

face. The interviews were also recorded by a voice recorder with the interviewee's permission and then transcribed verbatim. The experts conducted the interviews in a convenient place, and notes were taken during the interviews. The duration of each interview varied from 30 to 90 minutes.

To facilitate data collection during the interviews, some guiding questions were employed. The sample interview guiding questions are as follows:

1. What are the factors influencing the implementation of prenatal screening PtDAs?
2. What individuals and organizations are involved in implementing prenatal screening PtDAs?
3. How can we extend the use of prenatal screening PtDAs?
4. What are the inhibitors and facilitators in implementing prenatal screening PtDAs?
5. When would you use this decision aid in your practice?
6. How would you use this decision aid?

Data analysis and reporting

Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research were used to report results in this research. COREQ is a 32-item checklist for presenting details about the research team, study method and context, results, analysis, and interpretations. (8) One of the authors (RZ) conducted 24 interviews transcribed verbatim, imported into MAXQDA 10, and coded. Data analysis was performed via conventional content analysis provided by Graneheim and Lundman (9) and simultaneously with data collection. The analysis steps were as follows: the texts of the interviews were read several times to gain an in-depth understanding. After that, the data were organized in Semantic units, and the initial codes were extracted according to the study's objectives. Next, the initial codes were classified as sub-categories and categories through continuous comparison of the data. Finally, the relationships were discovered by comparing the categories and sub-categories,

and categories were linked to each other by themes.

Rigor

Four criteria proposed by Guba and Lincoln (10) were taken into account to enhance the accuracy and validity of the data. These criteria include credibility, confirmability, dependability, and transferability. The credibility of the research was enhanced by collecting credible information, having sufficient interaction with the participants, and confirming the information obtained from the interviews. A summary of the interviewer's interpretation of the interviewee's statements was provided to the participant after conducting each interview to avoid any misunderstanding (Member checking). We repeatedly reviewed the data, and we did our best to enhance conformability by seeking the approval of faculty members and experts and considering their views and opinions. To improve dependability, the codes were reviewed and modified through external checks. Furthermore, to enhance the transferability of the study, a detailed description of the research process was provided so that the study could be evaluated and applied to other fields.

Ethical consideration

The Ethics Committee approved this study of the Iran University of Medical Sciences (IR.IUMS.REC NO. 1397-1200). Informed consent was obtained before the onset of the interviews, and the participants were reminded of their freedom to withdraw from the interview during recording.

Results

A total of 24 experts, including seven obstetricians, four information scientists, five managers or policymakers, and eight midwives, were interviewed. Most interviewees (37.5%) were aged 46-50 years. Moreover, 75% had a Ph.D. or were medical specialists. Table 1 presents the attributes of the research sample.

help pregnant women make better prenatal screening decisions through PtDA.

Application findings and recommendation

The current study's findings are applicable to policymakers, hospital managers, and those who want to implement prenatal screening PtDA. Moreover, obstetricians and midwives can use these findings for the better implementation of PtDA. Also, information scientists can play their role by considering requirements like health literacy promotion and social marketing to successfully implement PtDA.

Acknowledgments

This study was part of a Ph.D. dissertation supported by the Iran University of Medical Sciences (Grant No: IUMS/SHMIS_97-4-37-14292).

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

1. National Expert Advisory Group on Safety and Quality in Australian Health Care. Implementing Safety and Quality Enhancement in Health Care: National Actions to Support Quality and Safety Improvement in Australian Health Care. Department of Health and Aged Care; 1999.
2. Adel A, Khodayari Zarnagh R, Darzi Ramandi S. Evaluating Clinical Governance in Patient and Society Participation. *Journal of Health Picture*. 2012 [Persian].
3. Höglund AT, Winblad U, Arnetz B, Arnetz JE. Patient participation during hospitalization for myocardial infarction: perceptions among patients and personnel. *Scandinavian journal of caring sciences*. 2010 Sep;24(3):482-9.
4. Alden DL, Friend J, Schapira M, Stiggelbout A. Cultural targeting and tailoring of shared decision making technology: a theoretical framework for improving the effectiveness of patient decision aids in culturally diverse groups. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2014 Mar 1;105:1-8.
5. Moca, D S. Should patient decision aids (PtDAs) be introduced in the health care system? Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe (Health Evidence Network). 2005.
6. Identify barriers and explore ways to overcome them. Available at: <https://decisionaid.ohri.ca/strategies.html>. Accessed April 7, 2021.
7. Zahedi R, Nemati-Anaraki L, Sedghi Sh, Shariat M. Factors Influencing Pregnant Women's Use of Patient Decision Aids and Decision Making on Prenatal Screening: A Qualitative Study. *J Fam Reprod Health* 2020; 14(4): 231-8.
8. Allison T, Peter S, Jonathan C, Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007 Des; 19(6):349-57.
9. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*. 2004; 24(2): 105-12.
10. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches: Jossey-Bass; 1981.
11. Joseph-Williams N, Abhyankar P, Boland L, Bravo P, Brenner AT, Brodney S, et al. What Works in Implementing Patient Decision Aids in Routine Clinical Settings? A Rapid Realist Review and Update from the International Patient Decision Aid Standards Collaboration. *Med Decis Making*. 2020 Dec 15:272989X20978208. doi: 10.1177/0272989X20978208. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33319621.0
12. Lin GA, Halley M, Rendle KAS, Tietbohl C, May SG, Trujillo L, et al. An effort to spread decision aids in five California primary care practices yielded low distribution, highlighting hurdles. *Health Aff*. 2013; 32(2): 311-20.
13. Munro S, Manski R, Donnelly K, Agusti D, Stevens G, Banach M, et al. Investigation of factors influencing the implementation of two shared decision making interventions in contraceptive care: a qualitative interview study among clinical and administrative staff. *Implement Sci*. 2019;14:95.
14. Berry DL, Hong F, Halpenny B, Sanda MG, Master VA, Filson ChP, et al. Evaluating clinical implementation approaches for prostate

cancer decision support. *Urol Pract.* 2019; 6(2): 93-9.

15. Dahl Steffensen K, Vinter M, Cruger D, Dankl K, Coulter A, Stuart B, et al. Lessons in integrating shared decision making into cancer care. *J Oncol Pract.* 2018;14(4): 229–35.

16. Stacey D, Taljaard M, Breau RH, Baba N, Blackmore T, Boland L, et al. A patient decision aid for men with localized prostate cancer. *Cancer Nurs.* 2018;1:E10-21.

17. MacDonald-Wilson KL. A successful implementation strategy to support adoption of decision making in mental health services. *Community Ment Health.* 2017; 53: 251–6.

18. Joseph-Williams N, Lloyd A, Edwards A, Stobbart L, Tomson D, Macphail Sh, et al. Implementing shared decision making in the NHS: lessons from the MAGIC programme. *BMJ.* 2017; 357: j1744.

19. Koon S. Important Considerations for Design and Implementation of Decision Aids for Shared Medical Decision Making. *Perm J.* 2020;24:19.064. doi: 10.7812/TPP/19.064.

20. Syrowatka A, Krömker D, Meguerditchian AN, Tamblyn R. Features of computer-based decision aids: Systematic review, thematic synthesis, and meta-analyses. *J Med Internet Res.* 2016 Jan 26; 18(1): e20. doi: 10.2196/jmir.4982.

21. Shorten A, Shorten B, Fagerlin A, Illuzzi J, Kennedy HP, Pettker C, Raju D, Whittemore R. A Study to Assess the Feasibility of Implementing a Web-Based Decision Aid for Birth after Cesarean to Increase Opportunities for Shared Decision Making in Ethnically Diverse Settings. *J Midwifery Womens Health.* 2019 Jan;64(1):78-87. doi: 10.1111/jmwh.12908.

22. Abbasgholizadeh Rahimi S, Lépine J, Croteau J, Robitaille H, Giguere AM, Wilson BJ, Rousseau F, Lévesque I, Légaré F. Psychosocial Factors of Health Professionals' Intention to Use a Decision Aid for Down Syndrome Screening: Cross-Sectional Quantitative Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2018 Apr; 20 (4):e114. doi: 10.2196/jmir.9036.

23. Stevens G, Thompson R, Watson B, Miller YD. Patient decision aids in routine maternity care: Benefits, barriers, and new opportunities. *Women Birth.* 2016 Feb; 29(1):30-4. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2015.08.002.

24. Lépine J, Leiva Portocarrero M, Delanoë A, Robitaille H, Lévesque I, Rousseau F, et al. What factors influence health

professionals to use decision aids for Down syndrome prenatal screening? *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2016; 16: 262.

25. Savelberg W, Boersma LJ, Smidt M, Goossens MFJ, Hermanns R, van der Weijden T. Does lack of deeper understanding of shared decision making explain the suboptimal performance on crucial parts of it? An example from breast cancer care. *Eur J Oncol Nurs.* 2019; 38:92-7.

26. Mangla M, Cha TD, Dorrwachter JM, Freiberg AA, Leavitt LJ, Rubash HE, et al. Increasing the use of patient decision AIDs in orthopaedic care: results of a quality improvement project. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2018;27(5): 347–54.

27. Yu, C.H., Ke, C., Jovicic, A., Hall, S., Straus, S.E., Cantarutti, p., et al. Beyond pros and cons—developing a patient decision aid to cultivate dialog to build relationships: Insights from a qualitative study and decision aid development. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2019; 19(1): 186. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-019-0898-5>

28. Portocarrero ME, Giguere AM, Lépine J, Garvelink MM, Robitaille H, Delanoë A, et al. Use of a patient decision aid for prenatal screening for Down syndrome: what do pregnant women say? *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2017; 17(1): 1-9.

29. Jones J, Nowels C, Kutner JS, Matlock DD. Shared decision making and the use of a patient decision aid in advanced serious illness: provider and patient perspectives. *Health Expect.* 2015 Dec;18(6):3236-47. doi: 10.1111/hex.12313.

30. Belkora JK, Teng A, Volz S, Loth MK, Esserman LJ. Expanding the reach of decision and communication aids in a breast care center: a quality improvement study. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2011 May;83(2):234-9. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2010.07.003.

31. Wilson BG. Reflections on constructivism and instructional design. *Instructional development paradigms.* Edited by: Dills CR, Romiszowski AJ. 1997, Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 63-80.

32. Pieterse AH, de Vries M, Kunneman M, Stiggelbout AM, Feldman-Stewart D. Theory-informed design of values clarification methods: A cognitive psychological perspective on patient health-related decision making. *Soc Sci Med.* 2013;77:156-63.