

# 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

## Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020594
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	MITTAINE-MARZAC, Benedicte; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, HOSPITALISATION A DOMICILE; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA DE STAMPA, Matthieu; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hospitalisation A Domicile; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA BAGARAGAZA, Emmanuel; Maison Médicale Jeanne Garnier, Pôle recherche SPES "soins palliatifs en société"; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA ANKRI, Joël; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Sainte Péline; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA AEGERTER, Philippe; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Ambroise Paré
Keywords:	CHEMOTHERAPY, PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based**  
8  
9 **parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol**  
10

11 **Mittaine-Marzac B<sup>1</sup>, De Stampa M<sup>1</sup>, Bagaragaza E<sup>2</sup>, Ankri J<sup>3</sup>, Aegerter P<sup>4</sup>**

12  
13  
14 Corresponding Author : Mittaine-Marzac Bénédicte,

15  
16  
17 Hospitalisation à Domicile Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris, Pharmacie à Usage intérieure, 32, rue  
18 Necker 94220 CHARENTON LE PONT, France

19  
20  
21 Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, 94800 VILLEJUIF, France UFR Médecine Paris-  
22 Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 [benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr](mailto:benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr)

28  
29  
30 00 33 +1 45 13 66 32

31  
32  
33  
34 **Authors information**

35  
36  
37 **De Stampa Matthieu** Hospitalization At Home, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 14, rue Vésale 75005  
38 Paris France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-  
39 France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

40  
41  
42 **Bagaragaza Emmanuel** Pôle Recherche SPES « Soins Palliatifs En Société », Maison Médicale Jeanne  
43 Garnier, 106, Avenue Emile Zola 75015 PARIS France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM,  
44 UVSQ, VIMA , UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

45  
46  
47 **Ankri Joël**<sup>3</sup> Hôpital Sainte Péline, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 11 Rue Chardon Lagache, 75016  
48 Paris France - Directeur Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, UFR Médecine Paris-  
49 Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

50  
51 **Aegerter Philippe**<sup>4</sup> Hôpital Ambroise Paré, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, Unité de Recherche  
52 Clinique – Département de Santé Publique – UMR-S1168– 9, avenue Charles de Gaulle  
53 92100 Boulogne France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine  
54 Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

55  
56  
57 Word count : 1575 words

58  
59 First submission

**ABSTRACT****INTRODUCTION:**

Despite policies, in a few countries, to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home and despite the demonstrated feasibility, the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains currently marginal. Of note, findings of different studies on health outcomes and resources utilization vary leading to conflicting results. This protocol outlines a systematic review that seeks to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration within the same high standards of clinical care.

**METHODS AND ANALYSIS:**

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach. Electronic searches will be conducted on bibliographic databases selected from the earliest available data through November 15th, 2017 published in French and English languages. Additional potential papers in the selected studies and grey literature will be also included in the review. The review will include all types of studies exploring patients receiving anti-cancer drug for injection at home compared to patients receiving the drugs in hospital setting and will assess at least one of the following criteria: the patients' health outcomes, the patients 'or caregivers 'satisfaction, the resources utilization with cost savings, the incentives and/or the barriers of each admission setting according to the patients and relatives' point of view. Two reviewers will independently screen studies and extract relevant data from included studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the "Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies" developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool in addition to the Drummond checklist for economic studies.

**ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.

**PROTOCOL REGISTRATION:** International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42017068164.

**KEYWORDS:** systematic review - chemotherapy -Hospitalization At Home- cancer care -Costs -Home Care - Quality Of Life

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

#### STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:

- This will be one of the first attempts to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration in the same high standards of clinical care. The systematic review protocol is developed using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and meta-analyses for Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines and includes the search to literature published in two languages and the wide search from published studies to the grey literature.
- Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the “Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies” developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool in addition to the Drummond checklist for economic studies.
- Based on previous work, we anticipate methodological heterogeneity and statistical heterogeneity leading to difficulty to analyze data quantitatively.
- The definition of home-based services is confusing including different types of interventions leading to discrepancies when analyzing.

## INTRODUCTION

Hospital remains the main setting for parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration despite the patient's general positive feeling about receiving care at home,[1]. As the worldwide incidence of cancers increases,[2] and, bearing in mind that due to progress in efficacy of treatments, cancer is becoming a long-term disease, along with advances in diagnostic technology and novel targeted treatments, with their financial constraints, it is necessary to develop alternative models of health service delivery such as home programs, without detrimental effects on health outcomes and costs. Despite the feasibility,[3-5] and despite policies to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home, in a few countries,[6,7], the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains marginal due to little evidence, for improving the health outcomes, for patient's quality of life and for cost savings. Furthermore, findings on outcomes varied leading sometimes to conflicting results,[8-10]. A recent scoping study demonstrates most economic studies concluded in favor of home care, but according to the appropriate type, all sources of expenditure (specialized clinical care, transportation, out-of-pocket expenses, etc...) were not systematically assessed,[11,12] whereas other studies showed no significant difference in the overall costs,[9,10]. Likewise, the impacts on caregivers especially the shift of the care burden from hospital to relatives have rarely been studied. To date, only one existing review of home-based chemotherapy,[13] and it ended in favor of administration at home but, this conclusion is hampered by a mix between routes of administration (parenteral and oral intake) and type of care (administration and post administration follow-up).

Considering these facts, a systematic review will be undertaken for providing a complete overview of parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration at home to investigate whether the clinical outcomes are maintained and the resources utilization are reduced in comparison to hospital high standard care.

## METHODS:

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach,[14] to increase the confidence in the findings. It has been registered in International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews database (no CRD42017068164).

### Types of studies

All types of studies that have investigated the parenteral cancer chemotherapy home administration compared to hospital setting as randomized, controlled or uncontrolled trials, cohort studies, parallel, or cross-over studies will be included if they fulfill at least one of the following criteria:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 1) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients' health outcomes,
- 5 whatever they are: survival, relapse, tolerance
- 6
- 7
- 8 2) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients 'or caregivers
- 9 'satisfaction
- 10
- 11
- 12 3) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on cost savings
- 13
- 14
- 15 4) Assessment of the incentives and/or the barriers according to the patients and/or relatives' point of view
- 16

### 17 **Participants:**

18 We will be interested in studies on participants receiving parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at  
19 home compared to patients receiving the drugs in a hospital setting. There will be no restriction concerning  
20 the type of tumor disease, age or sex of participants.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Eligibility criteria**

27 All studies exploring parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at home setting, mainly intravenous and  
28 subcutaneous administration, will be selected from the earliest available data through November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
29 published in French and English languages, whatever the country. The inclusion criteria defining the scope  
30 of publications included in the review will be the comparison of parenteral chemotherapy administration at  
31 home with administration in-patients and/or out-patients wards.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 As our goal is to study the home-based setting as an alternative context for providing the highest standards  
39 of clinical care concerning the parenteral drug delivery, we will exclude all community-based services with  
40 no anti-cancer drugs administration at home and the studies targeting only the post-administration  
41 chemotherapy monitoring, the disconnection of portable diffusor, the management of central venous  
42 catheter, and the supportive care therapy. For the same reasons, studies about oral anticancer drugs will be  
43 excluded as the oral treatment does not require hospital care, patients usually manage their pills  
44 themselves with an ambulatory follow-up and the treatment issues are deeply different (i.e chronic side  
45 effects, patient's compliance).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 **Databases and Search strategy:**

53 A detailed literature search will be conducted to identify all articles studying chemotherapy administration  
54 in home setting for adults and pediatrics patients. Published studies will be identified through searches of  
55 the Medline, Cochrane, Web of Science databases, Embase and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied  
56 Health (Cinahl) from the earliest available date through November 15th, 2017. We have developed a  
57 strategy in Medline to retrieve relevant literature on the topic. The MEDLINE search strategy will be  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 ("Neoplasms"[Mesh] AND ("Antineoplastic Combined Chemotherapy Protocols"[Mesh] OR "Antineoplastic  
5 Agents"[Mesh])) AND ("Home Care Services"[Mesh] OR "Home Care Agencies"[Mesh]). This search strategy  
6 will be adapted in searching other databases. The references from potentially relevant papers were  
7 manually searched for additional studies. A further research will be performed in Opengrey, in Research  
8 papers in Economics (RePec) and in Google Scholar databases to find relevant unpublished studies in grey  
9 literature.  
10  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 15 **Study selection:**

16  
17 We will use a two-stage process for the identification of papers that met our inclusion criteria. The first  
18 stage accumulated all papers from the two types of searches using the already mentioned databases. The  
19 first type of search will use combinations of keywords to retrieve titles of potentially relevant studies. The  
20 search output will be screened independently by two review authors (MDS, BMM) to identify studies that  
21 potentially meet the inclusion criteria outlined above. In case of discrepancy, the abstract of the concerned  
22 study will be retrieved. If disagreements are remained, a third author (EB) will arbitrate. In the second type  
23 of search, all papers citing or cited by articles that had already met our inclusion criteria will be identified  
24 then screened as the first ones. In the second stage, the full text of these selected studies will be retrieved  
25 and independently assessed for eligibility by the same two review members. An article will be considered  
26 relevant and kept for analysis if the full text for the publication will be a comparison design assessing  
27 patient's health or/and safety outcomes or/and patients' or relatives satisfaction, or/and cost-savings  
28 or/and the incentives and the barriers of using home as an alternative setting. The duplicates of articles will  
29 be discarded.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 Any disagreement between them over the eligibility of particular studies will be resolved through discussion  
41 with a 3rd reviewer (EB).  
42  
43

#### 44 45 **Data extraction**

46  
47 Extracted information to a standardized form will include:

- 48  
49 - study setting  
50  
51  
52 - study population  
53  
54  
55 - tumor type and chemotherapy regimen  
56  
57 - details of the intervention/control conditions  
58  
59 - experimental design  
60



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 - recruitment and study completion rates
- 5
- 6
- 7 - patients' health outcomes including Quality of Life, duration of survival, progression of disease, toxicity
- 8
- 9 - patients' and caregivers' satisfaction and preference, shift of burden,
- 10
- 11
- 12 - resources utilization with costs and consequences including cost-effectiveness, cost-utility or cost-benefit
- 13 analyses, perspective of the study including provider, payer or societal and shift of costs
- 14
- 15
- 16 - Incentives and barriers according to the patients' and/or relatives' point of view
- 17
- 18 - Information for the assessment of the risk of bias
- 19

20  
21 Data will be extracted independently by the two review members; discrepancies will be identified and  
22 resolved through discussion with a 3rd reviewer (PA).  
23  
24

#### 25 26 27 28 **Data assessment and synthesis:**

##### 29 30 *Quality assessment*

31  
32 Two reviewers (MDS and BMM) will independently assess the quality of included studies and the potential  
33 risk of bias. We will use the "Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies" developed by the Effective  
34 Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool,[15] as it can be applied to articles of any public health topic  
35 area , assessing the components of studies (design, methods, bias). Likewise, we will use the Drummond  
36 check-list <sup>(16)</sup>, focusing on the design quality of the costs studies. It is leading to an overall methodological  
37 rating of strong, moderate or weak. Consensus will be reached through discussion in case of disagreement.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

##### 45 46 *Data synthesis*

47  
48 According to the limited development of home parenteral chemotherapy administration, we anticipate  
49 methodological heterogeneity and statistical heterogeneity against a meta-analyze of the evidence base.  
50 Consequently, a narrative synthesis could be used to synthesize the data.  
51  
52

##### 53 54 *Subgroup analysis*

55  
56 If the data are available, we will conduct subgroup analyses investigating the effects of the study design, the  
57 effect of the tumor type (hematologic tumor, solid tumor) and the effects of the age of the study population  
58 (children, young people < 18 years old, adults, > 65 years old).  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 A sensitivity analysis will determine the robustness of the observed outcomes facing publication language,  
5 clinical or methodological heterogeneity.  
6  
7

8 **Ethics and dissemination:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require  
9 ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and  
10 trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.  
11  
12  
13

## 14 15 16 **CONCLUSION**

17  
18 This review will be an attempt to synthesize and to critically appraise the impact on parenteral  
19 chemotherapy administration at home for the patients and their relatives compared to the hospital setting  
20 and, following the P-PRISMA guidelines.  
21  
22

23  
24 Others strengths of this review include the search to literature published in two languages, French and  
25 English and the wide search from published studies to the grey literature.  
26  
27

28 It is although, acknowledged that the definition of home-based services is confusing including different  
29 types of interventions and could lead to discrepancies when analyzing. Likewise, the results of the review  
30 may be limited by the diversity of the study designs and present challenges in the quality assessment. These  
31 limitations will be considered in relation to the review findings.  
32  
33

34  
35 However, this review could be useful for the medical staffs to choice the best treatment setting for patients  
36 and their relatives, contributes to develop the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home and  
37 highlights to define the realistic methodology to set up in this field.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 **Contributors:** All authors made substantive intellectual contributions to the development of this protocol.  
45 BMM wrote this protocol. MDS, EB, PA commented critically the manuscript and involved in conceptualizing  
46 the review. JA commented critically the manuscript.  
47  
48

49 **Funding:** this work is supported by the Hospitalisation At Home \_ Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris  
50  
51

52 **Competing interests:** none declared  
53  
54  
55  
56

## 57 **REFERENCES**

- 58  
59  
60 1. Leff B, Burton L, Mader S, et al. Satisfaction with Hospital at Home Care. *JAGS* 2016; 54: 1355-1363.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 2. Global Burden of Disease Cancer Collaboration, Fitzmaurice C, Allen C, et al. Global, Regional and  
5 National Cancer Incidence, Mortality, Years of Life Lost, Years Lived With Disability and Disability-Adjusted  
6 Life-years for 32 Cancer Groups, 1990 to 2015. A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study.  
7 *JAMA oncology* 2017; 3 (4): 524-548.
- 8  
9  
10  
11 3. Anderson H, Addington-Hall JM, Peake MD, et al. Domiciliary chemotherapy with gemcitabine is safe and  
12 acceptable to advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients: results of a feasibility study. *British Journal of*  
13 *Cancer* 2003; 89, 2190 – 2196
- 14  
15  
16 4. Polinski JM, Kowal M, Gagnon M, et al. Home infusion: Safe, clinically effective, patient preferred, and  
17 cost saving. *Healthcare* 2017; 5:68-80.
- 18  
19  
20 5. Corbett M, Heirs M, Rose M, et al. The delivery of chemotherapy at home: an evidence synthesis. *Health*  
21 *Serv Deliv Res* 2015;3(14).
- 22  
23 6. Hirtzlin I, Conditions du développement de la chimiothérapie en hospitalisation à domicile : analyse  
24 économique et organisationnelle, Haute Autorité de Santé, mise en ligne janvier 2015 [https://www.has-](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)  
25 [sante.fr/portail/jcms/c\\_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)  
26 [a-domicile](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)
- 27  
28  
29 7. Lüthi F, Fucina N, Divorne N, et al. Home care—a safe and attractive alternative to inpatient  
30 administration of intensive chemotherapies. *Support Care Cancer* 2012; 20:575–581
- 31  
32  
33 8. Borrás J M, Sanchez-Hernandez A, Navarro M, et al. Compliance, satisfaction, and quality of life of  
34 patients with colorectal cancer receiving home chemotherapy or outpatient treatment: a randomized  
35 controlled trial. *British Journal of Cancer* 2001; 322:1–5
- 36  
37  
38 9. Stevens B, Croxford R, McKeever P, et al. Hospital and Home Chemotherapy for Children with Leukemia:  
39 A Randomized Cross-Over Study. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2006;47:285–292
- 40  
41  
42 10. Corrie P, Moody AM, Armstrong G, et al. Is community treatment best? a randomized trial comparing  
43 delivery of cancer treatment in the hospital, home and GP surgery. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013: 109,  
44 1549–1555. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013;109:1549–1555
- 45  
46  
47 11. Remonnay R, Devaux Y, Chvetzoff G, et al. Cancer treatment at home or in the hospital: what are the  
48 costs for French public health insurance? Findings of a comprehensive-cancer centre. *Health Policy* 2005 :  
49 72, 141–148
- 50  
51  
52 12. Lassalle A, Thomaré P, Fronteau C, et al. Home administration of bortezomib in multiple myeloma is  
53 cost-effective and is preferred by patients compared with hospital administration: results of a prospective  
54 single-center study. *Annals of Oncology* 2017: 27, 314–318.
- 55  
56  
57 13. Evans JM, Qiu M, Mackinnon M, et al. A multi-method review of home-based chemotherapy. *European*  
58 *Journal of Cancer Care* 2016; 25, 883–902
- 59  
60 14. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-  
analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1.

1  
2  
3  
4 15. National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (2008). *Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative*  
5 *Studies*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University. (Updated 27 July, 2017)

6 Retrieved from <http://www.nccmt.ca/resources/search/14>.

7  
8  
9 16. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, *et al*. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting  
10 standards (cheers)—explanation and elaboration: a report of the ispor health economic evaluation  
11 publication guidelines good reporting practices task force. *Value Health* 2013;16:231–50.  
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

# BMJ Open

## Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020594.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	MITTAINE-MARZAC, Benedicte; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, HOSPITALISATION A DOMICILE; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA DE STAMPA, Matthieu; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hospitalisation A Domicile; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA BAGARAGAZA, Emmanuel; Maison Médicale Jeanne Garnier, Pôle recherche SPES "soins palliatifs en société"; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA ANKRI, Joël; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Sainte Périne; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA AEGERTER, Philippe; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Ambroise Paré
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Health economics, Global health
Keywords:	CHEMOTHERAPY, PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based  
parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol**

**Mittaine-Marzac B<sup>1</sup>, De Stampa M<sup>1</sup>, Bagaragaza E<sup>2</sup>, Ankri J<sup>3</sup>, Aegerter P<sup>4</sup>**

Corresponding Author : Mittaine-Marzac Bénédicte,

Hospitalisation à Domicile Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris, Pharmacie à Usage Intérieure, 32, rue  
Necker 94220 CHARENTON LE PONT, France

Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, 94800 VILLEJUIF, France UFR Médecine Paris-  
Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

[benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr](mailto:benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr)

00 33 +1 45 13 66 32

**Authors information**

**De Stampa Matthieu** Hospitalization At Home, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 14, rue Vésale 75005  
Paris France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-  
France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Bagaragaza Emmanuel** Pôle Recherche SPES « Soins Palliatifs En Société », Maison Médicale Jeanne  
Garnier, 106, Avenue Emile Zola 75015 PARIS France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM,  
UVSQ, VIMA , UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Ankri Joël**<sup>3</sup> Hôpital Sainte Péline, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 11 Rue Chardon Lagache, 75016  
Paris France - Directeur Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, UFR Médecine Paris-  
Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Aegerter Philippe**<sup>4</sup> Hôpital Ambroise Paré, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, Unité de Recherche  
Clinique – Département de Santé Publique – UMR-S1168– 9, avenue Charles de Gaulle  
92100 Boulogne France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine  
Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

Word count : 1851 words

First submission

## ABSTRACT

### INTRODUCTION:

Despite policies, in a few countries, to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home and despite the demonstrated feasibility, the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains currently marginal. Of note, findings of different studies on health outcomes and resources utilization vary leading to conflicting results. This protocol outlines a systematic review that seeks to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration within the same high standards of clinical care.

### METHODS AND ANALYSIS:

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach. Electronic searches will be conducted on bibliographic databases selected from the earliest available data through November 15th, 2017 published in French and English languages. Additional potential papers in the selected studies and grey literature will be also included in the review. The review will include all types of studies exploring patients receiving anti-cancer drug for injection at home compared to patients receiving the drugs in hospital setting and will assess at least one of the following criteria: the patients' health outcomes, the patients 'or caregivers 'satisfaction, the resources utilization with cost savings, the incentives and/or the barriers of each admission setting according to the patients and relatives' point of view. Two reviewers will independently screen studies and extract relevant data from included studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the "Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies" developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool in addition to the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement for economic studies.

**ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.

**PROTOCOL REGISTRATION:** International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42017068164.

**KEYWORDS:** systematic review - chemotherapy -Hospitalization At Home- cancer care -Costs -Home Care - Quality Of Life

**STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:**

- This will be one of the first attempts to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration in the same high standards of clinical care. The systematic review protocol is developed using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and meta-analyses for Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines and includes the search to literature published in two languages and the wide search from published studies to the grey literature.
- Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the “Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies” developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool in addition to the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement for economic studies.
- Based on previous work, we anticipate methodological heterogeneity and statistical heterogeneity leading to difficulty to analyze data quantitatively.
- The definition of home-based services is confusing including different types of interventions leading to discrepancies when analyzing.



## INTRODUCTION

Hospital remains the main setting for parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration despite the patient's general positive feeling about receiving care at home,[1]. As the worldwide incidence of cancers increases,[2] and, bearing in mind that due to progress in efficacy of treatments, cancer is becoming a long-term disease, along with advances in diagnostic technology and novel targeted treatments, with their financial constraints, it is necessary to develop alternative models of health service delivery such as home programs, without detrimental effects on health outcomes and costs. Despite the feasibility,[3-5] and despite policies to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home, in a few countries,[6,7], the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains marginal due to little evidence, for improving the health outcomes, for patient's quality of life and for cost savings. Furthermore, findings on outcomes varied leading sometimes to conflicting results,[8-10]. A recent scoping study demonstrates most economic studies concluded in favor of home care, but according to the appropriate type, all sources of expenditure (specialized clinical care, transportation, out-of-pocket expenses, etc...) were not systematically assessed,[11,12] whereas other studies showed no significant difference in the overall costs,[9,10]. Likewise, the impacts on caregivers especially the shift of the care burden from hospital to relatives have rarely been studied. To date, only one existing review of home-based chemotherapy,[13] and it ended in favor of administration at home but, this conclusion is hampered by a mix between routes of administration (parenteral and oral intake) and type of care (administration and post administration follow-up).

Considering these facts, a systematic review will be undertaken for providing a complete overview of parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration at home to investigate whether the clinical outcomes are maintained and the resources utilization are reduced in comparison to hospital high standard care.

## METHODS:

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach,[14] to increase the confidence in the findings. It has been registered in International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews database (no CRD42017068164).

### Types of studies

Except the crossover studies, all types of studies that have investigated the parenteral cancer chemotherapy home administration compared to hospital setting as randomized, controlled or uncontrolled trials, cohort studies, and, parallel studies will be included if they fulfill at least one of the following criteria:

- 1) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients' health outcomes, whatever they are: survival, relapse, tolerance
- 2) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients 'or caregivers 'satisfaction
- 3) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on cost savings
- 4) Assessment of the incentives and/or the barriers according to the patients and/or relatives' point of view

The economic evaluations about the resources utilization with the costs and consequences such as cost-effectiveness, cost-utility or cost-benefit, either without any clinical assessment, will be included.

The crossover studies will be excluded from the review: the crossover studies involving oncology products or the type of hospitalization setting, could suffer from order effects, so that, it could be difficult to confirm statistically the lack of order effects and hence, to use the results.

#### **Participants:**

We will be interested in studies on participants receiving parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at home compared to patients receiving the drugs in a hospital setting. There will be no restriction concerning the type of tumor disease, age or sex of participants.

#### **Eligibility criteria**

All studies exploring parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at home setting, mainly intravenous and subcutaneous administration, will be selected from the earliest available data through November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017 published in French and English languages, whatever the country. The inclusion criteria defining the scope of publications included in the review will be the comparison of parenteral chemotherapy administration at home with administration in-patients and/or out-patients wards.

As our goal is to study the home-based setting as an alternative context for providing the highest standards of clinical care concerning the parenteral drug delivery, we will exclude all community-based services with no anti-cancer drugs administration at home and the studies targeting only the post-administration chemotherapy monitoring, the disconnection of portable diffusor, the management of central venous catheter, and the supportive care therapy. For the same reasons, studies about oral anticancer drugs will be excluded as the oral treatment does not require hospital care, patients usually manage their pills themselves with an ambulatory follow-up and the treatment issues are deeply different (i.e chronic side effects, patient's compliance).

#### Databases and Search strategy:

A detailed literature search will be conducted to identify all articles studying chemotherapy administration in home setting for adults and pediatrics patients. Published studies will be identified through searches of the Medline, Cochrane, Web of Science databases, Embase and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health (Cinahl) from the earliest available date through November 15th, 2017. HAH is defined as the delivery of hospital ward level care and replaces hospital by ensuring the continuity of care for the patients it takes care of. HAH is also known as “hospital in the home”, “home hospitalization” and “early supported discharge”, [15-17]. The MeSH definition of “Home Care Services” is defined as a community health and nursing services providing coordinated multiple services to the patient at the patient's homes. These home care services are provided by a visiting nurse, home health agencies, hospitals, or organized community groups using professional staff for care delivery. It differs from home nursing which is provided by non-professionals and, of “Home Care Agencies”, public or private organizations that provide, either directly or through arrangements with other organizations, home health services in the patient's home.

Therefore, we have developed a strategy in Medline to retrieve relevant literature on the topic. The MEDLINE search strategy will be ("Neoplasms"[Mesh] AND ("Antineoplastic Combined Chemotherapy Protocols"[Mesh] OR "Antineoplastic Agents"[Mesh])) AND ("Home Care Services"[Mesh] OR "Home Care Agencies"[Mesh]). This search strategy will be adapted in searching other databases. The references from potentially relevant papers were manually searched for additional studies. A further research will be performed in Opengrey, in Research papers in Economics (RePec) and in Google Scholar databases to find relevant unpublished studies in grey literature.

#### Study selection:

We will use a two-stage process for the identification of papers that met our inclusion criteria. The first stage accumulated all papers from the two types of searches using the already mentioned databases. The first type of search will use combinations of keywords to retrieve titles of potentially relevant studies. The search output will be screened independently by two review authors (MDS, BMM) to identify studies that potentially meet the inclusion criteria outlined above. In case of discrepancy, the abstract of the concerned study will be retrieved. If disagreements are remained, a third author (EB) will arbitrate. In the second type of search, all papers citing or cited by articles that had already met our inclusion criteria will be identified then screened as the first ones. In the second stage, the full text of these selected studies will be retrieved and independently assessed for eligibility by the same two review members. An article will be considered relevant and kept for analysis if the full text for the publication will be a comparison design assessing patient's health or/and safety outcomes or/and patients' or relatives satisfaction, or/and cost-savings

1  
2  
3  
4 or/and the incentives and the barriers of using home as an alternative setting. The duplicates of articles will  
5 be discarded.

6  
7  
8 Any disagreement between them over the eligibility of particular studies will be resolved through discussion  
9 with a 3rd reviewer (EB).

## 11 **Data extraction**

12  
13  
14 Extracted information to a standardized form will include:

- 15  
16 - study setting
- 17  
18 - study population
- 19  
20 - tumor type and chemotherapy regimen
- 21  
22 - details of the intervention/control conditions
- 23  
24 - experimental design
- 25  
26 - recruitment and study completion rates
- 27  
28 - patients' health outcomes including Quality of Life, duration of survival, progression of disease, toxicity
- 29  
30 - patients' and caregivers' satisfaction and preference, shift of burden,
- 31  
32 - resources utilization with costs and consequences including cost-effectiveness, cost-utility or cost-benefit
- 33  
34 analyses, perspective of the study including provider, payer or societal and shift of costs
- 35  
36 - Incentives and barriers according to the patients' and/or relatives' point of view
- 37  
38 - Information for the assessment of the risk of bias

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Data will be extracted independently by the two review members; discrepancies will be identified and  
45 resolved through discussion with a 3rd reviewer (PA).

## 46 47 48 49 **Data assessment and synthesis:**

### 50 51 *Quality assessment*

52  
53  
54  
55 Two reviewers (MDS and BMM) will independently assess the quality of included studies and the potential  
56 risk of bias. We will use the "Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies" developed by the Effective  
57  
58  
59

Public Health Practice Project (EPHHP) tool,[18] as it can be applied to articles of any public health topic area , assessing the components of studies (design, methods, bias). Likewise, we will use the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement,[19], focusing on the design quality of the costs studies. It is leading to an overall methodological rating of strong, moderate or weak. Consensus will be reached through discussion in case of disagreement.

#### *Data synthesis*

According to the limited development of home parenteral chemotherapy administration, we anticipate methodological heterogeneity, statistical heterogeneity, heterogeneity of the interventions and, heterogeneity of the models against a meta-analysis of the evidence base. In that case, an interpretative method should be more appropriate leading to the description of the observed effects with peculiarities, strengths and, limits of each study, according to the quality of the study, to the type of study, to the studied population and, to the interventions. This method should be more appropriate from a holistic point of view.

#### *Subgroup analysis*

If the data are available, we will conduct subgroup analyses investigating the effects of the study design, the models, the interventions, the effect of the tumor type (hematologic tumor, solid tumor) and, the effects of the age of the study population (children, young people < 18 years old, adults, > 65 years old).

A sensitivity analysis will determine the robustness of the observed outcomes facing publication language, clinical or methodological heterogeneity.

**Ethics and dissemination:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.

## **CONCLUSION**

This review will be an attempt to synthesize and to critically appraise the impact on parenteral chemotherapy administration at home for the patients and their relatives compared to the hospital setting and, following the P-PRISMA guidelines.

Others strengths of this review include the search to literature published in two languages, French and English and the wide search from published studies to the grey literature.

1  
2  
3  
4 It is although, acknowledged that the definition of home-based services is confusing including different  
5 types of interventions and could lead to discrepancies when analyzing. Likewise, the results of the review  
6 may be limited by the diversity of the study designs and present challenges in the quality assessment. These  
7 limitations will be considered in relation to the review findings.  
8  
9

10  
11 However, this review could be useful for the medical staffs to choice the best treatment setting for patients  
12 and their relatives, contributes to develop the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home and  
13 highlights to define the realistic methodology to set up in this field.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 **Contributors:** All authors made substantive intellectual contributions to the development of this protocol.  
19 BMM wrote this protocol. MDS, EB, PA commented critically the manuscript and involved in conceptualizing  
20 the review. JA commented critically the manuscript.  
21  
22

23  
24 **Funding:** this work is supported by the Hospitalisation At Home \_ Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris  
25

26  
27 **Competing interests:** none declared  
28  
29

## 30 31 REFERENCES

- 32  
33 1. Leff B, Burton L, Mader S, et al. Satisfaction with Hospital at Home Care. *JAGS* 2016; 54: 1355-1363.  
34  
35 2. Global Burden of Disease Cancer Collaboration, Fitzmaurice C, Allen C, et al. Global, Regional and  
36 National Cancer Incidence, Mortality, Years of Life Lost, Years Lived With Disability and Disability-Adjusted  
37 Life-years for 32 Cancer Groups, 1990 to 2015. A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study.  
38 *JAMA oncology* 2017; 3 (4): 524-548.  
39  
40 3. Anderson H, Addington-Hall JM, Peake MD, et al. Domiciliary chemotherapy with gemcitabine is safe and  
41 acceptable to advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients: results of a feasibility study. *British Journal of*  
42 *Cancer* 2003; 89, 2190 – 2196  
43  
44 4. Polinski JM, Kowal M, Gagnon M, et al. Home infusion: Safe, clinically effective, patient preferred, and  
45 cost saving. *Healthcare* 2017; 5:68-80.  
46  
47 5. Corbett M, Heirs M, Rose M, et al. The delivery of chemotherapy at home: an evidence synthesis. *Health*  
48 *Serv Deliv Res* 2015;3(14).  
49  
50 6. Hirtzlin I, Conditions du développement de la chimiothérapie en hospitalisation à domicile : analyse  
51 économique et organisationnelle, Haute Autorité de Santé, mise en ligne janvier 2015 [https://www.has-](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)  
52 [sante.fr/portail/jcms/c\\_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)  
53 [a-domicile](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

7. Lüthi F, Fucina N, Divorne N, et al. Home care—a safe and attractive alternative to inpatient administration of intensive chemotherapies. *Support Care Cancer* 2012; 20:575–581
8. Borrás J M, Sanchez-Hernandez A, Navarro M, et al. Compliance, satisfaction, and quality of life of patients with colorectal cancer receiving home chemotherapy or outpatient treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *British Journal of Cancer* 2001; 322:1–5
9. Stevens B, Croxford R, McKeever P, et al. Hospital and Home Chemotherapy for Children with Leukemia: A Randomized Cross-Over Study. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2006;47:285–292
10. Corrie P, Moody AM, Armstrong G, et al. Is community treatment best? a randomized trial comparing delivery of cancer treatment in the hospital, home and GP surgery. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013: 109, 1549–1555. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013;109:1549–1555
11. Remonnay R, Devaux Y, Chvetzoff G, et al. Cancer treatment at home or in the hospital: what are the costs for French public health insurance? Findings of a comprehensive-cancer centre. *Health Policy* 2005 : 72, 141–148
12. Lassalle A, Thomaré P, Fronteau C, et al. Home administration of bortezomib in multiple myeloma is cost-effective and is preferred by patients compared with hospital administration: results of a prospective single-center study. *Annals of Oncology* 2017: 27, 314–318.
13. Evans JM, Qiu M, Mackinnon M, et al. A multi-method review of home-based chemotherapy. *European Journal of Cancer Care* 2016; 25, 883–902
14. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1.
15. Leff B, Burton L, Mader SL, et al. Hospital at home: feasibility and outcomes of a program to provide hospital-level care at home for acutely ill older patients. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 143: 798-808.
16. Stessman J, Ginsberg G, Hammerman-Rozenberg R, et al. Decreased hospital utilization by older adults attributable to a home hospitalization program. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1996; 44: 591-598.
17. Langhorne P, Taylor G, Murray G, et al. Early supported discharge for stroke patients: a meta-analysis of individual patients' data. *Lancet* 2005; 365: 501-506.
18. National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (2008). *Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University. (Updated 27 July, 2017)  
Retrieved from <http://www.nccmt.ca/resources/search/14>.
19. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards (cheers)—explanation and elaboration: a report of the ispor health economic evaluation publication guidelines good reporting practices task force. *Value Health* 2013;16:231–50.



# BMJ Open

## Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020594.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	MITTAINE-MARZAC, Benedicte; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, HOSPITALISATION A DOMICILE; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA DE STAMPA, Matthieu; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hospitalisation A Domicile; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA BAGARAGAZA, Emmanuel; Maison Médicale Jeanne Garnier, Pôle recherche SPES "soins palliatifs en société"; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA ANKRI, Joël; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Sainte Périne; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA AEGERTER, Philippe; UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin, Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA; Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris, Hôpital Ambroise Paré
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Health economics, Global health
Keywords:	CHEMOTHERAPY, PUBLIC HEALTH, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Hospital At Home

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



**Impacts on health outcomes and on resources utilization for home based  
parenteral chemotherapy administration: a systematic review protocol**

**Mittaine-Marzac B<sup>1</sup>, De Stampa M<sup>1</sup>, Bagaragaza E<sup>2</sup>, Ankri J<sup>3</sup>, Aegerter P<sup>4</sup>**

Corresponding Author : Mittaine-Marzac Bénédicte,

Hospitalisation à Domicile Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris, Pharmacie à Usage Intérieure, 32, rue  
Necker 94220 CHARENTON LE PONT, France

Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, 94800 VILLEJUIF, France UFR Médecine Paris-  
Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

[benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr](mailto:benedicte.mittaine-marzac@aphp.fr)

00 33 +1 45 13 66 32

**Authors information**

**De Stampa Matthieu** Hospitalization At Home, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 14, rue Vésale 75005  
Paris France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-  
France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Bagaragaza Emmanuel** Pôle Recherche SPES « Soins Palliatifs En Société », Maison Médicale Jeanne  
Garnier, 106, Avenue Emile Zola 75015 PARIS France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM,  
UVSQ, VIMA , UFR Médecine Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Ankri Joël**<sup>3</sup> Hôpital Sainte Péline, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, 11 Rue Chardon Lagache, 75016  
Paris France - Directeur Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA, UFR Médecine Paris-  
Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

**Aegerter Philippe**<sup>4</sup> Hôpital Ambroise Paré, Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Paris, Unité de Recherche  
Clinique – Département de Santé Publique – UMR-S1168– 9, avenue Charles de Gaulle  
92100 Boulogne France - Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR) 1168 INSERM, UVSQ, VIMA UFR Médecine  
Paris-Ile-de-France-Ouest Université Versailles St-Quentin

Word count : 1991 words

First submission 10/11/2017 – revised version 06/03/18

## ABSTRACT

### INTRODUCTION:

Despite policies, in a few countries, to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home and despite the demonstrated feasibility, the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains currently marginal. Of note, findings of different studies on health outcomes and resources utilization vary leading to conflicting results. This protocol outlines a systematic review that seeks to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration within the same high standards of clinical care.

### METHODS AND ANALYSIS:

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach. Electronic searches will be conducted on bibliographic databases selected from the earliest available data through November 15th, 2017 published in French and English languages. Additional potential papers in the selected studies and grey literature will be also included in the review. The review will include all types of studies exploring patients receiving anti-cancer drug for injection at home compared to patients receiving the drugs in hospital setting and will assess at least one of the following criteria: the patients' health outcomes, the patients 'or caregivers 'satisfaction, the resources utilization with cost savings, the incentives and/or the barriers of each admission setting according to the patients and relatives' point of view. Two reviewers will independently screen studies and extract relevant data from included studies. Methodological quality of studies will be assessed using the "Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies" developed by the Effective Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool in addition to the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement for economic studies.

**ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.

**PROTOCOL REGISTRATION:** International Prospective Register for Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) number CRD42017068164.

**KEYWORDS:** Chemotherapy - Public Health - Organization of health services – Health economics – Hospital At Home

**STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY:**

- This will be one of the first attempts to synthesize and critically appraise the current state of evidence about the comparison between home setting and hospital setting for the parenteral chemotherapy administration.
- The systematic review protocol is developed using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and meta-analyses for Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines.
- Based on previous work, we anticipate methodological heterogeneity and statistical heterogeneity leading to difficulty to analyze data quantitatively.
- The definition of home-based services is confusing including different types of interventions leading to discrepancies when analyzing.

## INTRODUCTION

Hospital remains the main setting for parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration despite the patient's general positive feeling about receiving care at home,[1]. As the worldwide incidence of cancers increases,[2] and, bearing in mind that due to progress in efficacy of treatments, cancer is becoming a long-term disease, along with advances in diagnostic technology and novel targeted treatments, with their financial constraints, it is necessary to develop alternative models of health service delivery such as home programs, without detrimental effects on health outcomes and costs. Despite the feasibility,[3-5] and despite policies to enable more to receive chemotherapy at home, in a few countries,[6,7], the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home remains marginal due to little evidence, for improving the health outcomes, for patient's quality of life and for cost savings. Furthermore, findings on outcomes varied leading sometimes to conflicting results,[8-10]. A recent scoping study demonstrates most economic studies concluded in favor of home care, but according to the appropriate type, all sources of expenditure (specialized clinical care, transportation, out-of-pocket expenses, etc...) were not systematically assessed,[11,12] whereas other studies showed no significant difference in the overall costs,[9,10]. Likewise, the impacts on caregivers especially the shift of the care burden from hospital to relatives have rarely been studied. To date, only one existing review of home-based chemotherapy,[13] and it ended in favor of administration at home but, this conclusion is hampered by a mix between routes of administration (parenteral and oral intake) and type of care (administration and post administration follow-up).

Considering these facts, a systematic review will be undertaken for providing a complete overview of parenteral cancer chemotherapy administration at home to investigate whether the clinical outcomes are maintained and the resources utilization are reduced in comparison to hospital high standard care.

## METHODS:

This protocol has been prepared following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (P-PRISMA) approach,[14] to increase the confidence in the findings. It has been registered in International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews database (no CRD42017068164).

### Types of studies

Except the crossover studies, all types of studies that have investigated the parenteral cancer chemotherapy home administration compared to hospital setting as randomized, controlled or uncontrolled trials, cohort studies, and, parallel studies will be included if they fulfill at least one of the following criteria:

1  
2  
3  
4 1) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients' health outcomes,  
5 whatever they are: survival, relapse, tolerance  
6

7  
8 2) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on patients 'or caregivers  
9 'satisfaction  
10

11  
12 3) Assessment of the impact of parenteral chemotherapy administration on cost savings  
13

14 4) Assessment of the incentives and/or the barriers according to the patients and/or relatives' point of view  
15

16 The economic evaluations about the resources utilization with the costs and consequences such as cost-  
17 effectiveness, cost-utility or cost-benefit, either without any clinical assessment, will be included.  
18

19 The crossover studies will be excluded from the review: the crossover studies involving oncology products  
20 or the type of hospitalization setting, could suffer from order effects, so that, it could be difficult to confirm  
21 statistically the lack of order effects and hence, to use the results.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 **Participants:**

29  
30 We will be interested in studies on participants receiving parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at  
31 home compared to patients receiving the drugs in a hospital setting. There will be no restriction concerning  
32 the type of tumor disease, age or sex of participants.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

#### 38 **Patients and Public Involvement**

39  
40 As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not involve patients nor for the design of  
41 the study neither for the dissemination of the results.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

#### 47 **Eligibility criteria**

48  
49 All studies exploring parenteral anti-cancer drug administration at home setting, mainly intravenous and  
50 subcutaneous administration, will be selected from the earliest available data through November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
51 published in French and English languages, whatever the country. The inclusion criteria defining the scope  
52 of publications included in the review will be the comparison of parenteral chemotherapy administration at  
53 home with administration in-patients and/or out-patients wards. As our goal is to study the home-based  
54 setting as an alternative context for providing the highest standards of clinical care concerning the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

parenteral drug delivery, we will exclude all community-based services with no anti-cancer drugs administration at home and the studies targeting only the post-administration chemotherapy monitoring, the disconnection of portable diffuser, the management of central venous catheter, and the supportive care therapy. For the same reasons, studies about oral anticancer drugs will be excluded as the oral treatment does not require hospital care, patients usually manage their pills themselves with an ambulatory follow-up and the treatment issues are deeply different (i.e chronic side effects, patient's compliance).

### **Databases and Search strategy:**

A detailed literature search will be conducted to identify all articles studying chemotherapy administration in home setting for adults and pediatrics patients. Published studies will be identified through searches of the Medline, Cochrane, Web of Science databases, Embase and Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health (Cinahl) from the earliest available date through November 15th, 2017. HAH is defined as the delivery of hospital ward level care and replaces hospital by ensuring the continuity of care for the patients it takes care of. HAH is also known as "hospital in the home", "home hospitalization" and "early supported discharge",[15-17]. The MeSH definition of "Home Care Services" is defined as a community health and nursing services providing coordinated multiple services to the patient at the patient's homes. These home care services are provided by a visiting nurse, home health agencies, hospitals, or organized community groups using professional staff for care delivery. It differs from home nursing which is provided by non-professionals and, of "Home Care Agencies", public or private organizations that provide, either directly or through arrangements with other organizations, home health services in the patient's home.

Therefore, we have developed a strategy in Medline to retrieve relevant literature on the topic. The MEDLINE search strategy will be ("Neoplasms"[Mesh] AND ("Antineoplastic Combined Chemotherapy Protocols"[Mesh] OR "Antineoplastic Agents"[Mesh])) AND ("Home Care Services"[Mesh] OR "Home Care Agencies"[Mesh]). This search strategy will be adapted in searching other databases (see search strategy in supplementary file). The references from potentially relevant papers were manually searched for additional studies. A further research will be performed in Opengrey, in Research papers in Economics (RePec) and in Google Scholar databases to find relevant unpublished studies in grey literature.

### **Study selection:**

We will use a two-stage process for the identification of papers that met our inclusion criteria. The first stage accumulated all papers from the two types of searches using the already mentioned databases. The

1  
2  
3  
4 first type of search will use combinations of keywords to retrieve titles of potentially relevant studies. The  
5 search output will be screened independently by two review authors (MDS, BMM) to identify studies that  
6 potentially meet the inclusion criteria outlined above. In case of discrepancy, the abstract of the concerned  
7 study will be retrieved. If disagreements are remained, a third author (EB) will arbitrate. In the second type  
8 of search, all papers citing or cited by articles that had already met our inclusion criteria will be identified  
9 then screened as the first ones. In the second stage, the full text of these selected studies will be retrieved  
10 and independently assessed for eligibility by the same two review members. An article will be considered  
11 relevant and kept for analysis if the full text for the publication will be a comparison design assessing  
12 patient's health or/and safety outcomes or/and patients' or relatives satisfaction, or/and cost-savings  
13 or/and the incentives and the barriers of using home as an alternative setting. The duplicates of articles will  
14 be discarded.

15  
16  
17  
18 Any disagreement between them over the eligibility of particular studies will be resolved through discussion  
19 with a 3rd reviewer (EB).  
20  
21

#### 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 **Data extraction**

29  
30  
31 Extracted information to a standardized form will include:

- 32 - study setting
- 33
- 34 - study population
- 35
- 36 - tumor type and chemotherapy regimen
- 37
- 38 - details of the intervention/control conditions
- 39
- 40 - experimental design
- 41
- 42 - recruitment and study completion rates
- 43
- 44 - patients' health outcomes including Quality of Life, duration of survival, progression of disease, toxicity
- 45
- 46 - patients' and caregivers' satisfaction and preference, shift of burden,
- 47
- 48 - resources utilization with costs and consequences including cost-effectiveness, cost-utility or cost-benefit
- 49
- 50 analyses, perspective of the study including provider, payer or societal and shift of costs
- 51
- 52 - Incentives and barriers according to the patients' and/or relatives' point of view
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

1  
2  
3  
4 - Information for the assessment of the risk of bias  
5

6 Data will be extracted independently by the two review members; discrepancies will be identified and  
7 resolved through discussion with a 3rd reviewer (PA).  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 **Data assessment and synthesis:** 13

### 14 *Quality assessment* 15

16  
17 Two reviewers (MDS and BMM) will independently assess the quality of included studies and the potential  
18 risk of bias. We will use the “Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies” developed by the Effective  
19 Public Health Practice Project (EPHPP) tool,[18] as it can be applied to articles of any public health topic  
20 area , assessing the components of studies (design, methods, bias). Likewise, we will use the Consolidated  
21 Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement,[19], focusing on the design quality of  
22 the costs studies. It is leading to an overall methodological rating of strong, moderate or weak. Consensus  
23 will be reached through discussion in case of disagreement.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 *Data synthesis* 31

32  
33 According to the limited development of home parenteral chemotherapy administration, we anticipate  
34 methodological heterogeneity, statistical heterogeneity, heterogeneity of the interventions and,  
35 heterogeneity of the models against a meta-analysis of the evidence base. In that case, an interpretative  
36 method should be more appropriate leading to the description of the observed effects with peculiarities,  
37 strengths and, limits of each study, according to the quality of the study, to the type of study, to the studied  
38 population and, to the interventions. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and  
39 Evaluation (GRADE) approach,[20], will be used to assess the overall quality of evidence by downgrading scores in  
40 case of serious risk of bias, of imprecision, of study limitations, or indeed, by upgrading scores for studies what  
41 traditionally has been considered as a weak design. It would be appropriate to assess relevant studies which are  
42 not provide evidence regarding every outcome. Final scores for the quality of evidence will be categorised as high,  
43 moderate, low or very low and summarised in table. This method should be more appropriate from a holistic  
44 point of view.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### *Subgroup analysis*

If the data are available, we will conduct subgroup analyses investigating the effects of the study design, the models, the interventions, the effect of the tumor type (hematologic tumor, solid tumor) and, the effects of the age of the study population (children, young people < 18 years old, adults, > 65 years old).

A sensitivity analysis will determine the robustness of the observed outcomes facing publication language, clinical or methodological heterogeneity.

**Ethics and dissemination:** As the review is focused on the analysis of secondary data, it does not require ethics approval. The results of the study will be disseminated through articles in peer-reviewed journals and trade publications as well as presentations at relevant conferences.

### **CONCLUSION**

This review will be an attempt to synthesize and to critically appraise the impact on parenteral chemotherapy administration at home for the patients and their relatives compared to the hospital setting and, following the P-PRISMA guidelines.

Others strengths of this review include the search to literature published in two languages, French and English and the wide search from published studies to the grey literature.

It is although, acknowledged that the definition of home-based services is confusing including different types of interventions and could lead to discrepancies when analyzing. Likewise, the results of the review may be limited by the diversity of the study designs and present challenges in the quality assessment. These limitations will be considered in relation to the review findings.

However, this review could be useful for the medical staffs to choice the best treatment setting for patients and their relatives, contributes to develop the parenteral chemotherapy administration at home. As we anticipate a great heterogeneity of the studies mainly concerning the interventions, this review could at least highlight to define the realistic methodology to set up in this field.

**Contributors:** All authors made substantive intellectual contributions to the development of this protocol. BMM wrote this protocol. MDS, EB, PA commented critically the manuscript and involved in conceptualizing the review. JA commented critically the manuscript.

**Funding:** this work is supported by the Hospitalisation At Home \_ Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris

**Competing interests:** none declared

## REFERENCES

1. Leff B, Burton L, Mader S, et al. Satisfaction with Hospital at Home Care. *JAGS* 2016; 54: 1355-1363.
2. Global Burden of Disease Cancer Collaboration, Fitzmaurice C, Allen C, et al. Global, Regional and National Cancer Incidence, Mortality, Years of Life Lost, Years Lived With Disability and Disability-Adjusted Life-years for 32 Cancer Groups, 1990 to 2015. A systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study. *JAMA oncology* 2017; 3 (4): 524-548.
3. Anderson H, Addington-Hall JM, Peake MD, et al. Domiciliary chemotherapy with gemcitabine is safe and acceptable to advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients: results of a feasibility study. *British Journal of Cancer* 2003; 89, 2190 – 2196
4. Polinski JM, Kowal M, Gagnon M, et al. Home infusion: Safe, clinically effective, patient preferred, and cost saving. *Healthcare* 2017; 5:68-80.
5. Corbett M, Heirs M, Rose M, et al. The delivery of chemotherapy at home: an evidence synthesis. *Health Serv Deliv Res* 2015;3(14).
6. Hirtzlin I, Conditions du développement de la chimiothérapie en hospitalisation à domicile : analyse économique et organisationnelle, Haute Autorité de Santé, mise en ligne janvier 2015 [https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c\\_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile](https://www.has-sante.fr/portail/jcms/c_1696038/fr/conditions-du-developpement-de-la-chimiotherapie-en-hospitalisation-a-domicile)
7. Lüthi F, Fucina N, Divorne N, et al. Home care—a safe and attractive alternative to inpatient administration of intensive chemotherapies. *Support Care Cancer* 2012; 20:575–581
8. Borrás J M, Sanchez-Hernandez A, Navarro M, et al. Compliance, satisfaction, and quality of life of patients with colorectal cancer receiving home chemotherapy or outpatient treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *British Journal of Cancer* 2001; 322:1–5
9. Stevens B, Croxford R, McKeever P, et al. Hospital and Home Chemotherapy for Children with Leukemia: A Randomized Cross-Over Study. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2006;47:285–292
10. Corrie P, Moody AM, Armstrong G, et al. Is community treatment best? a randomized trial comparing delivery of cancer treatment in the hospital, home and GP surgery. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013: 109, 1549–1555. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013;109:1549–1555
11. Remonnay R, Devaux Y, Chvetzoff G, et al. Cancer treatment at home or in the hospital: what are the costs for French public health insurance? Findings of a comprehensive-cancer centre. *Health Policy* 2005 : 72, 141–148

- 1  
2  
3  
4 12. Lassalle A, Thomaré P, Fronteau C, et al. Home administration of bortezomib in multiple myeloma is  
5 cost-effective and is preferred by patients compared with hospital administration: results of a prospective  
6 single-center study. *Annals of Oncology* 2017; 27, 314–318.  
7  
8 13. Evans JM, Qiu M, Mackinnon M, et al. A multi-method review of home-based chemotherapy. *European*  
9 *Journal of Cancer Care* 2016; 25, 883–902  
10  
11 14. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-  
12 analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015;4:1.  
13  
14 15. Leff B, Burton L, Mader SL, et al. Hospital at home: feasibility and outcomes of a program to provide  
15 hospital-level care at home for acutely ill older patients. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 143: 798-808.  
16  
17 16. Stessman J, Ginsberg G, Hammerman-Rozenberg R, et al. Decreased hospital utilization by older adults  
18 attributable to a home hospitalization program. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1996; 44: 591-598.  
19  
20 17. Langhorne P, Taylor G, Murray G, et al. Early supported discharge for stroke patients: a meta-analysis of  
21 individual patients' data. *Lancet* 2005; 365: 501-506.  
22  
23 18. National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools (2008). *Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative*  
24 *Studies*. Hamilton, ON: McMaster University. (Updated 27 July, 2017)  
25  
26 Retrieved from <http://www.nccmt.ca/resources/search/14>.  
27  
28 19. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting  
29 standards (cheers)—explanation and elaboration: a report of the ispor health economic evaluation  
30 publication guidelines good reporting practices task force. *Value Health* 2013;16:231–50.  
31  
32 20. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin*  
33 *Epidemiol* 2011;64:401–6.  
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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Search strategy and key words used :  
6  
7

8 **1. Antineoplastic agents OR Chemotherapy**

9 **2. Home Care OR Hospital At Home OR Home Care Services OR Home Infusion Therapy**

10 **3. Injection OR Infusion OR Perfusion OR Parenteral OR Intravenous OR Subcutaneous**

11 **4. 1 AND 2 AND 3**

12 **5. ("Neoplasms"[Mesh] AND ("Antineoplastic Combined Chemotherapy Protocols"[Mesh] OR**  
13 **"Antineoplastic Agents"[Mesh])) AND ("Home Care Services"[Mesh] OR "Home Care**  
14 **Agencies"[Mesh])**

15 **6. Injection AND 'Home care' AND 'Chemotherapy'**