N. Ireland Cancer Registry
Implications of Research for Services

NICR Lead Author *(Office use only)*
Paper ID *(Office use only)*
Date Submitted to NICR Steering Group Click here to enter a date. *(Office use only)*

Paper Title	Systematic evaluation of Patient-Reported Outcome protocol content and reporting in cancer trials
Authors	Derek Kyte, Ameeta Retzer, Khaled Ahmed, Thomas Keeley, Jo Armes, Julia M Brown, Lynn Calman, Anna Gavin, Adam W Glaser, Diana M Greenfield, Anne Lanceley, Rachel M Taylor, Galina Velikova, Michael Brundage, Fabio Efficace, Rebecca Mercieca-Bebber, Madeline T King, Grace Turner, Melanie Calvert
Journal	Journal of the National Cancer Institute
DOI	10.1093/jnci/djz038
Funders	Macmillan Cancer Support (grant number 5592105)
Full paper available online	YES ☒ NO ☐ NOT YET ☐
Conclusion	PRO protocol content is frequently inadequate, and nonreporting of PRO findings is widespread, meaning patient-important information may not be available to benefit patients, clinicians, and regulators. Even where PRO data are published, there is often considerable delay and reporting quality is suboptimal.
What this means for the service	We therefore recommend that researchers utilize the recently published SPIRIT-PRO Extension (38) alongside the original SPIRIT 2013 statement (29,43) when developing protocols for trials including PROs. For reporting, we encourage the use of the CONSORT-PRO (31) Extension alongside CONSORT (44). Evidence suggests that the use of such checklists may be valuable in driving up standards of PRO research (45). We urge funders and journals to endorse and enforce the use of SPIRIT-PRO and CONSORT-PRO; and to promote and facilitate prompt publication of PRO findings, preferably as part of the main trial report. Finally, we encourage all stakeholders to utilize the growing range of suitable open access PRO training resources/guidelines to support high-quality PRO research and dissemination.