Implementation of OncoKompas.

P. I. A. I. C. C. C. A.	
Procedure introducing OK to patient	TTI 1 (1) CI (2) 1 1 (2)
Accurate introduction of OncoKompas	• Through (1) a flyer, (2) a website, (3) posters in
• According to a routine, to prevent that survivors that	waiting area, (4) a demo of <i>OncoKompas</i>
may benefit from OncoKompas are not referred	• Included in a care pathway (eg after dismissal)
	• At set times/moments (eg after dismissal)
	Responsibility introduction with one person
	• Availability of a trigger for introduction for HCPs so it
	cannot be forgotten
Implementation as self-management application	Implementation as supported self-management application
Stimulates survivor empowerment	Responsibility well-being patients with HCP
• Survivors have to take action themselves	Self-management not fully accepted in health care
Enables survivors to indicate priorities during	• Responsibility well-being always (partially) with HCP
consultation	HCP responsible when survivor receives suboptimal
Survivor determines how to handle symptoms and	care
not the physician	• QOL difficult to act upon by HCPs if they don't have
• Survivor needs to be motivated to address his	insight into results
complaints, otherwise stimulation by HCP will not be	• Important that symptoms unrelated to a specific
effective	specialty (eg anxiety, fatigue) receive attention and are
	noticeable
Survivor is responsible for own well-being	Feedback through access OncoKompas or system alert
• Responsibility lies with survivor to take action upon	• HCPs are interested in <i>OncoKompas</i> results of
symptoms	survivors
• Referral by <i>OncoKompas</i> in case of suboptimal	Feedback creates opportunity to discuss results during
QOL relieves HCPs' responsibility	consultation
• Survivor can bring printed results to consultation	HCPs want an alert when survivor has a suboptimal
Survivor can oring printed results to consumation	QOL and does not take action
	• Survivor without printer cannot take results to HCP
Privacy of survivor is protected	Problems surrounding privacy survivors
• Survivor is able to choose what to share with the	• Survivors need to be well informed about who has
HCP	access to their information and give consent
No social desirability because HCP cannot view	• Some aspects of <i>OncoKompas</i> are of no importance to
results	HCPs (such as financial issues)
HCPs doubt whether survivors would like their	• IT issues (accessibility) in how <i>OncoKompas</i> would
results known by HCPs	be safe to use for HCPs
Difficult to discuss results during regular consultation	Requires action from HCP
• Time pressure	• Survivors expect HCP to be aware of their results
Other priorities during consultation (cancer)	• Lack of HCPs' action may lead to disappointment and
recurrence)	have a negative impact on doctor-patient relation
Problems in prioritizing during consultation	Dependence of survivor in doctor-patient relationship
- 1 Toolems in prioritizing during consultation	requires action from HCPs
	requires action from fices