allows the patient and clinician to explore the risks, benefits and consequences of a treatment alternatives; a move from initial to informed preferences; and exploration of patient values to reach a shared decision <sup>25</sup>.

The structure of MDT working has not significantly changed since its inception in 1996. NHS patients rarely attend their MDT meetings, modern cancer care mandates that all

1  
2  
3 patients are discussed in this setting<sup>26</sup> and interventions to increase the number of patients  
4  
5 discussed in an MDT are still sought after<sup>27</sup>.  
6  
7

### 8 **The MDT recommendation**

9

10  
11 If the MDT meeting and clinic follow a paternalistic pathway, the way in which their  
12 recommendation is used is clear: it is delivered to the patient with an assumption that it will  
13 be accepted. In the paternalistic tradition, physicians are considered to be best placed to  
14 evaluate the trade-offs and pitfalls of treatment, and applied these to the decision process  
15 based on their evaluation of the best interests of the patient <sup>28</sup>. However, often in cancer care  
16 (particularly head and neck cancer), treatment options are available for a patient: which of  
17 these is “best” depends on the value you apply to the various aspects of the treatment. For  
18 example, is the priority of treatment cure or preservation of quality of life? What functional  
19 impact will a patient endure to achieve tumour control? What aspects of functional decline  
20 (such as speech, swallow or aesthetics) are most important? The answers to these questions  
21 are based on values: clinicians and patient do not share values <sup>29-31</sup>. Thus MDTs must ensure  
22 that treatment decisions are driven by patient values. Although patients may justifiably  
23 actively delegate some or all of the responsibility for the decision to the MDT members, at  
24 the same time, the MDT have a duty to ensure that this is not due to disempowerment or lack  
25 of access to the information required to take an active part in decision making. Hence the  
26 clinician has a role to, at the very least, support the patient to understand what is important to  
27 them before accepting the role as decision maker on the patient’s behalf  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 Outwith the MDT decision process, a treatment recommendation from an individual clinician  
53 can be modified depending on the ongoing interaction with the patient and the preferences  
54 expressed. An MDT recommendation, on the other hand, is problematic for MDT members  
55 who attempt to combine it with the values or preferences of the patient. Is it set in stone, an  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 obligatory 'best' which must be adhered to? If the patient disagrees with the  
4  
5 recommendation, what action should the MDT member take? In this way, MDT  
6  
7 recommendations are inflexible, especially in the light of new information from the patient  
8  
9 which was not clear or known in the MDT meeting. In other words, information about values  
10  
11 and preferences are vital to a shared decision but difficult to incorporate into the MDT  
12  
13 decision making structure. As we have previously described <sup>18</sup>, MDTs often build the  
14  
15 "evidential patient" in the MDT meeting discussion. This may include information about a  
16  
17 patient's values and preferences, but these are impossible to incorporate into a meeting  
18  
19 discussion without the patient present and without making assumptions about the patient.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 **Modernising MDT decision-making**

26  
27  
28 If we are to modernise the MDT decision making structure to improve patient involvement,  
29  
30 the role of the MDT discussion and the structure of the clinic must recognise that patients  
31  
32 often "distribute" decisions. Rapley <sup>32</sup> describes how patients demonstrate a 'relational  
33  
34 autonomy' by distributing their decision amongst people, encounters, places and information  
35  
36 sources. Promoting relational autonomy means that involving patients in decisions requires  
37  
38 more than presenting options and awaiting a verdict, instead emphasising the importance of  
39  
40 the interaction with the clinician, encouraging questions, correcting misunderstanding,  
41  
42 constructing preferences and allowing disagreement <sup>33</sup>. Indeed, the MDT decision-making  
43  
44 structure gives ample opportunity for MDT members to distribute their decision amongst  
45  
46 colleagues, but does not afford the same opportunity to patients  
47  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 If the patient is to be a true participant in shared decision making, an alternative model of  
53  
54 MDT decision making is required. Some teams have explored the idea of a patient attending  
55  
56 their own MDT meeting, with many patients reporting a positive experience<sup>34</sup>: this idea is  
57  
58 popular amongst patient advocates <sup>35</sup>, but clinicians have mixed views <sup>7 35 36</sup>. Small studies  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 have concluded that patients attending their own MDT allows for better information giving <sup>37</sup>  
4  
5 <sup>38</sup>and the opportunity to ask questions and contribute information such as preference <sup>39</sup>;  
6  
7 however included patients may have higher health literacy<sup>40</sup> raising the possibility that  
8  
9 including patients has potential to widen health inequality. MDT members often feel that  
10  
11 patients attending their own meeting would inhibit the discussion and cause patient anxiety  
12  
13 <sup>35</sup>; relationships within the MDT are often longstanding with pre existing hierarchies which  
14  
15 can present barriers to new user integration<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, if patients are to be included in  
16  
17 MDT meetings, clarity is required on how patients, their supporters and healthcare teams are  
18  
19 supported to make it a positive and worthwhile experience<sup>42</sup>.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Of key importance is that the MDT meeting is not a discussion of which option is 'best' for a  
26  
27 particular patient, but should instead aim to determine which valid treatment options are  
28  
29 available. In particular, palliative options (or options of 'doing nothing') are often  
30  
31 inadequately explored <sup>43</sup>. Clinic structures should be flexible to allow patients to distribute  
32  
33 their decision-making amongst information sources and people. The patient may be enabled  
34  
35 to come to the initial consultation more informed and prepared for the discussion. There may  
36  
37 be a role for pre MDT clinic with the patient meeting a surgeon, oncologist or specialist  
38  
39 nurse, or a post MDT clinic to convey options and explore values and preferences, maybe  
40  
41 with more than one clinician. The MDT meeting may take place in a small 'combined clinic'  
42  
43 setting around the interaction with the patient. The MDT members provide support, resources  
44  
45 and personnel to discuss the treatment options, communicate the risk and uncertainty, elicit  
46  
47 values and explore them; a decision aid may support this work <sup>44</sup>. The team may consider  
48  
49 providing an individual who is independent of the clinical team to act as a decision coach or  
50  
51 navigator <sup>45</sup>. MDT members should be encouraged to update their training in supporting  
52  
53 patients in shared decision making, consent and communication. This study provides a novel  
54  
55 and rich account of the difficulties that patients face when making a decision in the context of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 an MDT. Sampling included patients with a decision to make or options available, which  
4  
5 potentially excluded more straightforward cases which may make up a lot of MDT workload.  
6  
7 MDT decision making is mandated internationally however the specific structure of the  
8  
9 decision process varies widely. Although the structure presented here (MDT meeting without  
10  
11 a patient present, recommendation delivered to the patient separately) is common, other  
12  
13 models of MDT decision making may not face similar challenges. Also, ethnographic  
14  
15 methods, in providing depth to explore a smaller number of concepts in more detail, may lack  
16  
17 the breadth of findings to make this piece of work widely applicable. Nevertheless, whilst the  
18  
19 setting may not be universally generalisable, we hope that the emergent conclusions will be.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 It is time for the development and design of alternative models of team decision making  
26  
27 which have a central role for the patient. Further work to develop new model of delivering  
28  
29 team decision-making would be multifactorial, incorporating the development of the structure  
30  
31 of the MDT meeting and clinic, support and training for MDT members and patients and the  
32  
33 development of tools to be used in combination with team decisions. Qualitative approaches  
34  
35 should explore stakeholders' views of intervention components, which should be co-designed  
36  
37 with patients. Evaluation of such interventions requires novel trial design, comparing  
38  
39 methods of decision making and evaluating decision quality. MDT decision making is now  
40  
41 ubiquitous and therefore the urgent need of reform to meet the principles of shared decision  
42  
43 making should be a priority for clinical teams and cancer researchers.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **Author Contributions**

### 51 **DW Hamilton**

52 Protocol development, ethical approval, data gathering, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 55 **B Heaven**

56 Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

### 58 **R G Thomson**

59 Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation  
60

**JA Wilson**

Protocol development, data analysis, manuscript preparation

**C Exley**

Protocol development, ethical approval, data analysis, manuscript preparation

**Competing interests**

All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work

**Funding**

This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of Health DRF-2010-03-54.

**Data sharing statement**

No additional data available

**Ethics statement**

Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and Development governance permissions were obtained.

**References**

1. Licitra L, Keilholz U, Tahara M, et al. Evaluation of the benefit and use of multidisciplinary teams in the treatment of head and neck cancer. *Oral Oncol* 2016;59:73-9. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2016.06.002
2. Calman KC, Hine D. A Policy Framework for Commissioning Cancer Services In: Health Do, ed., 1995.
3. Kelly SL, Jackson JE, Hickey BE, et al. Multidisciplinary clinic care improves adherence to best practice in head and neck cancer. *American journal of otolaryngology* 2013;34(1):57-60. doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2012.08.010

- 1  
2  
3 4. Patil RD, Meinzen-Derr JK, Hendricks BL, et al. Improving access and timeliness of care  
4 for veterans with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: A multidisciplinary team's  
5 approach. *Laryngoscope* 2016;126(3):627-31. doi: 10.1002/lary.25528  
6
- 7  
8 5. Starmer H, Sanguineti G, Marur S, et al. Multidisciplinary head and neck cancer clinic and  
9 adherence with speech pathology. *Laryngoscope* 2011;121(10):2131-5. doi:  
10.1002/lary.21746  
10  
11
- 12  
13 6. Taylor C, Munro AJ, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Multidisciplinary team working in cancer:  
14 what is the evidence? *Bmj* 2010;340:c951. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c951  
15
- 16  
17 7. NCAT. Multidisciplinary team members' views about MDT working: results from a survey  
18 commissioned by the National Cancer Action Team. London Kings College,  
19 2009.
- 20  
21 8. Rajan S, Foreman J, Wallis MG, et al. Multidisciplinary decisions in breast cancer: does  
22 the patient receive what the team has recommended? *British journal of cancer*  
23 2013;108(12):2442-7. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2013.267  
24
- 25  
26 9. Blazeby JM, Wilson L, Metcalfe C, et al. Analysis of clinical decision-making in multi-  
27 disciplinary cancer teams. *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European*  
28 *Society for Medical Oncology / ESMO* 2006;17(3):457-60. doi:  
29 10.1093/annonc/mdj102
- 30  
31 10. Wood JJ, Metcalfe C, Paes A, et al. An evaluation of treatment decisions at a colorectal  
32 cancer multi-disciplinary team. *Colorectal disease : the official journal of the*  
33 *Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland* 2008;10(8):769-72. doi:  
34 10.1111/j.1463-1318.2007.01464.x
- 35  
36 11. Taylor C, Atkins L, Richardson A, et al. Measuring the quality of MDT working: an  
37 observational approach. *BMC cancer* 2012;12:202. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-202  
38
- 39  
40 12. Rowlands S, Callen J. A qualitative analysis of communication between members of a  
41 hospital-based multidisciplinary lung cancer team. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2013;22(1):20-  
42 31. doi: 10.1111/ecc.12004
- 43  
44 13. Lanceley A, Savage J, Menon U, et al. Influences on multidisciplinary team decision-  
45 making. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18(2):215-22. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1525-  
46 1438.2007.00991.x
- 47  
48 14. Soukup T, Murtagh G, Lamb BW, et al. Degrees of Multidisciplinary Underpinning  
49 Care Planning for Patients with Cancer in Weekly Multidisciplinary Team Meetings:  
50 Conversation Analysis. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2021;14:411-24. doi:  
51 10.2147/JMDH.S270394 [published Online First: 2021/02/27]  
52
- 53  
54 15. Kidger J, Murdoch J, Donovan JL, et al. Clinical decision-making in a multidisciplinary  
55 gynaecological cancer team: a qualitative study. *Bjog-Int J Obstet Gy*  
56 2009;116(4):511-17. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1471-0528.2008.02066.x  
57
- 58  
59 16. Horlait M, Baes S, Dhaene S, et al. How multidisciplinary are multidisciplinary team  
60 meetings in cancer care? An observational study in oncology departments in Flanders,



- 1  
2  
3 Belgium. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2019;12:159-67. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S196660  
4 [published Online First: 2019/03/14]  
5  
6  
7 17. Horlait M, De Regge M, Baes S, et al. Exploring non-physician care professionals' roles  
8 in cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*  
9 2022;17(2):e0263611. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0263611 [published Online First:  
10 2022/02/04]  
11  
12 18. Hamilton DW, Heaven B, Thomson RG, et al. Multidisciplinary team decision-making in  
13 cancer and the absent patient: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(7):e012559. doi:  
14 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012559 [published Online First: 2016/07/23]  
15  
16 19. Taylor C, Finnegan-John J, Green JS. "No decision about me without me" in the context  
17 of cancer multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative interview study. *BMC health*  
18 *services research* 2014;14:488. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0488-2  
19  
20 20. Strauss AL. *Continual permutations of action*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter 1993.  
21  
22 21. Charmaz K, editor. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through*  
23 *Qualitative Analysis*. London: SAGE, 2006.  
24  
25 22. Strauss AL, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research : grounded theory procedures and*  
26 *techniques*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications 1990.  
27  
28 23. Dey I. *Grounding grounded theory : guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. San Diego:  
29 Academic Press 1999.  
30  
31 24. Green J, Thorogood N. *Qualitative methods for health research*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles:  
32 SAGE 2009.  
33  
34 25. Elwyn G, Durand MA, Song J, et al. A three-talk model for shared decision making:  
35 multistage consultation process. *Bmj* 2017;359:j4891. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j4891  
36 [published Online First: 2017/11/08]  
37  
38 26. NICE. *Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancer - the Manual*. London, 2004.  
39  
40 27. Maharaj AD, Evans SM, Zalcborg JR, et al. Barriers and enablers to the implementation  
41 of multidisciplinary team meetings: a qualitative study using the theoretical domains  
42 framework. *BMJ quality & safety* 2021;30(10):792-803. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2020-  
43 011793 [published Online First: 2020/11/29]  
44  
45 28. Charles C, Gafni A, Whelan T. Decision-making in the physician-patient encounter:  
46 revisiting the shared treatment decision-making model. *Social science & medicine*  
47 1999;49(5):651-61. doi: S0277953699001458 [pii] [published Online First:  
48 1999/08/19]  
49  
50 29. Hamilton DW, Bins JE, McMeekin P, et al. Quantity vs quality of life in laryngeal  
51 cancer: a time trade off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology* 2012;37(Suppl. 1):108.  
52  
53 30. Hamilton DW, Pedersen A, Blanchford H, et al. A comparison of attitudes to laryngeal  
54 cancer treatment outcomes: A time trade-off study. *Clinical Otolaryngology*  
55 2018;43(1):117-23. doi: 10.1111/coa.12906  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 31. Slevin ML, Stubbs L, Plant HJ, et al. Attitudes to chemotherapy: comparing views of  
4 patients with cancer with those of doctors, nurses, and general public. *Bmj*  
5 1990;300(6737):1458-60. [published Online First: 1990/06/02]  
6  
7  
8 32. Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. *Sociol Health*  
9 *Illn* 2008;30(3):429-44. doi: SHIL1064 [pii]  
10 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2007.01064.x [published Online First: 2008/01/16]  
11  
12  
13 33. Entwistle VA, Carter SM, Cribb A, et al. Supporting patient autonomy: the importance of  
14 clinician-patient relationships. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25(7):741-5. doi:  
15 10.1007/s11606-010-1292-2  
16  
17  
18 34. Diekmann A, Heuser C, Ernstmann N, et al. How do breast cancer patients experience  
19 multidisciplinary tumor conferences? - A description from the patient perspective.  
20 *Breast* 2019;44:66-72. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2018.12.012 [published Online First:  
21 2019/01/23]  
22  
23  
24 35. Butow P, Harrison JD, Choy ET, et al. Health professional and consumer views on  
25 involving breast cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease  
26 and treatment plan. *Cancer* 2007;110(9):1937-44. doi: 10.1002/cncr.23007  
27  
28 36. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Schellenberger B, et al. Patient Participation in Multidisciplinary  
29 Tumor Conferences from the Providers' Perspective: Is It Feasible in Routine Cancer  
30 Care? *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2020;13:1729-39. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S283166  
31 [published Online First: 2020/12/05]  
32  
33 37. Bellardita L, Donegani S, Spatuzzi AL, et al. Multidisciplinary Versus One-on-One  
34 Setting: A Qualitative Study of Clinicians' Perceptions of Their Relationship With  
35 Patients With Prostate Cancer. *Journal of oncology practice / American Society of*  
36 *Clinical Oncology* 2011;7(1):e1-5. doi: 10.1200/JOP.2010.000020  
37  
38  
39 38. Choy ET, Chiu A, Butow P, et al. A pilot study to evaluate the impact of involving breast  
40 cancer patients in the multidisciplinary discussion of their disease and treatment plan.  
41 *Breast* 2007;16(2):178-89. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2006.10.002  
42  
43  
44 39. Bohmeier B, Schellenberger B, Diekmann A, et al. Opportunities and limitations of  
45 shared decision making in multidisciplinary tumor conferences with patient  
46 participation - A qualitative interview study with providers. *Patient education and*  
47 *counseling* 2021;104(4):792-99. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2020.09.007 [published Online  
48 First: 2020/10/15]  
49  
50 40. Heuser C, Diekmann A, Kowalski C, et al. Health literacy and patient participation in  
51 multidisciplinary tumor conferences in breast cancer care: a multilevel modeling  
52 approach. *BMC cancer* 2019;19(1):330. doi: 10.1186/s12885-019-5546-z [published  
53 Online First: 2019/04/10]  
54  
55 41. Martin GP, Finn R. Patients as team members: opportunities, challenges and paradoxes of  
56 including patients in multi-professional healthcare teams. *Sociol Health Illn*  
57 2011;33(7):1050-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01356.x  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 42. Schellenberger B, Heuser C, Diekmann A, et al. Questions and emotional expressions  
4 from patients and companions while participating in multidisciplinary tumor  
5 conferences in breast and gynecological cancer centers. *Patient education and*  
6 *counseling* 2021 doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2021.12.010 [published Online First: 2021/12/27]  
7  
8  
9 43. Nelson A, Longo M, Byrne A, et al. Chemotherapy decision-making in advanced lung  
10 cancer: a prospective qualitative study. *BMJ Support Palliat Care* 2020 doi:  
11 10.1136/bmjspcare-2020-002395 [published Online First: 2020/08/23]  
12  
13 44. Stacey D, Legare F, Lewis K, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or  
14 screening decisions. *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* 2017(4) doi: ARTN CD001431  
15  
16 10.1002/14651858.CD001431.pub5  
17  
18 45. Stacey D, Murray MA, Legare F, et al. Decision coaching to support shared decision  
19 making: a framework, evidence, and implications for nursing practice, education, and  
20 policy. *Worldviews Evid Based Nurs* 2008;5(1):25-35. doi: WVN108 [pii]  
21  
22 10.1111/j.1741-6787.2007.00108.x [published Online First: 2008/02/13]  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Staff Interview Schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- What do you see as the best way of making decisions in head and neck cancer?
- The MDT
  - What is it for? What is its primary aim?
  - What works well, and what works not so well?
  - How could it be improved?
  - No decision about me without me in the MDT.... Is this possible?
- Treatment decision
  - Why do you regard a treatment as the best for a patient?
  - What factors do you take into account when making treatment decisions?
- Patient involvement in decisions/shared decision making
  - What does it mean to you?
  - Do you think there are barriers to patient involvement? What are they? Why do they exist?
  - Why do clinicians struggle to involve their patients effectively?
  - Do you think we need to improve patient involvement? Why?
- Uncertainty/conflict
  - Is it a problem or is it healthy/required?
  - How should uncertainty and conflict be presented to the patient? Should they know that you don't know?
  - If there are options, how should they be communicated?
- Decision for treatment
  - What is the role of the patient in the treatment decision?
  - How much of a role should the patient have? Can patients know enough?
  - How much of a role should a patient have in the decision
    - Should we give power of veto?
    - Should you allow a patient to make a decision which is considered wrong?
    - how much should a patient know before treatment
  - How much of a role should the family have
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Do we palliate enough? Do we treat too many people radically?
  - What are the barriers to good palliation?
  - Do you think we have a range of palliative options available to us?
  - Do you have prognostic information available to you?
  - Would you use this information if it was available? How would you use it?

## New patient interview 1 schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

The interview will cover the following broad areas:

- Previous experience of making healthcare decisions
  - What does shared decision making mean?
  - Have you had to make big healthcare decisions before?
- Experience of making this decision
  - What was your process of making the decision? Talk me through it
  - What did you draw upon?
  - What factors did you take into account?
  - Did you turn to anybody/anything for information or help?
  - How did you come to your final decision?
  - What was the MDT like?
  - Did you understand what was going on?
  - Could it be improved?
- Information given about the disease and treatment options
  - Do you think you had enough information?
  - Where do you get your information from?
  - Do you think you need more information?
  - Did you understand all the information
- Patient involvement in the decision about care
  - Should patients be involved in decisions about their care?
  - How should we involve patients?
  - Were you involved? How?
  - Would you have liked more say/less say?
  - How this made the participant feel, and further exploration
- What are your expectations of treatment?
  - Are you expecting side effects? What sort?
  - Do you have any idea of your prognosis? Do you want to know?
  - Where will you be in 6 months time?
- In the perfect world, how do you think decisions should be made?

## New patient interview 2 schedule/retrospective patient interview schedule

Introduce researcher and purpose of the study

Obtain consent to proceed and to record the conversation

- Experience of the treatment
  - What has happened so far, story of the treatment
  - Correlation with expectations – worse, better
- New normal
  - Do you have a good quality of life?
  - How do you cope with swallowing?
  - How is your voice, how do you get on with communication?
- MDT and decision process
  - When you look back did you understand the treatment decision?
  - Did you understand the consequences of the decision?
  - Did you have enough information to base the decision on?
  - Should they have allowed you more or less control over the decision?
  - Do you wish the decision had been made differently?
  - Do you feel you made the right or the wrong decision?
  - Do you have any regrets?
  - How could they improve the clinic/the decision process?
  - In the perfect world, how do you think treatment decisions should be made?
- Palliation/prognosis
  - Were you ever aware of the chances of the treatment being successful?
  - Would you want to be aware?
  - Was palliation ever an option for you? Is it now?
- Information giving
  - Do you think you had enough information about treatment?
  - Did you understand what you were entering yourself into?
  - Should they give more information? Could they?

Topic	Page	Short description
1: Title	1	How do patients make decisions in the context of a multidisciplinary team: an ethnographic study of four head and neck cancer centres
2: Abstract	2-3	Included in manuscript
3: Problem formulation	4-5	MDT working is common and expensive, but the impact on shared decision making and patient involvement in decisions remains relatively unexplored
4: Purpose or research question	4-5	To examine critically patient engagement in the MDT treatment decision making process in head and neck cancer, and to evaluate the experience and practice of decision-making by patients and clinicians
5: Qualitative approach and research paradigm	5-7	Ethnographic methods (non-participant observation and semi-structured interviews). Analysis followed principles of constructivist grounded theory
6 Researcher characteristics and reflexivity	5	All data were collected by the lead author (DWH) whilst performing his PhD. At the time, he was a trainee surgeon and had taken time out of programme for research. The dual role of surgical trainee and researcher allowed easy access to the setting and language, making ethnography and observations easier and potentially more 'natural'. Co-authors BH and CE were involved in analysis in order to minimise the effect of the researcher's status on the emerging conclusions
7 Context	6&7	The research was conducted in four head and neck cancer centres in the north east of England. In all centres, the MDT meeting took place without the patient present; following this, one or more members of the MDT met with the patient in clinic
8 Sampling strategy	7	Initial sampling aimed to recruit patients who had a treatment decision to make about their care, or where more than one treatment option was available to the patient. Purposive sampling guided the sampling strategy to explore emerging concepts with data collection and analysis occurring in tandem. Thus, further sampling was guided by the emerging analysis and continued until a state of theoretical sufficiency was achieved.
9 Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects	5	Ethical approval was gained from the NHS Research Ethics Newcastle and North Tyneside 2 committee (reference 11/NE/0200) in September 2011 and all necessary local Research and Development governance permissions were obtained. All participants provided informed consent.
10 Data collection methods	6	Non-participant observation; semi structured interviews with patients and staff; field notes; reflective notes. Iterative process with emerging themes explored through further data collection. All

		emerging analysis and memos discussed with co-authors (CE and BH)
11 Data collection instruments and technologies	6	Interview guides (iteratively developed) used for interviews. Field notes and notes from informal discussions. Audiorecording and word-for-word transcription of all formal interviews, MDT meeting and MDT clinic
12 Units of study	6	34 observations of MDT meetings and 37 clinic appointments (for 30 patients; 13 of these patients were interviewed once, three were interviewed twice). Interviews with four further treated patients and nine members of staff.
13 Data processing	6-7	All audiorecordings were transcribed word for word and anonymised. All reflective notes and field notes were anonymised. Patients and staff given pseudonyms. MDT meeting data transcribed by the main author (DWH) and all recording transcribed by others were checked by DWH. Audio recordings destroyed after transcription. Data kept on University computers, password protected
14 Data analysis	7	The data were analysed by one researcher (DWH) and emerging analyses were discussed with CE and BH, following principles of constructivist grounded theory. All data sources (MDT meeting, clinic, informal and formal interviews) were analysed using the same coding framework. Line by line coding produced an initial coding framework: the emerging analysis was used during axial coding to guide further sampling and further development of the coding framework; when the coding framework was altered, all transcripts were re-coded. The codes used were conceptual, rather than descriptive, and labels were derived completely from the data, not pre-determined. The coding was organised using the NVivo computer package. Emerging findings (and 'memos') were discussed in the research team (particularly with CE and BH) to develop the data analysis and guide subsequent analysis and data sampling
15 Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	7	All emerging themes and analysis were discussed in the research team with CE and BH involved in analysis. Findings presented in departmental meetings
16 Synthesis and interpretation	7-12	The outcome of an MDT discussion is frequently a "in the clinic as they confront a terrifying diagnosis and a myriad of complex decision options. In turn,.
17 Links to empirical data	7-12	Data presented in the results section linked to empirical data throughout
18 Integration with prior work, implications, transferability and contributions to the field	12-16	The discussion section discusses the findings in the context of prior work and the contributions to the field



19 Limitations	3, 18-19	Strengths and limitations are discussed in the discussion section and there is a list of strengths and limitations at the beginning of the manuscript
20 Conflict of interest	16	All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form at <a href="http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf">www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf</a> (available on request from the corresponding author) and declare that DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no relationships with any companies that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous 3 years; and DWH, BH, RT, JAW and CE have no non-financial interests that may be relevant to the submitted work
21 Funding	17	This study represents independent research funded by the National Institute of Health Research. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute of Health Research or the Department of Health