

# 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

## The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-060326
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Dec-2021
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Brew-Sam, Nicola ; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Parkinson, Anne; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Lueck, Christian; Canberra Hospital, Neurology          Brown, Ellen; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Brown, Karen; Canberra Health Services; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Bruestle, Anne; Australian National University, The John Curtin School of Medical Research          Chisholm, Katrina; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Collins, Simone; Canberra Health Services          Cook, Matthew; Australian National University, The John Curtin School of Medical Research          Daskalaki, Eleni; Australian National University, School of Computing          Drew, Janet; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Ebbeck, Harry; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Elisha, Mark; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Fanning, Vanessa; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Henschke, Adam; University of Twente, Department of Philosophy          Herron, Jessica; Canberra Health Services          Matthews, Emma; Canberra Health Services          Murugappan, Krishnan; Australian National University, Nanotechnology Research Lab          Neshev, Dragomir; Australian National University, Department of Electronic Materials Engineering          Nolan, Christopher; Australian National University, Medical School &amp; The John Curtin School of Medical Research; The Canberra Hospital, Endocrinology          Pedley, Lachlan; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health          Phillips, Christine; Australian National University, Medical School          Suominen, Hanna; Australian National University, School of Computing;</p>

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

	University Of Turku, Department of Computing Tricoli, Antonio; Australian National University, Nanotechnology Research Laboratory; The University of Sydney, Nanotechnology Research Laboratory Wright, Kristine; Canberra Health Services Desborough, Jane; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health
Keywords:	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Information technology < BIOTECHNOLOGY & BIOINFORMATICS, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS



# The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

Brew-Sam, Nicola<sup>1</sup>; Parkinson, Anne<sup>1</sup>; Lueck, Christian<sup>2</sup>; Brown, Ellen<sup>1</sup>; Brown, Karen<sup>1,3</sup>; Bruestle, Anne<sup>4</sup>; Chisholm, Katrina<sup>1</sup>; Collins, Simone<sup>3</sup>; Cook, Matthew<sup>4</sup>; Daskalaki, Eleni<sup>5</sup>; Drew, Janet<sup>1</sup>; Ebbeck, Harry<sup>1</sup>; Elisha, Mark<sup>1</sup>; Fanning, Vanessa<sup>1</sup>; Henschke, Adam<sup>6</sup>; Herron, Jessica<sup>3</sup>; Matthews, Emma<sup>3</sup>; Murugappan, Krishnan<sup>7</sup>; Neshev, Dragomir<sup>8</sup>; Nolan, Christopher<sup>4,9,10</sup>; Pedley, Lachlan<sup>1</sup>; Phillips, Christine<sup>9</sup>; Suominen, Hanna<sup>5,11,12</sup>; Tricoli, Antonio<sup>7,13</sup>; Wright, Kristine<sup>3</sup>; Desborough, Jane<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>2</sup> Canberra Hospital, Neurology, Canberra, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Canberra Health Services, Canberra, Australia

<sup>4</sup>The John Curtin School of Medical Research, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>5</sup>School of Computing, College of Engineering and Computer Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>6</sup>University of Twente, Department of Philosophy, Enschede, The Netherlands

<sup>7</sup>Nanotechnology Research Lab, Research School of Chemistry, College of Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>8</sup>Department of Electronic Materials Engineering, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>9</sup>ANU Medical School, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>10</sup>The Canberra Hospital, Endocrinology, Canberra, Australia

<sup>11</sup>Department of Computing, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

<sup>12</sup>Data61, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia

<sup>13</sup>Nanotechnology Research Laboratory, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

**Author notes.** Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Nicola Brew-Sam, Our Health in Our Hands, Health Experience Team, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, 63 Eggleston Rd, 2601, Acton, Canberra, Australia; Email: nicola.brew-sam@anu.edu.au

**Keywords (MeSH terms).** Concept formation, interdisciplinary research, personalized medicine, precision medicine, systematic review

**Word count.** 3315

# The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

## Abstract

*Introduction.* The terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" have become key terms in health-related research, and in science-related public communication. However, the application of these two concepts and their interpretation in various disciplines are heterogeneous, which also affects research translation and public awareness. This leads to confusion regarding the use and distinction of the two concepts.

*Methods and analysis.* Our study aims at using Rodger's concept analysis method to systematically examine and distinguish the current understanding of the concepts "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence, and to identify their respective attributes (clusters of characteristics) and surrogate and related terms. We will analyse similarities and differences in definitions in the respective disciplines and across different (sub)disciplines. The analysis procedure will include (1) a concept identification, (2) a setting, sample, and data source selection, (3) data collection, (4) data analysis and data summary, (5) identification of examples, and (6) identification of implications for further concept development.

*Ethics and dissemination.* Following ethical and research standards, we will comprehensively report the methodology for a systematic analysis following Roger's[1] concept analysis method. Our systematic concept analysis will contribute to the clarification of the two concepts and distinction in their application in given settings and circumstances. Such a broader concept analysis will contribute to non-systematic syntheses of the concepts, or occasional systematic reviews on one of the concepts that have been published in specific disciplines, in order to facilitate interdisciplinary communication, translational medical research, and implementation science.

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- In contrast to previous studies, we examine the definitions of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in specific selected disciplines in order to facilitate interdisciplinary communication, translational medical research, and implementation science.
- Moreover, we analyse these two concepts systematically and base our review on renowned concept analysis methodology.
- Our study contributes to the clarification of the two concepts, their attributes, and differences in various disciplines.
- Concepts are constantly developing and their meanings change over time, and hence it is not possible for our analysis to deliver an unequivocal definition.

## Introduction

The terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" are increasingly used in health-related research. However, the interpretation of these concepts and their application in various disciplines are heterogeneous[2, 3]. The terms are often used in relation to specific diseases (e.g., cancer) with an applied focus but without a detailed definition or specification of the underlying concepts. Non-systematic syntheses of (one of) the concepts[4, 5], or occasional systematic reviews on (one or other of) the concepts have been published in specific disciplines[6, 7]. But, so far, understanding of the concepts has not been systematically clarified and compared across disciplines. Erikainen and Chan[4] report that disciplines have inconsistent, and potentially contrary, understandings of precision medicine or personalised medicine, as well as differing preferences of terms describing similar entities (for an exemplary variety of definitions see Table 1).

For example, discussion in biomedical literature has relatively early started to express criticism of the term "personalised medicine" arguing that this term implies unrealistic optimism and promises in relation to what biomedical technology will be able to deliver. According to Schleidgen et al.[6] "personalised medicine" wrongly implies a focus on the interests and preferences of an individual and the provision of patient-centered medicine through personalised medicine alone. A similar statement was put forward by the United States National Academies[8]. Schleidgen et al.[6] recommended the use of the term "stratified medicine" instead of "personalised medicine" to present a more realistic vision of the underlying concept[4]. Similarly, "precision" promises a level of certainty[9] "that is unlikely to be reflected in the realities of precision medicine"[8].

However, other disciplines (including medical ethics, critical studies of biosciences, patient-centered research) have criticised Schleidgen's view, suggesting it can only be applied in a biomedical context, emphasizing that "personalised medicine" should be clearly distinguished from "patient-centered care"[4]:

Schleidgen and colleagues' definition can be seen as privileging the biological and molecular interpretation of "personalization" as group-level treatment stratification, to the explicit and purposeful exclusion of patient-centered interpretations.[4]

*Table 1.* Variety of definitions of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" – examples

Concept	Year	Authors, Journal/Source	Discipline (Scopus) <sup>a</sup>	Definition
Precision Medicine	2017	Marson, Bertuzzo & Ribeiro[10], <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i>	Medicine: pharmacology; Pharmacology, toxicology, pharmaceuticals: pharmacology	In precision medicine, the individual is understood "as a response to the interrelation between environment, lifestyle, and genetic factors"

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

	2020	Elemento[11], Emerging Topics in Life Sciences	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology: general biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology	Precision medicine is "personalized medicine enhanced by technology"
	2020	Ho et al.[12], Trends in Biotechnology	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology: biotechnology;  Chemical engineering: bioengineering	"From an engineering perspective, precision medicine involves the use of technologies to acquire and validate population-wise data, such as omics-based single-cell analysis and biomarker discovery, for subsequent application on the individual patient level."
	2021	Ong et al.[13], Asian Bioethics Review	Arts and humanities: philosophy;  Social sciences: health;  Medicine: health policy	"Precision medicine (PM) aims to improve healthcare with the use of genomic analyses and data analytics to develop tailored approaches to predicting disease progression and treatment responses for individual patients"
	2021	U.S. National Library of Medicine[14]	(Medicine)	"Clinical, therapeutic and diagnostic approaches to optimal disease management based on individual variations in a patient's genetic profile."
Personalised Medicine	2013	Schleiden et al.[6], BMC Medical Ethics	Nursing: ethics and legal aspects;  Social sciences: health;  Medicine: health policy	Personalized medicine "is not medicine with a special focus on the interests and preferences of the individual patient" and it "is not related to the term patient-centered medicine"
	2017	Marson, Bertuzzo & Ribeiro[10], Frontiers in Pharmacology	Medicine: pharmacology;  Pharmacology, toxicology, pharmaceutics: pharmacology	Personalized medicine is "the treatment directed at the symptoms, and this treatment is adjusted depending on the patient's phenotype"
	2015/2 020	Council of the European Union[15]/ European Commission[16 ]	(Health policy)	"Personalised medicine refers to a medical model using characterisation of individuals' phenotypes and genotypes (e.g. molecular profiling, medical imaging, lifestyle data) for tailoring the right therapeutic strategy for the right person at the right time, and/or to determine the predisposition to disease and/or to deliver timely and targeted prevention. Personalised medicine relates to the broader concept of patient-centred care, which takes into

account that, in general, healthcare systems need to better respond to patient needs"

2020	Ho et al.[12], Trends in Biotechnology	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology; biotechnology;  Chemical engineering: bioengineering	"Personalized medicine involves the use of technologies to seriously acquire and assess an individual's own data for only their own treatment. For example, this may involve the use of artificial intelligence (AI) to both design a drug combination based on a patient's own biopsy and follow with N-of-1 dosing protocols"
2021	Fournier et al.[17], Journal of Personalized Medicine	Medicine: medicine (miscellaneous)	"PM seems to have a wide scope, encompassing many practices, including targeted therapies (TT)... It seems there are several terms used to name PM... Indeed, it is possible to define PM as 'targeted therapy', 'pharmacogenomics' or 'precision medicine' depending on the author, the domain or the definition..."

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>For discipline categorisation, the "source details" in Scopus are used for information on the respective journals ([www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com))

To summarise, the understanding and use of the concepts "personalised" and "precision" medicine is discipline-dependent, which may also influence discussions on a policy level[15, 18-20]. The latter can be shown by country-specific preferences at a policy level. For example, while the discussion is mostly focusing on precision medicine in the U.S. since the Precision Medicine Initiative was launched in 2015[19], the European Union set up an International Consortium for Personalised Medicine (ICPerMed) in 2016[16]. Yet, the distinction of the two concepts is not clear enough to argue how the two terms differ. Preferences and an understanding largely depend on historical developments of the terms in specific contexts, leading to varying interpretations (e.g., on a research and a policy level). This variety in interpretations, going along with the use of different terms, can have negative consequences, including the creation of different representations or beliefs in people when using a variety of terms, or a reinforcement of inaccuracies in definitions[17].

A first step towards more clarity is an understanding of current differences and similarities regarding precision and personalised medicine across disciplines in research. Further research can then examine how these current interpretations developed historically (concept revisions), and how they influence(d) policy.

Our Health in Our Hands (OHIOH) is a multidisciplinary research project at the Australian National University which brings together the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence. These disciplines are the focus of this paper. OHIOH aims to advance digitalisation and personalisation of healthcare using a co-



1  
2  
3 production approach with partners from research, lived experience, healthcare professionals,  
4 and health services[21]. OHIOH research includes studies on the experiences of people living  
5 with Multiple Sclerosis (MS)[22] and Type 1 Diabetes[23]. A recently published OHIOH  
6 paper[24] discusses the understanding and experiences of people living with MS in order to  
7 emphasise the importance of personalised medicine in MS treatment and care. In the course of  
8 drafting the manuscript, discussions around "personalised" and "precision" medicine revealed  
9 that the understanding of these two concepts varied greatly between the researchers in the  
10 various disciplines involved in OHIOH.  
11  
12  
13

## 14 Objective

15  
16  
17 The aim of this study is to examine the current understanding of the concepts "precision  
18 medicine" and "personalised medicine" in clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating  
19 genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering;  
20 machine learning, and artificial intelligence using Rodgers'[1] concept analysis to identify  
21 concept attributes (clusters of characteristics) and to determine how these two concepts are  
22 distinguished in these selected disciplines and potential subdisciplines. We will answer the  
23 following research questions (RQ):  
24  
25

26 RQ1: What is the current understanding of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in  
27 clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services  
28 research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence, and  
29 what are similarities and differences in definitions in the respective disciplines and across  
30 different (sub)disciplines?  
31  
32

33 RQ2: What are the related and surrogate terms for "precision medicine" and "personalised  
34 medicine" in each of the selected disciplines?  
35  
36

37 It is important to understand how the two concepts are currently interpreted and understood in  
38 the individual disciplines in order to be able to create consistent understanding of the concept  
39 interpretations and to reduce ambiguity in the literature. This current interpretation does not  
40 include concept revisions over time which could be examined in follow-up research.  
41  
42  
43

## 44 Methods and Analysis

### 45 Protocol development

46  
47  
48 We used the 17 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols  
49 (PRISMA-P) throughout the development of our study protocol[25] (see supplementary file).  
50 Our systematic data collection and analysis will similarly follow the subsequent Preferred  
51 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)[26]. Amendments to the  
52 study protocol will be reported in the final published systematic concept analysis manuscript.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Concept analysis approach

A concept analysis aims to clarify a concept (e.g., attributes, antecedents, consequences)[1]. Such a concept clarification enables assessment of a concept's strengths and weaknesses[27]. Based on Walker and Avant's[28] traditional approach<sup>1</sup> derived from Wilson's method[29] which is based on realism (deductive analysis), Rodgers[1] developed an evolutionary concept analysis based on relativism (inductive analysis). Rodgers[1] viewed concepts as dynamic and evolving phenomena without strict boundaries. This took account of the fact that concepts are constantly developing and their meanings change over time, and hence it is not possible for an analysis to deliver an unequivocal definition[27]. Moreover, concepts are understood differently in different disciplines due to what Rodgers[1] calls "enculturation" within individual disciplines. Thus, it is important to clarify the selection of disciplines being focused on when using Roger's approach to a concept analysis.

Bearing in mind the changing and non-static understanding of the terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" over time, Rodger's approach appears to be a good fit for analysis. Our analysis of "personalised" and "precision" medicine will only represent a snapshot of the current understanding of these concepts in the literature pertaining to clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence. Nevertheless, it is essential to highlight any differences and similarities between disciplines to inform current and future research, aiming to standardise and generate a uniform approach if at all possible. We will not look into revisions of definitions over time, the focus is on the current understanding of the two concepts.

Rodger's[1] concept analysis has generated a lot of attention in the healthcare context, and has become a recognised method of concept clarification. For example, Hudon et al.[30] used Rodger's concept analysis approach to analyse "enablement" in a healthcare context. In Rodger's method of concept analysis[1], concepts are considered to be abstractions that are expressed in an arbitrary form. They constitute a mental (re)grouping of a number of attributes. Hudon et al.[30] define attributes as characteristics of concepts that must be present for the recognition of the concept as an entity. Concept analyses are employed in developing valid measuring instruments which can evaluate the attributes of a concept (determining whether there is good content validity)[30].

## Concept analysis procedure

Rodger's[1] concept analysis is divided into six steps, comprising (1) the identification of the concepts of interest and associated expressions and background, (2) the selection of an appropriate realm for data collection (setting, sample and data sources), (3) the collection of data

---

<sup>1</sup> Walker & Avant (2019) view concepts as static entities which are independent of context and have clear boundaries.

1  
2  
3 relevant to identifying concept attributes and the contextual concept basis, (4) the analysis and  
4 data summary regarding the concept characteristics, (5) the identification of concept examples,  
5 and (6) the identification of implications for further concept development.  
6

### 7 8 *Concept identification (step 1)* 9

10 By way of example, Viana et al.[31] state that "precision medicine" and "precision health" are  
11 not identical:  
12

13         Distinct from precision medicine, precision health takes a lifespan perspective in health  
14 monitoring, identifying actionable risks and intervening early.[31]  
15

16  
17 Our systematic concept analysis will focus on the clarification of the two concepts "precision  
18 medicine" and "personalised medicine". Surrogate and related terms will not be identified in  
19 advance: surrogate terms are other terms used to describe identical concepts, while related terms  
20 describe entities that are not identical but have something in common with the concepts under  
21 analysis[1]. The exploration of these will be conducted at a later step in the full text analysis of  
22 the included papers[compare 32]. Related (but not identical) concepts such as individualised  
23 care, stratified medicine, P4 medicine (predictive, preventive, personalised and participatory),  
24 genomic medicine, or patient-centered care, will be collected in the systematic review  
25 alongside definitions and interpretations derived from analysis of the full texts. Similarly,  
26 replacement terms for "medicine" in "precision/personalised medicine" such as "health(care)",  
27 "treatment", "therapy/therapeutics", "medical care", or similar composite terms[33] will be  
28 collected during full text analysis. Since related concepts are not identical with precision or  
29 personalised medicine, these are not central to the focus of this study. The main focus will be  
30 on the two terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine".  
31  
32  
33

### 34 *Setting, sample, and data source selection and data collection (steps 2 and 3)* 35

36  
37 As above, the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and  
38 bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning,  
39 and artificial intelligence were selected for analysis due to their key roles in OHIOH, which is  
40 an interdisciplinary research collaboration. The analysis might also reveal diverse  
41 understandings of the concepts in subdisciplines of the selected disciplines. This will be  
42 considered adequately in the analysis.  
43

44  
45 The search strategy will be used to search a number of databases relevant to each of these  
46 disciplines. We will use the databases PubMed, Medline, CINAHL, Scopus, Web of Science,  
47 Google Scholar, Research Square, F1000 Research and other computing-specific databases listed  
48 in Table 2. These are among the most representative and commonly used databases for the  
49 included disciplines.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 2. Collection of databases for the selected disciplines

Database	Disciplines
CINAHL	Clinical medicine, health services research
F1000 Research	Biomedicine
Google Scholar	Clinical medicine, health services research, physics, chemistry, engineering, machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://aclanthology.org/">https://aclanthology.org/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://arxiv.org/">https://arxiv.org/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://dblp.org/">https://dblp.org/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://dl.acm.org/">https://dl.acm.org/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://paperswithcode.com/">https://paperswithcode.com/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
<a href="https://www.ieee.org/">https://www.ieee.org/</a>	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
Medline	Clinical medicine, health services research
PubMed	Clinical medicine, biomedicine, health services research, medical informatics
Research Square	Biomedicine
Scopus	Clinical medicine, health services research, medical informatics, physics, chemistry, engineering
Web of Science	Clinical medicine, health services research, physics, chemistry, engineering

Once identified, the relevant discipline of a given publication will be defined according to the chosen publication's profile in Scopus ([www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com)). Scopus delivers a detailed categorisation and classification of journals into disciplines.

Additional manual hand searching will be carried out to identify potentially relevant articles that might have been missed in the searches of the above databases (e.g., references of papers).

The search strategy will look for articles that mention "precision medicine" and/or "personalised medicine" in their titles in addition to "defin\*" (definition/define) or "concept\*" in the full text. Both British and American spelling will be accepted ("personalised"/ "personalized" medicine). As an example, a PubMed search string for precision and personalised medicine will include:

((precision medicine[Title]) OR (personalised medicine[Title]) OR (personalized medicine[Title])) AND ((defin\*[Text Word]) OR (concept\*[Text Word]))

The search will be limited to scientific research papers in English language published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Moreover, the search will be limited to articles published from 2016 to 2022 in order to capture the current understanding of these concepts following the introduction of major initiatives such as the Precision Medicine Initiative[19] or the International Consortium for Personalised Medicine in 2015/2016[16].

Any articles with a main focus on clarifying at least one of the concepts and contributing to a deeper understanding of the concept(s) will be included (Table 3). Articles that do not offer any substantial (theoretical) basis underlying the clarification of the concepts will be excluded. Empirical studies will be included if they serve the purpose of concept clarification (e.g., hybrid concept analysis which combines empirical research/fieldwork such as expert interviews with the analysis of a concept[34]).

1  
2  
3 The study selection procedure will follow standard practice, i.e. an initial first search by one  
4 researcher who will remove any duplicates, followed by screening of titles and abstracts, and  
5 then full article screening, by several researchers from the included disciplines. Any  
6 disagreements regarding article inclusion will be resolved through discussion with additional  
7 researchers.  
8  
9

10 Search and inclusion results will be displayed using a PRISMA flow diagram. A search/study log  
11 book will be used to support study reliability estimation, with notes about the search and data  
12 collection procedure taken by the researchers throughout the data collection.  
13

14 Data will be managed using a reference manager (Endnote), an Excel list with study details and  
15 data extraction summaries, and the systematic review management program Covidence to  
16 organise data collection and analysis steps.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 *Table 3. Eligibility criteria for articles*  
22

- 
- 23 • Publications in peer-reviewed academic journals
  - 24
  - 25 • Published in the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and  
26 bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and  
27 artificial intelligence (discipline defined by the chosen publication's profile in Scopus)
  - 28
  - 29 • Published between 2016 and 2022 (including papers under review)
  - 30
  - 31 • Published in English language
  - 32
  - 33
  - 34 • Having a main focus on clarifying at least one of the concepts "precision medicine" or "personalised  
35 medicine", and contributing to a deeper understanding of the concept(s) using theoretical or empirical  
36 studies – publications that do not deliver any substantial contribution regarding the clarification of the  
37 concepts are to be excluded
  - 38
  - 39 • Empirical studies will be included if they serve the purpose of concept clarification (e.g., hybrid concept  
40 analysis which combines empirical research with the analysis of a concept)
  - 41
- 

42  
43  
44  
45 *Analysis, data summary, and identification of examples (steps 4 and 5)*  
46

47  
48 For full text analysis, every included article will be read with a focus on extracting information  
49 relevant to the interpretation and definition of the two concepts, as well as their contextual basis,  
50 their attributes and any related and/or surrogate terms (Table 4). Data extracted from the eligible  
51 papers will include the journal name, research discipline/context (including subdiscipline),  
52 authors, year, citation, study aim, and definitions of the concepts, attributes/characteristics,  
53 concept differences/similarities, related and surrogate terms, quality appraisal, and further notes.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For empirical studies, risk of bias will be assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)[35].

Several researchers with expertise in cooperating across the included disciplines (who participated in the abstract and full article screening) will initially extract data from 5-10 papers for the extraction to be compared in order to reach consensus for the further extraction. The subjectivity of the views of involved researchers will be identified and discussed through inter-coder comparisons, and differences will be resolved through discussion with additional researchers, if necessary. In the following, data will be extracted from all remaining included articles by the same researchers.

Rodgers' concept analysis method will guide a narrative synthesis, an example can be found in Miles and Huberman[36]. The findings will be compared, with (dis)similarities within the disciplines analysed[27]. Through this process, patterns will be revealed and main themes will be identified. This is a continuous process of data analysis, the data being reorganised until a descriptive pattern of themes is reached[1]. A data summary requires consensus regarding the concepts and their attributes, and (practical) examples from the included articles are used for concept explanation and illustration[1, 27]. Several researchers will be involved in the data analysis in order to avoid subjective interpretation.

*Table 4. Questions to explain the categories for analysis*

Concept attribute	What are the concept's characteristics?
Concept definition	Which definitions are presented in the data material?
Concept differences/similarities	Are specific concept differences or similarities mentioned in the data material?
Contextual basis	In which context is the concept presented (research discipline)?
Example	Are examples of the concept described in the data material?
Related term	Do other words have something in common with the concept?
Surrogate term	Do other words say the same thing as the chosen concept?

*Note.* Based on Tofthagen and Fagerstrom[27]

#### *Identification of implications for further concept development (step 6)*

Rodgers[1] suggests that, based on the data analysis, further questions and hypotheses are presented, rather than an attempt to generate a 'final' definition of the concepts involved, since this is not possible due to the dynamic nature of concepts. Suggestions will be made in relation to directing future research and helping guide further concept development and analysis.



## Patient and public involvement

OHIOH is a project that spans several disciplines and is underpinned by a participatory co-production model of research that is characterised by close collaboration with clinicians and with people living with Multiple Sclerosis or Type 1 Diabetes in research planning and in conducting the research. Our co-production partners have been involved in the development of this protocol and will continue to be involved throughout the research project. After finalising the data collection and data analysis, the results will be discussed with our partners and the OHIOH teams in order to put the results in an OHIOH context. For each discipline, the respective OHIOH team will review the resulting understanding of personalised and precision medicine from their scientific perspective.

## Ethics and dissemination

Following ethical and research standards, we will comprehensively report the methodology for a concept analysis following Rodgers[1]. Ethical approval is not required for this research because our study collects publicly available and theoretical data about the concepts underlying "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine". The results of this study will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed academic journals and at scientific conferences. Our findings will contribute to clarification of the underlying concepts and so help guide future research.

## Potential study limitations

Potentially relevant articles might be missed using any specific search strategy. However the inclusion of several databases and additional hand searching as part of a systematic approach is likely to minimise the risk of missing significant literature. Difficulties arising in an application of concept analysis to precision/personalised medicine could include that in contrast to other theoretical concepts (e.g., enablement), precision/personalised medicine are mostly practical medical terms rather than mere theoretical concepts.

## Acknowledgements and funding

This research was funded by and has been delivered in partnership with Our Health in Our Hands (OHIOH), a strategic initiative of the Australian National University, which aims to transform health care by developing new personalized health technologies and solutions in collaboration with patients, clinicians, and health care providers. AT gratefully acknowledges the support of

1  
2  
3 the Australian Research Council (ARC) (DP190101864 and FT200100939) and NATO Science  
4 for Peace and Security Program AMOXES.  
5  
6  
7

### 8 9 **Authors' Contributions**

10  
11 NBS prepared the study protocol and drafted the manuscript. JD supervised the procedure of  
12 developing the study protocol. All authors were involved in study concept and design  
13 discussions. All authors were involved in manuscript revision.  
14  
15

### 16 17 18 **Competing interests**

19  
20 None declared.  
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



## References

1. Rodgers, B.L., *Concept analysis. An evolutionary view*, in *Concept development in nursing: Foundations, techniques and applications*, B.L. Rodgers and K.A. Knafl, Editors. 2000, Saunders: Philadelphia, PA. p. 77-102
2. De Grandis, G. and V. Halgunset, *Conceptual and terminological confusion around personalised medicine: A coping strategy*. BMC Med Ethics, 2016. **17**(1): p. 43.DOI: 10.1186/s12910-016-0122-4
3. Faulkner, E., A.P. Holtorf, S. Walton, et al., *Being precise about precision medicine: What should value frameworks incorporate to address precision medicine? A report of the personalized precision medicine special interest group*. Value Health, 2020. **23**(5): p. 529-539.DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2019.11.010
4. Erikainen, S. and S. Chan, *Contested futures: Envisioning "personalized," "stratified," and "precision" medicine*. New Genet Soc, 2019. **38**(3): p. 308-330.DOI: 10.1080/14636778.2019.1637720
5. Muthusamy, V., A. Venkatesan, A. Radhakrishnan, and G. Kuppuswamy, *Personalized medicine: A review on scope and its pitfall*. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 2020. **13**(01).DOI: 10.31838/ijpr/2021.13.01.141
6. Schleidgen, S., C. Klingler, T. Bertram, W.H. Rogowski, and G. Marckmann, *What is personalized medicine: Sharpening a vague term based on a systematic literature review*. BMC Med Ethics, 2013. **14**: p. 55.DOI: 10.1186/1472-6939-14-55
7. Sheikhy, A., A. Fallahzadeh, H.R. Aghaei Meybodi, et al., *Personalized medicine in cardiovascular disease: Review of literature*. Journal of Diabetes & Metabolic Disorders, 2021. **20**(2): p. 1793-1805.DOI: 10.1007/s40200-021-00840-0
8. Williamson, R., W. Anderson, S. Duckett, et al., *The future of precision medicine in australia. Report for the australian council of learned academies*, 2018.
9. Hunter, D.J., *Uncertainty in the era of precision medicine*. N Engl J Med, 2016. **375**(8): p. 711-3.DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1608282
10. Marson, F.A.L., C.S. Bertuzzo, and J.D. Ribeiro, *Personalized or precision medicine? The example of cystic fibrosis*. Front Pharmacol, 2017. **8**: p. 390.DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2017.00390
11. Elemento, O., *The future of precision medicine: Towards a more predictive personalized medicine*. Emerg Top Life Sci, 2020. **4**(2): p. 175-177.DOI: 10.1042/ETLS20190197
12. Ho, D., S.R. Quake, E.R.B. McCabe, et al., *Enabling technologies for personalized and precision medicine*. Trends Biotechnol, 2020. **38**(5): p. 497-518.DOI: 10.1016/j.tibtech.2019.12.021
13. Ong, S., J. Ling, A. Ballantyne, T. Lysaght, and V. Xafis, *Perceptions of 'precision' and 'personalised' medicine in singapore and associated ethical issues*. Asian Bioeth Rev, 2021. **13**(2): p. 179-194.DOI: 10.1007/s41649-021-00165-3
14. U.S. National Library of Medicine. *Precision medicine. Mesh descriptor data 2021*. MeSH Descriptor Data 2021 2021 [cited 2021 11/22/2021]; Available from: <https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/record/ui?ui=D057285>.
15. Council of the European Union, *Personalised medicine for patients – council conclusions (7 december 2015)*. Document number 15054/15, 2015.

16. European Commission. *Personalised medicine*. 2020 30/11/2021]; Available from: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/research-area/health-research-and-innovation/personalised-medicine\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/research-area/health-research-and-innovation/personalised-medicine_en).
17. Fournier, V., T. Prebet, A. Dormal, et al., *Definition of personalized medicine and targeted therapies: Does medical familiarity matter?* J Pers Med, 2021. **11**(1).DOI: 10.3390/jpm11010026
18. AMS. *Stratified, personalised or p4 medicine: A new direction for placing the patient at the centre of healthcare and health education. Summary of a joint forum meeting held on 12 may 2015*. . 2015.
19. NIH, *The precision medicine initiative cohort programme – building a research foundation for 21st century medicine*, 2015.
20. Health Informatics Society of Australia HISA, *What are precision medicine and personalized medicine?*, 2018.
21. The Australian National University. *Our health in our hands*. 2021 09/01/2021]; Available from: <https://www.anu.edu.au/research/research-initiatives/our-health-in-our-hands>.
22. Desborough, J., C. Brunoro, A. Parkinson, et al., *'It struck at the heart of who i thought i was': A meta-synthesis of the qualitative literature examining the experiences of people with multiple sclerosis*. Health Expect, 2020. **23**(5): p. 1007-1027.DOI: 10.1111/hex.13093
23. Brew-Sam, N., M. Chhabra, A. Parkinson, et al., *Experiences of young people and their caregivers of using technology to manage type 1 diabetes mellitus: Systematic literature review and narrative synthesis*. JMIR Diabetes, 2021. **6**(1): p. e20973.DOI: 10.2196/20973
24. Henschke, A., J. Desborough, A. Parkinson, et al., *Personalizing medicine and technologies to address the experiences and needs of people with multiple sclerosis*. J Pers Med, 2021. **11**(8).DOI: 10.3390/jpm11080791
25. Shamseer, L., D. Moher, M. Clarke, et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation*. BMJ, 2015. **349**: p. g7647.DOI: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
26. Moher, D., A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, and P. Group, *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The prisma statement*. BMJ, 2009. **339**: p. b2535.DOI: 10.1136/bmj.b2535
27. Toftagen, R. and L.M. Fagerstrom, *Rodgers' evolutionary concept analysis--a valid method for developing knowledge in nursing science*. Scand J Caring Sci, 2010. **24 Suppl 1**: p. 21-31.DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6712.2010.00845.x
28. Walker, L.O. and K.C. Avant, *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*. 6th ed. 2019, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall
29. Wilson, J., *Thinking with concept*. 1963, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
30. Hudon, C., D. St-Cyr Tribble, G. Bravo, and M.E. Poitras, *Enablement in health care context: A concept analysis*. J Eval Clin Pract, 2011. **17**(1): p. 143-9.DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01413.x

- 1  
2  
3 31. Viana, J.N., S. Edney, S. Gondalia, et al., *Trends and gaps in precision health research: A*  
4 *scoping review*. BMJ Open, 2021. **11**(10): p. e056938.DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-  
5 056938  
6  
7 32. Pueyo-Garrigues, M., D. Whitehead, M.I. Pardavila-Belio, et al., *Health education: A*  
8 *rogerian concept analysis*. Int J Nurs Stud, 2019. **94**: p. 131-138.DOI:  
9 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.03.005  
10  
11 33. Ali-Khan, S., S. Kowal, W. Luth, R. Gold, and T. Bubela, *Terminology for personalized*  
12 *medicine: A systematic collection*, PACEOMICS, Editor 2016, McGill University and  
13 University of Alberta.  
14  
15 34. Schwartz-Barcott, D. and H.-S. Kim, *An expansion and elaboration of the hybrid model of*  
16 *concept development.*, in *Concept development in nursing: Foundation, techniques, and*  
17 *applications*, B.-L. Rodgers and K.-A. Knafl, Editors. 2000, Saunders: Philadelphia. p. 129-  
18 159  
19  
20 35. Hong, Q.N., P. Pluye, S. Fabregues, et al., *Mixed methods appraisal tool (mmat) version*  
21 *2018 - user guide*, 2018.  
22  
23 36. Miles, M.B. and M.A. Huberman, *Qualitative data analysis*. 2003, London: Sage  
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

## PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>			
Title:			
Identification	1a ✓	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title of manuscript, p.1
Update	1b	<del>If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such</del>	
Registration	2	<del>If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number</del>	
Authors:			
Contact	3a ✓	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Title page, p.1
Contributions	3b ✓	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Author contributions, p.13
Amendments	4	<del>If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments</del>	Methods - protocol development, p.6
Support:			
Sources	5a ✓	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Funding statement, p.12
Sponsor	5b ✓	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or funder	5c ✓	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	6 ✓	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Introduction/objective, p.3-6
Objectives	7 ✓	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Research questions, p.6
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	8 ✓	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Methods, p.6-11
Information sources	9 ✓	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Methods, p.8-9
Search strategy	10 ✓	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Methods, p.9
Study records:			
Data management	11a ✓	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Methods, p.10

1				
2				
3				
4	Selection process	11b	✓ State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Methods, p.9-10
5				
6	Data collection process	11c	✓ Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Methods, p.9-10
7				
8	Data items	12	✓ List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Methods, p.10
9				
10	Outcomes and prioritization	13	<del>List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale</del>	
11				
12	Risk of bias in individual studies	14	✓ Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	Methods, p.10
13				
14	Data synthesis	15a	<del>Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised</del>	
15		15b	<del>If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I<sup>2</sup>, Kendall's τ)</del>	
16		15c	<del>Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)</del>	
17		15d	✓ If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Methods, p.11
18				
19	Meta-bias(es)	16	<del>Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)</del>	
20				
21	Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	<del>Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)</del>	
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				

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

# BMJ Open

## The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-060326.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Brew-Sam, Nicola ; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Parkinson, Anne; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Lueck, Christian; Australian National University, School of Medicine and Psychology, College of Health and Medicine; Canberra Health Services, Department of Neurology          Brown, Ellen; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Brown, Karen; Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Bruestle, Anne; Australian National University, The John Curtin School of Medical Research, College of Health and Medicine          Chisholm, Katrina; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Collins, Simone; Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics          Cook, Matthew; Australian National University, The John Curtin School of Medical Research, College of Health and Medicine          Daskalaki, Eleni; Australian National University, School of Computing, College of Engineering and Computer Science          Drew, Janet; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Ebbeck, Harry; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Elisha, Mark; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Fanning, Vanessa; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine          Henschke, Adam; University of Twente, Department of Philosophy          Herron, Jessica; Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics          Matthews, Emma; Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics          Murugappan, Krishnan; Australian National University, Nanotechnology Research Lab, Research School of Chemistry, College of Science; CSIRO, Mineral Resources          Neshev, Dragomir; Australian National University, Department of Electronic Materials Engineering, Research School of Physics, College of Science          Nolan, Christopher; Australian National University, School of Medicine</p>

	and Psychology & The John Curtin School of Medical Research, College of Health and Medicine; Canberra Health Services, Endocrinology Pedley, Lachlan; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine Phillips, Christine; Australian National University, School of Medicine and Psychology, College of Health and Medicine Suominen, Hanna; Australian National University, School of Computing, College of Engineering and Computer Science; University Of Turku, Department of Computing Tricoli, Antonio; Australian National University, Nanotechnology Research Laboratory, Research School of Chemistry, College of Science; The University of Sydney, Nanotechnology Research Laboratory, Faculty of Engineering Wright, Kristine; Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics Desborough, Jane; Australian National University, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Patient-centred medicine
<b>Secondary Subject Heading</b> :	Qualitative research, Health services research
<b>Keywords</b> :	Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



# The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

Brew-Sam, Nicola<sup>1</sup>; Parkinson, Anne<sup>1</sup>; Lueck, Christian<sup>2,3</sup>; Brown, Ellen<sup>1</sup>; Brown, Karen<sup>1,4</sup>; Bruestle, Anne<sup>5</sup>; Chisholm, Katrina<sup>1</sup>; Collins, Simone<sup>4</sup>; Cook, Matthew<sup>5</sup>; Daskalaki, Eleni<sup>6</sup>; Drew, Janet<sup>1</sup>; Ebbeck, Harry<sup>1</sup>; Elisha, Mark<sup>1</sup>; Fanning, Vanessa<sup>1</sup>; Henschke, Adam<sup>7</sup>; Herron, Jessica<sup>4</sup>; Matthews, Emma<sup>4</sup>; Murugappan, Krishnan<sup>8,9</sup>; Neshev, Dragomir<sup>10</sup>; Nolan, Christopher J.<sup>3,5,11</sup>; Pedley, Lachlan<sup>1</sup>; Phillips, Christine<sup>3</sup>; Suominen, Hanna<sup>6,12</sup>; Tricoli, Antonio<sup>8,13</sup>; Wright, Kristine<sup>4</sup>; Desborough, Jane<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Canberra Health Services, Department of Neurology, Canberra, Australia

<sup>3</sup> School of Medicine and Psychology, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>4</sup>Canberra Health Services, Paediatrics, Canberra, Australia

<sup>5</sup>The John Curtin School of Medical Research, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>6</sup>School of Computing, College of Engineering and Computer Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>7</sup>University of Twente, Department of Philosophy, Enschede, The Netherlands

<sup>8</sup>Nanotechnology Research Lab, Research School of Chemistry, College of Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>9</sup>CSIRO, Mineral Resources, Private Bag 10, Clayton South, Victoria, 3169, Australia

<sup>10</sup>Department of Electronic Materials Engineering, Research School of Physics, College of Science, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

<sup>11</sup>Canberra Health Services, Endocrinology, Canberra, Australia

<sup>12</sup>Department of Computing, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

<sup>13</sup>Nanotechnology Research Laboratory, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

**Author notes.** Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Nicola Brew-Sam, Our Health in Our Hands, Health Experience Team, National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, 63 Eggleston Rd, 2601, Acton, Canberra, Australia; Email: nicola.brew-sam@anu.edu.au

**Keywords (MeSH terms).** Concept formation, interdisciplinary research, personalized medicine, precision medicine, systematic review

**Word count.** 3560



# The Current Understanding of Precision Medicine and Personalised Medicine in Selected Research Disciplines – Study Protocol of a Systematic Concept Analysis

## Abstract

*Introduction.* The terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" have become key terms in health-related research, and in science-related public communication. However, the application of these two concepts and their interpretation in various disciplines are heterogeneous, which also affects research translation and public awareness. This leads to confusion regarding the use and distinction of the two concepts. Our aim is to provide a snapshot of the current understanding of these concepts.

*Methods and analysis.* Our study will use Rodger's evolutionary concept analysis to systematically examine the current understanding of the concepts "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence, and to identify their respective attributes (clusters of characteristics) and surrogate and related terms.

A systematic search of the literature will be conducted for 2016-2022 using databases relevant to each of these disciplines: ACM Digital Library, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, F1000Research, IEEE Xplore, Pubmed/Medline, Science Direct, Scopus, and Web of Science. These are among the most representative databases for the included disciplines.

We will examine similarities and differences in definitions of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in the respective disciplines and across (sub)disciplines, including attributes of each term. This will enable us to determine how these two concepts are distinguished.

*Ethics and dissemination.* Following ethical and research standards, we will comprehensively report the methodology for a systematic analysis following Roger's concept analysis method. Our systematic concept analysis will contribute to the clarification of the two concepts and distinction in their application in given settings and circumstances. Such a broad concept analysis will contribute to non-systematic syntheses of the concepts, or occasional systematic reviews on one of the concepts that have been published in specific disciplines, in order to facilitate interdisciplinary communication, translational medical research, and implementation science.

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- In contrast to previous studies, we examine the definitions of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in specific selected disciplines in order to facilitate interdisciplinary communication, translational medical research, and implementation science.

- Moreover, we analyse these two concepts systematically and base our review on renowned concept analysis methodology.
- Our study will contribute to the clarification of the two concepts, their attributes, and differences in various disciplines.
- Concepts are constantly developing and their meanings change over time, and hence it is not our objective to deliver an unequivocal definition.

## Introduction

The terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" are increasingly used in health-related research. However, the interpretation of these concepts and their application in various disciplines is heterogeneous[1, 2]. The terms are often used in relation to specific diseases (e.g., cancer) with an applied focus but without a detailed definition or specification of the underlying concepts. Non-systematic syntheses of (one of) the concepts[3, 4], or occasional systematic reviews on (one or other of) the concepts have been published in specific disciplines[5, 6]. But, so far, understanding of the concepts has not been systematically clarified and compared across disciplines. Erikainen and Chan[3] report that disciplines have inconsistent, and potentially contrary, understandings of precision medicine or personalised medicine, as well as differing preferences of terms describing similar entities (for an exemplary variety of definitions see Table 1).

For example, discussion in biomedical literature has relatively early started to express criticism of the term "personalised medicine" arguing that this term implies unrealistic optimism and promises in relation to what biomedical technology will be able to deliver. According to Schleidgen et al.[5] "personalised medicine" wrongly implies a focus on the interests and preferences of an individual and the provision of patient-centered medicine through personalised medicine alone. A similar statement was put forward by the United States National Academies[7]. Schleidgen et al.[5] recommended the use of the term "stratified medicine" instead of "personalised medicine" to present a more realistic vision of the underlying concept[3]. Similarly, "precision" promises a level of certainty[8] "that is unlikely to be reflected in the realities of precision medicine"[7].

However, other disciplines (including medical ethics, critical studies of biosciences, patient-centered research) have criticised Schleidgen's view, suggesting it can only be applied in a biomedical context, emphasizing that "personalised medicine" should be clearly distinguished from "patient-centered care"[3]:

Schleidgen and colleagues' definition can be seen as privileging the biological and molecular interpretation of "personalization" as group-level treatment stratification, to the explicit and purposeful exclusion of patient-centered interpretations.[3]

Table 1. Variety of definitions of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" – examples

Concept	Year	Authors, Journal/Source	Discipline (Scopus) <sup>a</sup>	Definition
Precision Medicine	2017	Marson, Bertuzzo & Ribeiro[9], <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i>	Medicine: pharmacology; Pharmacology, toxicology, pharmaceuticals: pharmacology	In precision medicine, the individual is understood "as a response to the interrelation between environment, lifestyle, and genetic factors"
	2020	Elemento[10], <i>Emerging Topics in Life Sciences</i>	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology: general biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology	Precision medicine is "personalized medicine enhanced by technology"
	2020	Ho et al.[11], <i>Trends in Biotechnology</i>	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology: biotechnology; Chemical engineering: bioengineering	"From an engineering perspective, precision medicine involves the use of technologies to acquire and validate population-wise data, such as omics-based single-cell analysis and biomarker discovery, for subsequent application on the individual patient level."
	2021	Ong et al.[12], <i>Asian Bioethics Review</i>	Arts and humanities: philosophy; Social sciences: health; Medicine: health policy	"Precision medicine (PM) aims to improve healthcare with the use of genomic analyses and data analytics to develop tailored approaches to predicting disease progression and treatment responses for individual patients"
	2021	U.S. National Library of Medicine[13]	(Medicine)	"Clinical, therapeutic and diagnostic approaches to optimal disease management based on individual variations in a patient's genetic profile."
Personalised Medicine	2013	Schleidgen et al.[5], <i>BMC Medical Ethics</i>	Nursing: ethics and legal aspects; Social sciences: health; Medicine: health policy	Personalized medicine "is not medicine with a special focus on the interests and preferences of the individual patient" and it "is not related to the term patient-centered medicine"
	2017	Marson, Bertuzzo & Ribeiro[9], <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i>	Medicine: pharmacology; Pharmacology, toxicology, pharmaceuticals: pharmacology	Personalized medicine is "the treatment directed at the symptoms, and this treatment is adjusted depending on the patient's phenotype"

2015/2020	Council of the European Union[14]/ European Commission[15]	(Health policy)	"Personalised medicine refers to a medical model using characterisation of individuals' phenotypes and genotypes (e.g. molecular profiling, medical imaging, lifestyle data) for tailoring the right therapeutic strategy for the right person at the right time, and/or to determine the predisposition to disease and/or to deliver timely and targeted prevention. Personalised medicine relates to the broader concept of patient-centred care, which takes into account that, in general, healthcare systems need to better respond to patient needs"
2020	Ho et al.[11], Trends in Biotechnology	Biochemistry, genetics and molecular biology; biotechnology;  Chemical engineering; bioengineering	"Personalized medicine involves the use of technologies to seriously acquire and assess an individual's own data for only their own treatment. For example, this may involve the use of artificial intelligence (AI) to both design a drug combination based on a patient's own biopsy and follow with N-of-1 dosing protocols"
2021	Fournier et al.[16], Journal of Personalized Medicine	Medicine: medicine (miscellaneous)	"PM seems to have a wide scope, encompassing many practices, including targeted therapies (TT)... It seems there are several terms used to name PM... Indeed, it is possible to define PM as 'targeted therapy', 'pharmacogenomics' or 'precision medicine' depending on the author, the domain or the definition..."

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>For discipline categorisation, the "source details" in Scopus are used for information on the respective journals ([www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com))

To summarise, the understanding and use of the concepts "personalised" and "precision" medicine is discipline-dependent, which may also influence discussions on a policy level[14, 17-19]. The latter can be shown by country-specific preferences at a policy level. For example, while the discussion is mostly focusing on precision medicine in the U.S. since the Precision Medicine Initiative was launched in 2015[18], the European Union set up an International Consortium for Personalised Medicine (ICPerMed) in 2016[15]. Yet, the distinction of the two concepts is not clear enough to argue how the two terms differ. Preferences and an understanding largely depend on historical developments of the terms in specific contexts, leading to varying interpretations (e.g., on a research and a policy level). This variety in interpretations, going along with the use of different terms, can have negative consequences, including the creation of different representations or beliefs in people when using a variety of terms, or a reinforcement of inaccuracies in definitions[16].

1  
2  
3 A first step towards more clarity is an understanding of current differences and similarities  
4 regarding precision and personalised medicine across disciplines in research. Further research  
5 can then examine how these current interpretations developed historically (concept revisions),  
6 and how they influence(d) policy.  
7

8  
9 Our Health in Our Hands (OHIOH) is a multidisciplinary research project at the Australian  
10 National University which brings together the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine  
11 (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry,  
12 engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence. These disciplines are the focus of  
13 this paper. OHIOH aims to advance digitalisation and personalisation of healthcare using a co-  
14 production approach with partners from research, lived experience, healthcare professionals,  
15 and health services[20]. OHIOH research includes studies on the experiences of people living  
16 with Multiple Sclerosis (MS)[21] and Type 1 Diabetes[22]. A recently published OHIOH  
17 paper[23] discusses the understanding and experiences of people living with MS in order to  
18 emphasise the importance of personalised medicine in MS treatment and care. In the course of  
19 drafting the manuscript, discussions around "personalised" and "precision" medicine revealed  
20 that the understanding of these two concepts varied greatly between the researchers in the  
21 various disciplines involved in OHIOH.  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 Objective

27  
28 The aim of this study is to examine the current understanding of the concepts "precision  
29 medicine" and "personalised medicine" in clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating  
30 genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering;  
31 machine learning, and artificial intelligence using Rodgers'[24] concept analysis to identify  
32 concept attributes (clusters of characteristics) and to determine how these two concepts are  
33 distinguished in these selected disciplines and potential subdisciplines. We will answer the  
34 following research questions (RQ):  
35  
36

37  
38 RQ1: What is the current understanding of "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" in  
39 clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services  
40 research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence, and  
41 what are similarities and differences in definitions in the respective disciplines and across  
42 different (sub)disciplines?  
43

44  
45 RQ2: What are the related and surrogate terms for "precision medicine" and "personalised  
46 medicine" in each of the selected disciplines?  
47

48 It is important to understand how the two concepts are currently interpreted and understood in  
49 the individual disciplines in order to be able to create consistent understanding of the concept  
50 interpretations and to reduce ambiguity in the literature. This current interpretation does not  
51 include concept revisions over time which could be examined in follow-up research. As concepts  
52 are constantly developing and their meanings change over time it is not our objective to deliver  
53 an unequivocal definition.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

## Methods and Analysis

### Protocol development

We used the 17 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) throughout the development of our study protocol[25] (see supplementary file). Our systematic data collection and analysis will similarly follow the subsequent Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)[26]. Amendments to the study protocol will be reported in the final published systematic concept analysis manuscript.

### Concept analysis approach

A concept analysis aims to clarify a concept (e.g., attributes, antecedents, consequences)[24]. Such a concept clarification enables assessment of a concept's strengths and weaknesses[27]. Based on Walker and Avant's[28] traditional approach<sup>1</sup> derived from Wilson's method[29] which is based on realism (deductive analysis), Rodgers[24] developed an evolutionary concept analysis based on relativism (inductive analysis). Rodgers[24] viewed concepts as dynamic and evolving phenomena without strict boundaries. This took account of the fact that concepts are constantly developing and their meanings change over time, and hence it is not possible for an analysis to deliver an unequivocal definition[27]. Moreover, concepts are understood differently in different disciplines due to what Rodgers[24] calls "enculturation" within individual disciplines. Thus, it is important to clarify the selection of disciplines being focused on when using Roger's approach to a concept analysis.

Bearing in mind the changing and non-static understanding of the terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine" over time, Rodger's approach appears to be a good fit for analysis. Our analysis of "personalised" and "precision" medicine will only represent a snapshot of the current understanding of these concepts in the literature pertaining to clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and artificial intelligence. Nevertheless, it is essential to highlight any differences and similarities between disciplines to inform current and future research, aiming to standardise and generate a uniform approach if at all possible. We will not look into revisions of definitions over time, the focus is on the current understanding of the two concepts.

Rodger's[24] concept analysis has generated a lot of attention in the healthcare context, and has become a recognised method of concept clarification. For example, Hudon et al.[30] used Rodger's concept analysis approach to analyse "enablement" in a healthcare context. In Rodger's method of concept analysis[24], concepts are considered to be abstractions that are expressed in an arbitrary form. They constitute a mental (re)grouping of a number of attributes. Hudon et al.[30] define attributes as characteristics of concepts that must be present for the recognition of the concept as an entity. Concept analyses are employed in developing valid measuring

---

<sup>1</sup> Walker & Avant (2019) view concepts as static entities which are independent of context and have clear boundaries.



1  
2  
3 instruments which can evaluate the attributes of a concept (determining whether there is good  
4 content validity)[30].  
5  
6  
7  
8

### 9 Concept analysis procedure

10  
11 Rodger's[24] concept analysis is divided into six steps, comprising (1) the identification of the  
12 concepts of interest and associated expressions and background, (2) the selection of an  
13 appropriate realm for data collection (setting, sample and data sources), (3) the collection of data  
14 relevant to identifying concept attributes and the contextual concept basis, (4) the analysis and  
15 data summary regarding the concept characteristics, (5) the identification of concept examples,  
16 and (6) the identification of implications for further concept development.  
17  
18

#### 19 *Concept identification (step 1)*

20  
21 By way of example, Viana et al.[31] state that "precision medicine" and "precision health" are  
22 not identical:  
23

24  
25         Distinct from precision medicine, precision health takes a lifespan perspective in health  
26 monitoring, identifying actionable risks and intervening early.[31]  
27

28  
29 Our systematic concept analysis will focus on the clarification of the two concepts "precision  
30 medicine" and "personalised medicine". Surrogate and related terms will not be identified in  
31 advance: surrogate terms are other terms used to describe identical concepts, while related terms  
32 describe entities that are not identical but have something in common with the concepts under  
33 analysis[24]. The exploration of these will be conducted at a later step in the full text analysis of  
34 the included papers[e.g. 32]. Related (but not identical) concepts such as individualised care,  
35 stratified medicine, P4 medicine (predictive, preventive, personalised and participatory),  
36 genomic medicine, or patient-centered care, will be collected in the systematic review  
37 alongside definitions and interpretations derived from analysis of the full texts. Similarly,  
38 replacement terms for "medicine" in "precision/personalised medicine" such as "health(care)",  
39 "treatment", "therapy/therapeutics", "medical care", or similar composite terms[33] will be  
40 collected during full text analysis. Since related concepts are not identical with precision or  
41 personalised medicine, these are not central to the focus of this study. The main focus will be  
42 on the two terms "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine".  
43  
44

#### 45 *Setting, sample, and data source selection and data collection (steps 2 and 3)*

46  
47  
48 As above, the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and  
49 bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning,  
50 and artificial intelligence were selected for analysis due to their key roles in OHIOH, which is  
51 an interdisciplinary research collaboration. The analysis might also reveal diverse  
52 understandings of the concepts in subdisciplines of the selected disciplines. This will be  
53 considered adequately in the analysis.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The search strategy will be used to search a number of databases relevant to each of these disciplines. We will use the databases ACM Digital Library, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, F1000 Research, IEEE Xplore Digital Library, Pubmed/Medline, Science Direct, Scopus, and Web of Science (*Error! Reference source not found.*). These are among the most representative and commonly used databases for the included disciplines. They were selected based on a more extensive list of databases from which several were excluded for reasons as specified in Table 3.

*Table 2. Collection of databases for the selected disciplines*

Database	Disciplines
ACM Digital Library (Association for Computing Machinery)	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
CINAHL	Clinical medicine Health services research
Cochrane Library	All included disciplines
F1000 Research	Biomedicine
IEEE Xplore Digital Library	Machine learning and artificial intelligence
PubMed/ Medline	Clinical medicine Biomedicine Health services research Medical informatics
Science Direct	All included disciplines
Scopus	Clinical medicine Health services research Medical informatics Physics Chemistry Engineering
Web of Science	Clinical medicine Health services research Physics Chemistry Engineering

*Table 3. Considered but excluded databases*

Database	Disciplines	Exclusion reason
ACL Anthology	Machine learning and artificial intelligence	Poster and conference proceedings
arXiv (Cornell University)	Machine learning and artificial intelligence	Pre-print server
DBLP Computer Science Bibliography	Machine learning and artificial intelligence	Limited search options (by publication only). Pilot searches returned poor results



EMBASE	Biomedicine	Unable to access
Google Scholar	Clinical medicine Health services research Physics Chemistry Engineering Machine learning and artificial intelligence	Searches difficult to refine Large volume of irrelevant results
Paperswithcode	Machine learning and artificial intelligence	No advanced search option Could not restrict to peer reviewed journal papers
Research Square	Biomedicine	Mainly preprints No advanced search option No export option

Once identified, the relevant discipline of a given publication will be defined according to the chosen publication's profile in Scopus ([www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com)). Scopus delivers a detailed categorisation and classification of journals into disciplines.

Additional manual hand searching will be carried out to identify potentially relevant articles that might have been missed in the searches of the above databases (e.g., references of papers).

The search strategy, developed after an initial exploratory search of the literature, will look for articles that mention "precision medicine" and/or "personalised medicine" in their titles in addition to "defin\*" (definition/define) or "concept\*" in the full text. Both British and American spelling will be accepted ("personalised"/ "personalized" medicine). As an example, a PubMed search string for precision and personalised medicine will include:

((precision medicine[Title]) OR (personalised medicine[Title]) OR (personalized medicine[Title])) AND ((defin\*[Text Word]) OR (concept\*[Text Word]))

The search will be limited to scientific research papers in English language published in peer-reviewed academic journals. Moreover, the search will be limited to articles published from 2016 to 2022 in order to capture the current understanding of these concepts following the introduction of major initiatives such as the Precision Medicine Initiative[18] or the International Consortium for Personalised Medicine in 2015/2016[15].

Guidance from Rodgers advises that each discipline should be represented by approximately 20 percent of the overall included references. If a larger number of relevant studies are returned in our search results we will reduce the number for analysis in each discipline by selecting every fifth article starting from a random article.

Any articles with a main focus on clarifying at least one of the concepts, beyond that of a simple definition, and contributing to a deeper understanding of the concept(s) will be included (Table 4). Articles that do not offer any substantial (theoretical) basis underlying the clarification of the

1  
2  
3 concepts will be excluded. Empirical studies will be included if they serve the purpose of  
4 concept clarification (e.g., hybrid concept analysis which combines empirical research/fieldwork  
5 such as expert interviews with the analysis of a concept[34]).  
6

7  
8 The study selection procedure will follow standard practice, i.e. an initial first search by one  
9 researcher who will remove any duplicates, followed by screening of titles and abstracts, and  
10 then full article screening, by several researchers from the included disciplines. We recognise  
11 that due to the nature of our inquiry, it may not be apparent at the abstract and title screening  
12 stage whether articles discuss concepts in detail; this will be determined at the full text screening  
13 stage. Any disagreements regarding article inclusion will be resolved through discussion with  
14 additional researchers.  
15

16  
17 Search and inclusion results will be displayed using a PRISMA flow diagram. A search/study log  
18 book will be used to support study reliability estimation, with notes about the search and data  
19 collection procedure taken by the researchers throughout the data collection.  
20

21  
22 Data will be managed using a reference manager (Endnote), an Excel list with study details and  
23 data extraction summaries, and the systematic review management program Covidence to  
24 organise data collection and analysis steps.  
25

26  
27  
28 *Table 4. Eligibility criteria for articles*  
29

- 
- 30 • Publications in peer-reviewed academic journals
  - 31
  - 32 • Published in the disciplines of clinical medicine, biomedicine (incorporating genomics and  
33 bioinformatics), health services research; physics, chemistry, engineering; machine learning, and  
34 artificial intelligence (discipline defined by the chosen publication's profile in Scopus)
  - 35
  - 36 • Published between 2016 and 2022 (including papers under review)
  - 37
  - 38 • Published in English language
  - 39
  - 40
  - 41 • Having a main focus on clarifying at least one of the concepts "precision medicine" or "personalised  
42 medicine", beyond that of a simple definition, and contributing to a deeper understanding of the  
43 concept(s) using theoretical or empirical studies – publications that do not deliver any substantial  
44 contribution regarding the clarification of the concepts are to be excluded
  - 45
  - 46 • Empirical studies will be included if they serve the purpose of concept clarification (e.g., hybrid concept  
47 analysis which combines empirical research with the analysis of a concept)  
48
-

*Analysis, data summary, and identification of examples (steps 4 and 5)*

For full text analysis, every included article will be read with a focus on extracting information relevant to the interpretation and definition of the two concepts, as well as their contextual basis, their attributes and any related and/or surrogate terms (Table 5). Data extracted from the eligible papers will include the journal name, research discipline/context (including subdiscipline), authors, year, citation, study aim, and definitions of the concepts, attributes/characteristics, concept differences/similarities, related and surrogate terms, quality appraisal, and further notes. For empirical studies – if the final analysis will include these – risk of bias will be assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)[35].

Several researchers with expertise in cooperating across the included disciplines (who participated in the abstract and full article screening) will initially extract data from 5-10 papers for the extraction to be compared in order to reach consensus for the further extraction. The subjectivity of the views of involved researchers will be identified and discussed through inter-coder comparisons, and differences will be resolved through discussion with additional researchers, if necessary. In the following, data will be extracted from all remaining included articles by the same researchers.

Rodgers' concept analysis method will guide a narrative synthesis, an example can be found in Miles and Huberman[36]. The findings will be compared, with (dis)similarities within the disciplines analysed[27]. Through this process, patterns will be revealed and main themes will be identified. This is a continuous process of data analysis, the data being reorganised until a descriptive pattern of themes is reached[24]. A data summary requires consensus regarding the concepts and their attributes, and (practical) examples from the included articles are used for concept explanation and illustration[24, 27]. Several researchers will be involved in the data analysis in order to avoid subjective interpretation.

*Table 5.* Questions to explain the categories for analysis

Concept attribute	What are the concept's characteristics?
Concept definition	Which definitions are presented in the data material?
Concept differences/similarities	Are specific concept differences or similarities mentioned in the data material?
Contextual basis	In which context is the concept presented (research discipline)?
Example	Are examples of the concept described in the data material?
Related term	Do other words have something in common with the concept?
Surrogate term	Do other words say the same thing as the chosen concept?

*Note.* Based on Tofthagen and Fagerstrom[27]

### *Identification of implications for further concept development (step 6)*

Rodgers[24] suggests that, based on the data analysis, further questions and hypotheses are presented, rather than an attempt to generate a 'final' definition of the concepts involved, since this is not possible due to the dynamic nature of concepts. Suggestions will be made in relation to directing future research and helping guide further concept development and analysis.

### **Patient and public involvement**

OHIOH is a project that spans several disciplines and is underpinned by a participatory co-production model of research that is characterised by close collaboration with clinicians and with people living with Multiple Sclerosis or Type 1 Diabetes in research planning and in conducting the research. Our co-production partners have been involved in the development of this protocol and will continue to be involved throughout the research project. After finalising the data collection and data analysis, the results will be discussed with our partners and the OHIOH teams in order to put the results in an OHIOH context. For each discipline, the respective OHIOH team will review the resulting understanding of personalised and precision medicine from their scientific perspective.

### **Ethics and dissemination**

Following ethical and research standards, we will comprehensively report the methodology for a concept analysis following Rodgers[24]. Ethical approval is not required for this research because our study collects publicly available and theoretical data about the concepts underlying "precision medicine" and "personalised medicine". The results of this study will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed academic journals and at scientific conferences. Our findings will contribute to clarification of the underlying concepts and so help guide future research.

### **Potential study limitations**

Potentially relevant articles might be missed using any specific search strategy. However the inclusion of several databases and additional hand searching as part of a systematic approach is likely to minimise the risk of missing significant literature. Difficulties arising in an application of concept analysis to precision/personalised medicine could include that in contrast to other theoretical concepts (e.g., enablement), precision/personalised medicine are mostly practical medical terms rather than mere theoretical concepts.

### Acknowledgements and funding

This research was funded by and has been delivered in partnership with Our Health in Our Hands (OHIOH), a strategic initiative of the Australian National University, which aims to transform health care by developing new personalized health technologies and solutions in collaboration with patients, clinicians, and health care providers. AT gratefully acknowledges the support of the Australian Research Council (ARC) (DP190101864 and FT200100939) and NATO Science for Peace and Security Program AMOXES.

### Authors' Contributions

NBS prepared the study protocol and drafted the manuscript. NBS, AP, CL, EB, KB, AB, KC, SC, MC, ED, JDr, HE, ME, VF, AH, JH, EM, KM, DN, CJN, LP, CP, HS, AT, KW, JD were involved in study concept and design discussions, and provided feedback on the draft study protocol. AP, NBS and JD revised the manuscript based on the feedback. JD supervised the procedure of developing the study protocol. All authors approved the final manuscript version.

### Competing interests

None declared.

## References

1. De Grandis, G. and V. Halgunset, *Conceptual and terminological confusion around personalised medicine: A coping strategy*. BMC Med Ethics, 2016. **17**(1): p. 43.DOI: 10.1186/s12910-016-0122-4
2. Faulkner, E., A.P. Holtorf, S. Walton, et al., *Being precise about precision medicine: What should value frameworks incorporate to address precision medicine? A report of the personalized precision medicine special interest group*. Value Health, 2020. **23**(5): p. 529-539.DOI: 10.1016/j.jval.2019.11.010
3. Erikainen, S. and S. Chan, *Contested futures: Envisioning "personalized," "stratified," and "precision" medicine*. New Genet Soc, 2019. **38**(3): p. 308-330.DOI: 10.1080/14636778.2019.1637720
4. Muthusamy, V., A. Venkatesan, A. Radhakrishnan, and G. Kuppaswamy, *Personalized medicine: A review on scope and its pitfall*. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 2020. **13**(01).DOI: 10.31838/ijpr/2021.13.01.141
5. Schleidgen, S., C. Klingler, T. Bertram, W.H. Rogowski, and G. Marckmann, *What is personalized medicine: Sharpening a vague term based on a systematic literature review*. BMC Med Ethics, 2013. **14**: p. 55.DOI: 10.1186/1472-6939-14-55
6. Sheikhy, A., A. Fallahzadeh, H.R. Aghaei Meybodi, et al., *Personalized medicine in cardiovascular disease: Review of literature*. Journal of Diabetes & Metabolic Disorders, 2021. **20**(2): p. 1793-1805.DOI: 10.1007/s40200-021-00840-0
7. Williamson, R., W. Anderson, S. Duckett, et al., *The future of precision medicine in australia. Report for the Australian Council of Learned Academies*, 2018.
8. Hunter, D.J., *Uncertainty in the era of precision medicine*. N Engl J Med, 2016. **375**(8): p. 711-3.DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1608282
9. Marson, F.A.L., C.S. Bertuzzo, and J.D. Ribeiro, *Personalized or precision medicine? The example of cystic fibrosis*. Front Pharmacol, 2017. **8**: p. 390.DOI: 10.3389/fphar.2017.00390
10. Elemento, O., *The future of precision medicine: Towards a more predictive personalized medicine*. Emerg Top Life Sci, 2020. **4**(2): p. 175-177.DOI: 10.1042/ETLS20190197
11. Ho, D., S.R. Quake, E.R.B. McCabe, et al., *Enabling technologies for personalized and precision medicine*. Trends Biotechnol, 2020. **38**(5): p. 497-518.DOI: 10.1016/j.tibtech.2019.12.021
12. Ong, S., J. Ling, A. Ballantyne, T. Lysaght, and V. Xafis, *Perceptions of 'precision' and 'personalised' medicine in Singapore and associated ethical issues*. Asian Bioeth Rev, 2021. **13**(2): p. 179-194.DOI: 10.1007/s41649-021-00165-3
13. U.S. National Library of Medicine. *Precision medicine. Mesh descriptor data 2021*. MeSH Descriptor Data 2021 2021 [cited 2021 11/22/2021]; Available from: <https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/record/ui?ui=D057285>.
14. Council of the European Union, *Personalised medicine for patients – council conclusions (7 december 2015)*. Document number 15054/15, 2015.
15. European Commission. *Personalised medicine*. 2020 30/11/2021]; Available from: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/research-area/health-research-and-innovation/personalised-medicine\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/research-area/health-research-and-innovation/personalised-medicine_en).



16. Fournier, V., T. Prebet, A. Dormal, et al., *Definition of personalized medicine and targeted therapies: Does medical familiarity matter?* J Pers Med, 2021. **11**(1).DOI: 10.3390/jpm11010026
17. AMS. *Stratified, personalised or p4 medicine: A new direction for placing the patient at the centre of healthcare and health education. Summary of a joint forum meeting held on 12 may 2015.* . 2015.
18. NIH, *The precision medicine initiative cohort programme – building a research foundation for 21st century medicine*, 2015.
19. Health Informatics Society of Australia HISA, *What are precision medicine and personalized medicine?*, 2018.
20. The Australian National University. *Our health in our hands*. 2021 [09/01/2021]; Available from: <https://www.anu.edu.au/research/research-initiatives/our-health-in-our-hands>.
21. Desborough, J., C. Brunoro, A. Parkinson, et al., '*It struck at the heart of who i thought i was*': A meta-synthesis of the qualitative literature examining the experiences of people with multiple sclerosis. Health Expect, 2020. **23**(5): p. 1007-1027.DOI: 10.1111/hex.13093
22. Brew-Sam, N., M. Chhabra, A. Parkinson, et al., *Experiences of young people and their caregivers of using technology to manage type 1 diabetes mellitus: Systematic literature review and narrative synthesis*. JMIR Diabetes, 2021. **6**(1): p. e20973.DOI: 10.2196/20973
23. Henschke, A., J. Desborough, A. Parkinson, et al., *Personalizing medicine and technologies to address the experiences and needs of people with multiple sclerosis*. J Pers Med, 2021. **11**(8).DOI: 10.3390/jpm11080791
24. Rodgers, B.L., *Concept analysis. An evolutionary view*, in *Concept development in nursing: Foundations, techniques and applications*, B.L. Rodgers and K.A. Knaf, Editors. 2000, Saunders: Philadelphia, PA. p. 77-102
25. Shamseer, L., D. Moher, M. Clarke, et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (prisma-p) 2015: Elaboration and explanation*. BMJ, 2015. **349**: p. g7647.DOI: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
26. Moher, D., A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, and P. Group, *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The prisma statement*. BMJ, 2009. **339**: p. b2535.DOI: 10.1136/bmj.b2535
27. Toftagen, R. and L.M. Fagerstrom, *Rodgers' evolutionary concept analysis--a valid method for developing knowledge in nursing science*. Scand J Caring Sci, 2010. **24 Suppl 1**: p. 21-31.DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6712.2010.00845.x
28. Walker, L.O. and K.C. Avant, *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*. 6th ed. 2019, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall
29. Wilson, J., *Thinking with concept*. 1963, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
30. Hudon, C., D. St-Cyr Tribble, G. Bravo, and M.E. Poitras, *Enablement in health care context: A concept analysis*. J Eval Clin Pract, 2011. **17**(1): p. 143-9.DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01413.x

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 31. Viana, J.N., S. Edney, S. Gondalia, et al., *Trends and gaps in precision health research: A*
- 5 *scoping review*. BMJ Open, 2021. **11**(10): p. e056938.DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-
- 6 056938
- 7 32. Pueyo-Garrigues, M., D. Whitehead, M.I. Pardavila-Belio, et al., *Health education: A*
- 8 *rogerian concept analysis*. Int J Nurs Stud, 2019. **94**: p. 131-138.DOI:
- 9 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.03.005
- 10 33. Ali-Khan, S., S. Kowal, W. Luth, R. Gold, and T. Bubela, *Terminology for personalized*
- 11 *medicine: A systematic collection*, PACEOMICS, Editor 2016, McGill University and
- 12 University of Alberta.
- 13 34. Schwartz-Barcott, D. and H.-S. Kim, *An expansion and elaboration of the hybrid model of*
- 14 *concept development.*, in *Concept development in nursing: Foundation, techniques, and*
- 15 *applications*, B.-L. Rodgers and K.-A. Knafl, Editors. 2000, Saunders: Philadelphia. p. 129-
- 16 159
- 17 35. Hong, Q.N., P. Pluye, S. Fabregues, et al., *Mixed methods appraisal tool (mmat) version*
- 18 *2018 - user guide*, 2018.
- 19 36. Miles, M.B. and M.A. Huberman, *Qualitative data analysis*. 2003, London: Sage
- 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



## PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>			
Title:			
Identification	1a	✓ Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Title of manuscript, p.1
Update	1b	x If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	x If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	N/A
Authors:			
Contact	3a	✓ Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Title page, p.1
Contributions	3b	✓ Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	Author contributions, p.14
Amendments	4	✓ If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Methods - protocol development, p.7
Support:			
Sources	5a	✓ Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Funding statement, p.14
Sponsor	5b	✓ Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	✓ Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	6	✓ Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Introduction/objective, p.3-6
Objectives	7	✓ Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	Research questions, p.6
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	8	✓ Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	Methods, p.8-12
Information sources	9	✓ Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	Methods, p.8-12
Search strategy	10	✓ Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	Methods, p.8-12
Study records:			
Data management	11a	✓ Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	Methods, p.8-12

1				
2				
3				
4	Selection process	11b	✓ State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	Methods, p.8-12
5				
6	Data collection process	11c	✓ Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Methods, p.8-12
7				
8	Data items	12	✓ List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Methods, p.8-12
9				
10	Outcomes and prioritization	13	✗ List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	N/A
11				
12	Risk of bias in individual studies	14	✓ Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	Methods, p.12
13				
14	Data synthesis	15a	✗ Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	N/A
15		15b	✗ If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as $I^2$ , Kendall's $\tau$ )	N/A
16		15c	✗ Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	
17		15d	✓ If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	Methods, p.12
18				
19	Meta-bias(es)	16	✗ Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	
20				
21	Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	✗ Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	N/A
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				

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.