Effective Health Care
Regulation/Approval Process for Psychological Tests Nomination Summary Document

Results of Topic Selection Process & Next Steps

- Regulation/approval process for psychological tests does not fit within the domain of the Effective Health Care (EHC) Program because regulatory processes are not within the scope of this program. No further activity will be undertaken on this topic.

Topic Description

Nominator: Individual

Nomination Summary: The nominator is interested in how safe and effective various psychological tests are. More specifically, the nominator asks if we should be requiring informed consent before such tests are administered and if something similar to a patient package insert (PPI-as used with pharmaceuticals) would be beneficial to patients receiving psychological testing. The nominator seems to be interested in a regulation and/or approval process for psychological tests similar to the rigors of the drug approval process. The nominator mentions traumatic brain injury patients as a set of potential subjects.

Key Questions from Nominator:

1. How much harm comes from early testing?
2. Does testing cause anxiety, improve outcomes, or have a negative contribution?
3. If we treat a traumatic brain injury patient as disabled from the beginning, does that increase the chance of the patient filing for a disability?
4. Do these tests contribute to malingering?
5. Does the present lack of regulation increase the chance of a test being ineffective?

Considerations

- The topic does not meet EHC Program appropriateness criteria. (For more information, see http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/submit-a-suggestion-for-research/how-are-research-topics-chosen/.)

- It appears the nominator is most interested in whether psychological tests should have a regulation and/or approval process similar to the rigors of the drug approval process carried out by the US Food and Drug Administration. This question does not fall within the domain of the EHC Program.