

EURHOBOP structured questionnaire for coordinator's on-site visit to Partners

Partner:

Ana Azevedo/ Marta Pereira/ Carla Araújo Ana Bastos/ Ricardo Soares	FMUP Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade do Porto Porto - Portugal
---	--

Place:

Instituto de Saúde Pública da Universidade do Porto
Rua das Taipas, 135 4050-600 Porto

Date: 18 July 2011

Investigators:

Ana Azevedo/Marta Pereira/Carla Araújo*/Ana Bastos/Ricardo Soares

*not present at the meeting

OBJECTIVE

This questionnaire is intended to capture the partner integration in the Project, what they think that could be done better in the coordinating center, to follow the progress of the WPs in which they participate / lead or specific tasks under their responsibility, and to discuss other topics relevant to the appropriate completion of the tasks and Budget expenditure.

How do you feel about your participation in EURHOBOP?

- 1) Integration / involvement
 - a. **Fully**
 - b. Comfortably
 - c. Fairly
 - d. Poorly
- 2) Interest & objectives-affinity with your own research topics of interest
 - a. **Full**
 - b. Adequate
 - c. Fair
 - d. Poor

Open comment:

The data collected to answer the main objectives of the EURHOBOP Project will also allow updating data on characteristics and outcomes of hospitalizations for acute coronary syndrome in Portugal, which currently cannot be analyzed in otherwise available databases.

How do you perceive the Coordinating centre?

- 1) Organization
 - a. **Very good**
 - b. Adequate
 - c. Fair
 - d. Poor
- 2) Communication & information exchange
 - a. **Very good**
 - b. Adequate
 - c. Fair
 - d. Poor
- 3) Funds transfer
 - a. Very good
 - b. **Adequate**
 - c. Fair
 - d. Poor

How could the coordination centre be improved in your opinion?

For the overall communication within the team, the coordination centre is doing a very good job, with regular webconferences and their minutes circulating shortly after them.

The idea that was discussed early in the course for data extractors training (Barcelona, January 2010) involving the creation of a platform or an online discussion forum with the particular aim of discussing limitations, obstacles or difficulties experienced during data collection was never brought into practice. It would have been a good opportunity to refine the methodology for collecting data and suggesting ideas for improving the performance of fieldwork.

Anticipation of the deadline for patient recruitment in WP4 happened a bit in short notice and we were not able to fulfill the new requirement of having all the data by June 2011.

Regarding the funds transfer issue raised above, we realize any delays were not the responsibility of the coordinating centre.

In which WP do you participate?

<i>Work-package (WP) No</i>	<i>Work package title</i>	<i>Lead partner</i>	<i>IMAS IMIM</i>	<i>HCS ATTIKON</i>	<i>DEASL</i>	<i>FMUP</i>	<i>HMGU</i>	<i>THL</i>	<i>AEPMC CV</i>	<i>ISS</i>	<i>HOPE</i>
WP 1	Coordination of the Project	IMAS-IMIM	X								
WP 2	Dissemination of the results	ISS	X				X	X		X	X
WP 3	Evaluation of the project	HMGU	X				X				
WP 4	Benchmarking function development	IMAS-IMIM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WP 5	Analysis of availability of severity measurements in administrative data	AEPMC CV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
WP 6	Sex inequalities assessment	DEASL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
WP 7	Cost analysis of procedures	THL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
WP 8	Benchmarking assessment with hospital real-life data	HOPE	X								X

- Is there any other WP or activity in which you would like to participate?

Please describe:

How do you consider the progress of the tasks involved in the WP in which you participate in your country?

- WP 4 Task: patient Recruitment

- a) **Very good**
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- d) Poor

- Data in country hospitals

- 1) discharge letters
 - a. All the data
 - b. Most of data
 - c. Some of data**
 - d. A few data
- 2) Computer records
 - a. All the data
 - b. Most of data
 - c. Some of data**
 - d. A few data
- 3) Medical records
 - a. All the data
 - b. Most of data**
 - c. Some of data
 - d. A few data

- 4) Emergency room records
 - a. All the data
 - b. Most of data
 - c. Some of data**
 - d. A few data

Comments:

The data availability, format and quality vary greatly between hospitals and within the same hospital. This is of course an outcome of the project itself. We overcame these problems, as much as we could, mainly through continuous training of data extractors, aiming to extract as much valid information as possible.

- WP 2 Dissemination of the results

- a) Very good
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- d) Poor
- e) Evaluation is premature**

- WP 3 Evaluation of the project

- a) Very good**
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- d) Poor
- e) Evaluation is premature

- WP 4 Benchmarking function development

- a) Very good
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- f) Poor
- d) Evaluation is premature**

- WP 5 Analysis of availability of severity measurements in administrative data

- a) Very good
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- g) Poor
- d) Evaluation is premature**

- WP 6 Sex inequalities assessment

- a) Very good
- b) Adequate
- c) Fair
- h) Poor
- d) Evaluation is premature**

- **WP 7** Cost analysis of procedures
 - a) Very good
 - b) Adequate
 - c) Fair
 - i) Poor
 - d) **Evaluation is premature**

Comments:

Please describe any difficulties you may be finding in any task involved in your participation in EURHOBOP

The process of obtaining authorization for data collection at the hospitals was time consuming and ended up with some hospitals not allowing participation although the departments of Cardiology had previously shown interest and availability. In general, the main problem raised by both national authorities and local hospital administrations was related with the need to obtain informed consent for access to individual patient files.

During the patient recruitment task and data collection it would have been advantageous to create a general database with the questions arising during data collection, and send them frequently to all participating countries. Instructions for patient inclusion/exclusion and data extraction could have been clarified using a manual of procedures and dictionary of variables (because some issues were not clarified in detail in EURHOBOP data extraction procedures). Perhaps there should have been more communication between all partners in order to improve this work package performance.

What percentage of your budget did you expend so far? Take into account that you should have spent > 70% of your period budget at the time of the next report to the EAHC.

Over 100% of the period budget, but controlled for the whole project 3-year period.

Other issues: