



Topic Exploration Report

This report summarises the existing evidence on the technology of interest in this Bevan exemplar application.

Topic:	VIVID™ : Video-supported consent for a Visually-aided Informed Decision
Topic exploration report number:	TER134

Aim of Search

Cedar researchers, on behalf of Health Technology Wales, searched for evidence on the use of multi-language animations or videos to support informed consent from patients undergoing image-guided interventions.

Summary of Findings

No existing guidance, Cochrane reviews or ongoing trials have been identified on the use of multi-language animations or videos to support informed consent from patients undergoing image-guided interventions. Six relevant primary studies were identified four which are randomised controlled trials of image-guided interventions (cystoscopy, angiography or arthroscopy).

All studies reported a significant increase in understanding of information by participants following video-supported intervention when compared to standard delivery of information (via verbal means). Conflicting results exist in regards to patients' satisfaction, anxiety and distress levels following the video-supported intervention.

Key Sources of Evidence

Lattuca B, Barber-Chamoux N, Alos B, et al. (2018). Impact of video on the understanding and satisfaction of patients receiving informed consent before elective inpatient coronary angiography: a randomized trial. *American heart journal*. 200: 67-74.

Mednick Z, Irrcher I, Hopman WM, et al. (2016). Assessing a narrated white board animation as part of the consent process for intravenous fluorescein angiography: a randomized educational study. *Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology*. 51(6): 471-5.

Rossi MJ, Guttman D, MacLennan MJ, et al. (2005). Video informed consent improves knee arthroscopy patient comprehension. *Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery*. 21(6): 739-43. Winter M, Kam J, Nalavenkata S, et al. (2016). The use of portable video media vs standard verbal communication in the urological consent process: a multicentre, randomised controlled, crossover trial. *BJU international*. 118(5): 823-8.

Areas of Uncertainty

Currently, a limited amount of evidence is available with half of the studies published in the last three years. Only one study included a cohort of more than 100 participants (Lattuca et al. 2018). Moreover, the content of the animations or videos varies greatly between studies. Currently, there is no information on what should be included within the intervention. Limited or conflicting evidence exist for patients' satisfaction, anxiety and distress levels following the use of intervention.

Brief literature search results

Resource	Results
UK guidelines and guidance	
Healthcare Improvement Scotland	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
NICE	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
Guidelines International Network	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
Secondary literature and economic evaluations	
ECRI	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
Cochrane library	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
Medline	We did not identify any relevant information from this source.
Primary studies	
Medline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lattuca B, Barber-Chamoux N, Alos B, et al. (2018). Impact of video on the understanding and satisfaction of patients receiving informed consent before elective inpatient coronary angiography: a randomized trial. <i>American heart journal</i>. 200: 67-74. Mednick Z, Irrcher I, Hopman WM, et al. (2016). Assessing a narrated white board animation as part of the consent process for intravenous fluorescein angiography: a randomized educational study. <i>Canadian Journal of Ophthalmology</i>. 51(6): 471-5. Rossi MJ, Guttman D, MacLennan MJ, et al. (2005). Video informed consent improves knee arthroscopy patient comprehension. <i>Arthroscopy: The Journal of Arthroscopic & Related Surgery</i>. 21(6): 739-43. Winter M, Kam J, Nalavenkata S, et al. (2016). The use of portable video media vs standard verbal communication in the urological consent process: a multicentre, randomised controlled, crossover trial. <i>BJU international</i>. 118(5): 823-8. Sahai A, Kucheria R, Challacombe B, et al. (2006). Video consent: a pilot study of informed consent in laparoscopic urology and its impact on patient satisfaction. <i>JSLs: Journal of the Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons</i>. 10(1): 21.
Cochrane library	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philippe F, Meney M, Larrazet F, et al. (2006). Effects of video information in patients undergoing coronary angiography. <i>Archives des Maladies du Coeur et des Vaisseaux</i>. 99(2): 95-101
Ongoing secondary research	
Clinicaltrials.gov	We did not identify any ongoing clinical trial.
Date of search:	02 August 2019
Concepts used:	informed consent, video recording, animation