

## **METHODOLOGY SUPPLEMENT**

**TITLE: 2016 Updated American Society of Clinical Oncology/Oncology Nursing Society  
Chemotherapy Administration Safety Standards Including Standards for Pediatric  
Oncology**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1. OVERVIEW**
  - Expert Panel Composition
  - Standards Development Process
  - Systematic Literature Review
  - Literature Search Strategy
  - Data Extraction
  
- 2. DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS**
  - Study Quality Assessment
  - Public Comment

## 1. OVERVIEW

### ***Working Group Composition***

A Working Group was convened with multidisciplinary representation in medical oncology, oncology nursing, and pediatric hematology and oncology. The Working Group was led by two Co-Chairs who had primary responsibility for the development and timely completion of the standards. The Working Group members are listed in Appendix Table A1 (online only), denoted by an \*.

### ***Standards Development Process***

The Working Group held an in-person meeting, had webinars on several occasions and corresponded frequently through e-mail; progress on standards development was driven primarily by the Co-Chairs along with ASCO and ONS staff. The purpose of the meetings was for members to contribute content, provide critical review, interpret evidence, and finalize the standards based upon the consideration of the evidence.\* All members of the Expert Panel participated in the preparation of the draft guideline document, which was then disseminated for external review and submitted to the *Journal of Oncology Practice (JOP)* for peer review and consideration for publication. These standards were reviewed and approved by the ASCO and ONS Boards of Directors prior to publication.

### ***Systematic Literature Review***

The ASCO-ONS standards are based on a systematic review of the literature. A protocol for each systematic review defines parameters for a targeted literature search. Additional parameters include relevant study designs, literature sources, types of reports, and pre-specified inclusion and exclusion criteria for literature are identified.

### ***Literature Search Strategy***

PubMed was searched for evidence reporting on outcomes of interest. Further details on the search strategy and results are provided in Data Supplements 1 and 2.

### ***Data Extraction***

Literature search results were reviewed and deemed appropriate for full text review by the working group. The working group reviewed the full texts prior to the in-person working group meeting.

## **2. DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS**

### ***Study Quality Assessment***

Study quality was formally assessed for the studies identified. Design aspects related to the individual study quality were assessed by one reviewer and included factors such as blinding, allocation concealment, placebo control, intention to treat, funding sources, etc. The risk of bias is assessed as “low,” “intermediate,” or “high” for most of the identified evidence.

### ***Public Comment***

Public comments were obtained using the Zarca Web-based survey tool (Zarca Interactive, Herndon, VA) from December 1, 2015 until January 19, 2016. Comments were solicited from relevant stakeholders. 31 comments were received through the survey tool. The comments were reviewed by the Working Group and used to edit, revise, and clarify the Standards.