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***Search Strategy***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Database | Platform | Inception | Date of access | Number of results obtained |
| Medline | OvidSP | 1946 | april 2016 | 82 |
| Embase | Elsevier | 1974 | april 2016 | 48 |
| Cinahl | EbscoHOST | 1940 | april 2016 | 33 |
| Science Citation Index Expanded | WOS | 2000 | april 2016 | 38 |
| Cochrane Library | Wiley | 1993 | april 2016 | 84 |
| PsycINFO | EbscoHOST | 1967 | april 2016 | 13 |
| Scopus | Elsevier | 2004 | april 2016 | 45 |
| JSTOR | JSTOR | 1995 | april 2016 | 16 |
| TOTAL (without duplicates) | | | | 211 |

Medline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | \*Consumer Participation/ | 8199 |
| 2 | \*Patient Participation/ | 10651 |
| 3 | ((Patient or Consumer or caregiver or client or community or service-user or user or citizen) adj1 (Involvement or Participation or engagement)).tw. | 9797 |
| 4 | 1 or 2 or 3 | 25998 |
| 5 | \*Technology Assessment, Biomedical/ | 4938 |
| 6 | (HTA).tw. | 1872 |
| 7 | (Health Technology adj1 (Assessment or funding or appraisal)).tw | 2767 |
| 8 | 5 or 6 or 7 | 7669 |
| 9 | 4 and 8 | 87 |
| 10 | limit 9 to (english or french or spanish) | 84 |
| 11 | remove duplicates from 10 | 82 |

Embase

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #9 | #3 AND #7 AND ([english]/lim OR [french]/lim OR [spanish]/lim) AND [embase]/lim | 48 |
| #8 | #3 AND #7 | 76 |
| #7 | #4 OR #5 OR #6 | 8761 |
| #6 | ('health technology' NEAR/1 (assessment OR funding OR appraisal)):ab,ti | 3316 |
| #5 | hta:ab,ti | 3620 |
| #4 | 'biomedical technology assessment'/mj | 3854 |
| #3 | #1 OR #2 | 30323 |
| #2 | ((patient OR consumer OR caregiver OR client OR community OR 'service user' OR user OR citizen) NEAR/1 (involvement OR participation ORengagement)):ab,ti | 11928 |
| #1 | 'consumer'/mj OR 'patient participation'/mj | 20183 |

Cinahl

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S7 | S3 AND S6 Limitadores - Idioma: English, French, Spanish | (33) |
| S6 | S4 OR S5 | (1,425) |
| S5 | TI ( (('health technology' N1 (assessment OR funding OR appraisal)) ) OR AB ( (('health technology' N1 (assessment OR funding OR appraisal)) ) | (1,247) |
| S4 | TI ( ('biomedical technology assessment' OR hta) ) OR AB ( ('biomedical technology assessment' OR hta) ) | (465) |
| S3 | Or/ S1-S2 | (14,031) |
| S2 | TI ( ((Patient or Consumer or caregiver or client or community or service-user or user or citizen) N1 (Involvement or Participation or engagement)) ) OR AB ( ((Patient or Consumer or caregiver or client or community or service-user or user or citizen) N1 (Involvement or Participation or engagement)) ) | (7,641) |
| S1 | (MM "Consumer Participation") | (7,788) |

Science Citation Index Expanded

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #3 | (#2 AND #1) *AND*Idioma: (English OR French OR Spanish) | 38 |
| #2 | ('biomedical technology assessment') *OR* Title: (hta OR health technology assessment OR health technology funding OR health technology appraisal) | 2.052 |
| #1 | ('Consumer Participation' or 'Patient Participation') OR Title: (patient participation OR consumer participation OR caregiver participation OR client participation OR community participation OR service user participation OR user participation OR citizen participation OR patient involvement OR consumer involvement OR caregiver involvement OR client involvement OR community involvement OR service user involvement OR user involvement OR citizen involvement OR patient engagement OR consumer engagement OR caregive engagement OR client engagement OR community engagement OR service user engagement OR user engagement OR citizen engagement) | 36.636 |

COCHRANE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #1 | MeSH descriptor: [Consumer Participation] this term only | 243 |
| #2 | MeSH descriptor: [Patient Participation] this term only | 1010 |
| #3 | ('Consumer Participation' or 'Patient Participation' or patient participation or consumer participation or caregiver participation or client participation or community participation or service user participation or user participation or citizen participation or patient involvement or consumer involvement or caregiver involvement or client involvement or community involvement or service user involvement or user involvement or citizen involvement or patient engagement or consumer engagement or caregive engagement or client engagement or community engagement or service user engagement or user engagement or citizen engagement):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) | 12794 |
| #4 | #1 or #2 or #3 | 12794 |
| #5 | MeSH descriptor: [Technology Assessment, Biomedical] this term only | 607 |
| #6 | ('health technology' near/1 (assessment or funding or appraisal)):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) | 1167 |
| #7 | 'biomedical technology assessment' or hta:ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched) | 1184 |
| #8 | #5 or #6 or #7 | 1785 |
| #9 | #4 and #8 | 84 |

PsycINFO

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S7 | S3 AND S6 **Limitadores** - Idioma: English, French, Spanish | (13) |
| S6 | S4 OR S5 | (458) |
| S5 | TI ( (('health technology' N1 (assessment OR funding OR appraisal)) ) OR AB ( (('health technology' N1 (assessment OR funding OR appraisal)) ) | (300) |
| S4 | TI ( ('biomedical technology assessment' OR hta) ) OR AB ( ('biomedical technology assessment' OR hta) ) | (257) |
| S3 | S1 OR S2 | (11,725) |
| S2 | TI ( ((Patient or Consumer or caregiver or client or community or service-user or user or citizen) N1 (Involvement or Participation or engagement)) ) OR AB ( ((Patient or Consumer or caregiver or client or community or service-user or user or citizen) N1 (Involvement or Participation or engagement)) ) | (11,020) |
| S1 | MM "Client Participation" | (1,245) |

Scopus

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| #1 | TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "Patient Participation" AND "Health Technology Assessment" ) AND SUBJAREA ( mult OR medi OR nurs OR vete OR dent OR heal ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( DOCTYPE , "ar" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( DOCTYPE , "re" ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( LANGUAGE , "English" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( LANGUAGE , "Spanish" ) OR LIMIT-TO ( LANGUAGE , "French" ) ) | 45 |

JSTOR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | (( "Patient Participation" AND "Health Technology Assessment" )) | 16 |
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**Difficulty of participation activities of patients, caregivers and users**

*Question 4: The tasks that patients, caregivers and users could perform to participate in the different phases of HTA are listed in detail below. The most important activities of each phase are presented in sequential order. We hope that you can assess the possibility and degree of difficulty that participation in each of these activities would have for your organization.*

*Please rate the difficulty of participation in each of these activities, taking into account the following criteria:*

* *Low difficulty: we could do it in our organization autonomously with the available resources.*
* *Medium difficulty: we could do it with some extra technical support.*
* *High difficulty: it is difficult to find the time and resources to do this.*