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Review question(s)
What is known from quantitative research methods about preferences relevant for medication choices, from adult patients with a mental disorder?

Searches

Types of study to be included
Studies using quantitative patient preference methods will be included. These are usually classified as ranking, rating or choice-based methods. Studies using qualitative methodology only will be excluded.

Condition or domain being studied
Mental disorders

Participants/ population
Adult patients with direct experience of mental disorder, currently diagnosed with the disease or at risk for the relevant disease. Children/adolescents are excluded.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)
We will review the outcomes of studies applying quantitative patient preference methodologies to elicit patient preferences relevant in decisions involving pharmacotherapeutic interventions. Studies in which the scope is not mental disorder are excluded.

Comparator(s)/ control
There are no comparator(s)/control.

Context
No restrictions regarding study setting.

Outcome(s)
Primary outcomes
The outcomes are quantitative measures of patient preferences in psychopharmacological treatments.

**Secondary outcomes**
None

**Data extraction, (selection and coding)**
Two researchers (OE and KN) will independently evaluate all the identified titles and abstracts for inclusion. If both researchers agree, articles will be included or eliminated accordingly. In cases of disagreement, the full article will be retrieved and discussed until consensus is achieved. All the remaining included abstracts will move to full text review by the same two researchers. In cases of discrepancy the researchers will discuss the article and try to reach consensus, If not, a third reviewer will be consulted.

We will develop and pilot a data extraction form on a few randomly selected studies from the inclusion list. A manual recording of the potential amendments and or/corrections to the data extraction form will be kept for future reference.

Items in the data extraction form will include:
- General information about the publication; study characteristics (objective, study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, recruitment procedures); participant characteristics (number, age, gender, disease); intervention and setting (clinical setting, treatment options or attributes, decision problem, timing, preference elicitation method); outcome data and results.

**Risk of bias (quality) assessment**
There is no gold standard method for quality assessment and evaluation of risk of bias in patient preference elicitation studies. We will consider risk of bias by using well-known elements for quality assessment and evaluate factors such as: appropriateness of study design; validity; reliability; internal consistency; outcome reporting bias; acceptability and generalisability.

**Strategy for data synthesis**
Due to the variability of the outcome measures and heterogeneity of included studies found in comparable patient preference systematic reviews, we do not plan to conduct a meta-analysis, but we will summarise the results in narrative and tabular form.

**Analysis of subgroups or subsets**
We will summarise the research on preferences for the individual disorders if the data permits.

**Dissemination plans**
The results of the review will be prepared for publication in an international peer-reviewed journal and the results will also be presented at national and international conferences.
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Stage of review at time of this submission
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary searches</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting of the study selection process</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data extraction</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of bias (quality) assessment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>