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Abstract

Study Objectives

1. To determine the actual time required by patients, physicians and nurses to complete the LCSS-QL on their computer and handheld electronic devices.

Methods

Background: The LCSS has been compared to the Lung Cancer Symptom Scale (LCSS) for time to completion between the paper and electronic forms using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC).

The objective of this paper is to report the results of a study designed to evaluate the feasibility of the computerized version of the LCSS-QL, to determine the acceptability of the computerized version of the LCSS-QL by patients, nurses, and physicians, and to compare the scores on the computerized version of the LCSS-QL to the scores obtained from the paper version of the LCSS-QL.

The study was conducted in two steps.

1. The computerized version of the LCSS-QL was compared to the paper version of the LCSS-QL.

2. The computerized version of the LCSS-QL was compared to the paper version of the LCSS-QL on their computer and handheld electronic devices.

Results: The computerized version of the LCSS-QL was considered easy to use by patients, nurses, and physicians. The computerized version of the LCSS-QL was considered easy to use by patients, nurses, and physicians.

Conclusion: The computerized version of the LCSS-QL was considered easy to use by patients, nurses, and physicians.
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