

# 1 **Raising the bar for patient experience during care transitions in** 2 **Canada:**

## 3 **A repeated cross-sectional survey evaluating a patient-oriented** 4 **discharge summary at Ontario hospitals**

5 Short title: Evaluating impact of a patient-oriented discharge summary on  
6 patient experience in Ontario

7 Karen Okrainec<sup>1,3,4\*</sup>¶, Audrey Chaput<sup>7</sup>¶, Valeria E. Rac<sup>2,4</sup>¶, George Tomlinson<sup>4,5</sup>¶, John Matelski<sup>5</sup>¶,  
8 Mark Robson<sup>6</sup>¶, Amy Troup<sup>1,7</sup>¶, Murray Krahn<sup>1,3</sup>¶, Shoshana Hahn-Goldberg<sup>7,8</sup>¶

9 <sup>1</sup>Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

10  
11 <sup>2</sup>Program for Health System and Technology Evaluation, Ted Rogers Centre for Heart Research at  
12 Peter Munk Cardiac Centre, Toronto General Research Institute

13  
14 <sup>3</sup>Department of Medicine, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

15  
16 <sup>4</sup>Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health,  
17 University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

18  
19 <sup>5</sup>Biostatistics Research Unit, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

20  
21 <sup>6</sup>Ontario Health, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

22  
23 <sup>7</sup>OpenLab, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;

24  
25 <sup>8</sup>Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

26  
27 \*Corresponding author:

28 E-mail: [karen.okrainec@uhn.ca](mailto:karen.okrainec@uhn.ca) (KO)

29 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 30 **Abstract**

31           Background: Patient experience when transitioning home from hospital is an important quality  
32 metric linked to improved patient outcomes. We evaluated the impact of a hospital-based care  
33 transition intervention, patient-oriented discharge summary (PODS), on patient experience across  
34 Ontario acute care hospitals. Methods: We used a repeated cross-sectional study design to compare  
35 yearly positive responses to four questions centered on discharge communication from the Canadian  
36 Patient Experience Survey (2016-2020) among three hospital cohorts with various levels of PODS  
37 implementation. Logistic regression using a binomial likelihood accounting for site level clustering was  
38 used to assess continuous linear time trends among cohorts and cohort differences during the post-  
39 implementation period. This research had oversight from a public advisory group of patient and  
40 caregiver partners from across the province. Results: 512,288 responses were included with mean age  
41  $69 \pm 14$  years (females) and  $61 \pm 20$  years (males). Compared to non-implementation hospitals,  
42 hospitals with full implementation (>50% discharges) reported higher odds for having discussed the  
43 help needed when leaving hospital (OR=1.18, 95% CI=1.02-1.37) and having received information in  
44 writing about what symptoms to look out for (OR=1.44, 95%=1.17-1.78) post-implementation. The  
45 linear time trend was also significant when comparing hospitals with full versus no implementation for  
46 having received information in writing about what symptoms to look out for (OR=1.05, 95% CI=1.01-  
47 1.09). Interpretation: PODS implementation was associated with higher odds of positive patient  
48 experience, particularly for discharge planning. Further efforts should center on discharge management,  
49 specifically: understanding of medications and what to do if worried once home.

## 50 **Introduction**

51           Improving patient experience following hospital admission is an important target of health  
52 systems worldwide [1-3]. Patient experience is a patient-reported experience measure that allows  
53 patients to rank various elements of the hospitalization that were important to them using standardized  
54 and validated measures that can be compared across patients, institutions, provinces, countries and  
55 drive improvements in quality of care [4]. Patient experience is often also used to complement patient-  
56 reported outcome measures to help understand rising numbers of avoidable health-care utilization, yet  
57 rarely considered when evaluating the impact of care transition interventions or new models of care [5].  
58 The Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) survey, designed  
59 in the US, is becoming increasingly recognized and used in many parts of the world [6-8] along with  
60 the three-item version of the Care Transitions Measure (CTM-3) [9]. In 2014, the Canadian Institute for  
61 Health Information created the first Canadian Patient Experience - Inpatient Care (CPES-IC) survey to  
62 capture the quality of communication, information sharing and other markers of patient experience for  
63 Canadian patients discharged from acute care hospitals [10].

64           The Patient Oriented-Discharge Summary (PODS) is a novel individualized discharge  
65 instruction tool containing five sections of information centered on changes to medications, daily  
66 activities and diet, follow-up appointments, symptoms to watch out for and resources [11]. Co-designed  
67 with patients and caregivers to improve communication, PODS has been found to increase patient-  
68 centered discharge practices by involving family caregivers in discharge conversations and by  
69 increasing the use of teach-back, two communication practices known to improve patient outcomes  
70 [12,13]. The objective of this study was to evaluate the association of PODS with patient experience  
71 among surgical and medical inpatients across Ontario hospitals.

72

## 73 **Methods**

74           Between April 2017 and March 2018, 21 hospitals in Ontario implemented PODS in an  
75 inpatient population of their choice through a funded and supported community of practice [13]. The  
76 study was reviewed by the University Health Network (UHN) research ethics board. The UHN REB  
77 waived ethics approval given the use of aggregate non patient identified data (Waiver 17-5469).  
78 Consent was not obtained as the data were analyzed anonymously.

## 79 **Intervention**

80           PODS contains five sections of written discharge instructions co-designed with patients and  
81 family caregivers to be meaningful and usable: 1) medications, 2) changes to daily activities and diet,  
82 3) follow-up appointments, 4) expected and worrisome symptoms to watch for after leaving hospital  
83 and 5) resources and contact information. PODS includes design features (large font, pictograms, note-  
84 taking section) known to enhance retention and understanding of instructions and is accompanied by  
85 process guidelines which foster patient and caregiver engagement and teach-back when reviewing  
86 discharge instructions [12]. Prior to PODS implementation, discharge instructions in Ontario hospitals  
87 were verbal or a summary directed to the primary care provider [11].

## 88 **Setting/Patients**

89           Ontario is Canada's largest province which includes 123 acute care hospitals. The CPES-IC is a  
90 standardized and validated survey administered by email, mail or telephone in English or French to  
91 adults over 18 years discharged from an Ontario acute care hospital's medical or surgical unit in the  
92 previous 48 hours to three months [14]. Ontario hospitals who collected patient experience data among  
93 their medical or surgical inpatients during all four years of the study period, April 2016 to March 2020,  
94 were eligible for inclusion in our study.

95           We received anonymized data to the CPES-IC survey for all hospitals by pre-assigned cohorts.  
96 The first cohort included hospitals who implemented PODS among  $\geq 50\%$  of medical and surgical  
97 inpatients between April 1, 2017 and March 2018. Our second cohort included hospitals who had

98 implemented PODS among <50% of their medical or surgical inpatients in our implementation study  
99 by March 2018 or who had some known implementation outside this study. Our third cohort included  
100 all other hospitals who collected outcome data but who had no PODS implementation as of December  
101 2018. Further data on yearly mean age, mean proportion of sex represented by the CPES-IC survey for  
102 respondents along with yearly response rate for aggregate questions were obtained from the Canadian  
103 Institute for Health Information.

## 104 **Design**

105 Our study used a repeated cross-sectional design to measure outcomes at four different time  
106 points: 1) pre-implementation (April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017), 2) year 1 of implementation (April 1,  
107 2017 to March 31, 2018), 3) year 2 of implementation (April 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019) and 4) post-  
108 implementation (April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020) in all three cohorts. We used the STROBE cross-  
109 sectional checklist when writing our report [15].

## 110 **Outcomes**

111 We used individual responses to the following four questions from CPES-IC centered on  
112 discharge communication as they represented content directly addressed in the PODS intervention. To  
113 reflect discharge planning, responses to the following two questions were used: 1) During this hospital  
114 stay, did doctors, nurses or other hospital staff talk with you about whether you would have the help  
115 needed when you left hospital? Responses included no or yes; 2) During this hospital stay, did you get  
116 information in writing about what symptoms or health problems to look out for after you left hospital?  
117 Responses included no or yes. To reflect discharge management, responses to the following two  
118 questions were used: 3) Before you left the hospital, did you have a clear understanding about all your  
119 prescribed medications, including those you were taking before your hospital stay? Responses included  
120 not at all, partly, quite a bit, completely, not applicable; 4) Did you receive enough information from

121 hospital staff about what to do if you were worried about your condition or treatment after you left the  
122 hospital? Responses included not at all, partly, quite a bit, and completely.

## 123 **Statistical Analysis**

124 For each survey question, aggregate percentages of the top response and 95% confidence  
125 intervals for these estimates were computed for each cohort at each time point using Generalized  
126 Estimating Equations (GEE), which allowed us to account for site level clustering. A second GEE  
127 model treated time as a continuous predictor to evaluate linear time trends for each cohort and to assess  
128 cohort level differences in the post implementation period. We report all estimates as odds ratios, along  
129 with 95% confidence intervals and Wald test p-values. Alpha= .05 is used as the threshold for  
130 statistical significance. The models were fit using the geepack package in R version 3.6.2.

## 131 **Involvement of Patient Partners**

132 Our study involved patients and caregivers as research partners. One of our caregiver partners  
133 (AC) has been a research partner in all aspects of the study, including as principal applicant on the  
134 grant which funded this work and identifying original research questions and outcomes for this study.  
135 Subsequently, AC recruited four other patient and caregiver partners to join a provincial advisory group  
136 in June 2020. This advisory group (AC, AF, GC, TM, and JR) subsequently collaborated in this work  
137 by reviewing results and through discussion, informed the framing of our paper, including the  
138 discussion and conclusions. AC subsequently critically reviewed the final version and is a co-author on  
139 this paper.

## 140 **Results**

141 A total of 512,288 responses aggregated from 59 hospitals were analyzed. Cohort 1 included  
142 eight hospitals who implemented PODS fully, cohort 2 included 16 hospitals who implemented PODS  
143 partially and cohort 3 included 36 hospitals who had no PODS implementation. The mean age by

144 gender and year for all respondents in Ontario is listed in Table 1. Response rates across Ontario  
 145 hospitals to the Patient Experience Survey ranged between 28% and 35% (Table 2).

146 **Table 1. Mean Age of Ontario Patients in CPERS<sup>a</sup> by Gender and Fiscal Year**

Year	Age			
	Female		Male	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Pre-implementation	68	14	60	20
Year 1	68	14	60	20
Year 2	69	13	61	20
Post- implementation	69	14	61	20

147 <sup>a</sup>CPERS = Canadian Patient Experience Response Survey

148 **Table 2. Ontario CPES-IC Response Rates - Overall and Measures (Discharge Communication**  
 149 **& Planning and Discharge Management) by Fiscal Year**

Year	Number of responses	Number of Ontario hospitals <sup>a</sup>	Response Rate		
			Overall	Discharge communication & planning <sup>b</sup>	Discharge management <sup>c</sup>
2016-2017	130,721	61	35.7	33.7	34.6
2017-2018	135,900	68	36.2	33.6	35.1
2018-2019	126,832	84	34.9	32.2	33.8
2019-2020	118,835	96	30.1	27.9	29.1

150 <sup>a</sup>n = Number of Ontario hospitals that submitted data to CPERS;

151 <sup>b</sup>The measure Discharge Planning consists of CPES-IC questions 19 (help needed after leaving hospital) and 20  
 152 (information in writing about symptoms to look out for);

153 °The measure Discharge Management consists of CPES-IC questions 37 (understanding about medications) and 38 (what to  
154 do if worried after leaving hospital) along with an additional question not included in our survey, question 39 (better  
155 understanding of condition post discharge).

156 Individuals discharged from hospitals with no PODS implementation had lower pre-  
157 implementation patient experience scores for all questions when compared to individuals discharged  
158 from hospitals with PODS implementation (Fig 1). The odds of reporting a positive patient experience  
159 in the post implementation period was statistically higher for two of four questions when compared to  
160 non-implementing hospitals (Table 3). Specifically, the odds of a positive response for having  
161 discussions with hospital staff on help needed and receiving information in writing about what  
162 symptoms to look for after leaving hospital was higher among hospitals with full implementation  
163 (cohort 1) when compared to those with no implementation (cohort 3). The odds of receiving  
164 information in writing about what symptoms to look for was also higher among partially implementing  
165 hospitals (cohort 2) when compared to those with no implementation (cohort 3). However, there was a  
166 statistically significant linear time trend difference between hospitals with full implementation (cohort  
167 1) versus no implementation (cohort 3) for receiving information in writing about what symptoms to  
168 look for after leaving hospital and between hospitals with some implementation (cohort 2) versus no  
169 implementation (cohort 3) for having discussions with hospital staff on help needed (Table 3). Visual  
170 representations of the full model adjusting for time and clustering of sites with variability in the speed  
171 of each hospitals' individual response are displayed in S1 Fig.

172 **Fig 1. Percentages of positive patient experience by cohort over time, accounting for site level**  
173 **clustering, using GEE.**

174 **Table 3. Odds of a positive patient experience following discharge from acute care hospital one**  
175 **year following PODS implementation when compared to hospitals with no intervention**

	<b>Full PODS implementation</b>	<b>Partial PODS implementation</b>
--	-------------------------------------	--



<b>Question</b>	<b>Odds ratio (95% CI)</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odds Ratio (95% CI)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
Help needed after leaving hospital	1.18 (1.02-1.37)	0.025	1.05 (0.92-1.20)	0.488
Information in writing about symptoms to look out for	1.44 (1.17-1.78)	<0.001	1.35 (1.04-1.76)	0.023
Clear understanding about medications	0.96 (0.86-1.08)	0.517	0.99 (0.89-1.10)	0.858
Information about what to do if worried after leaving hospital	1.08 (0.90-1.29)	0.414	1.06 (0.91-1.22)	0.473
<b>Linear Time Trend (slope)</b>				
Help needed after leaving hospital	1.02 (0.98-1.06)	0.440	0.97 (0.94-0.99)	0.021
Information in writing about symptoms to look out for	1.05 (1.01-1.09)	0.027	0.96 (0.91-1.02)	0.209
Clear understanding about medications	0.98 (0.93-1.02)	0.308	0.99 (0.95-1.02)	0.507
Information about what to do if worried after leaving hospital	0.98 (0.92-1.04)	0.480	0.99 (0.94-1.05)	0.817

176 Note: There was a significant association between time and the outcome for cohort 3 for each outcome for the reference  
 177 group (cohort 3) for all questions.

## 178 Discussion

179 Our study found the delivery of a discharge instruction tool was associated with an  
 180 improvement in patient experience for hospitals who implemented PODS, particularly for discharge

181 planning. These are promising results given the recent attention both patients and Ontario Health, the  
182 province's integrated health system planning and oversight agency, has given to improving quality  
183 standards in care transitions [16-18]. PODS however was not associated with an improvement on  
184 discharge management, particularly for understanding medications or what to do if worried after  
185 discharge, though linear time trends demonstrate active efforts in the province may be having a positive  
186 impact beyond the effect demonstrated by our tool. Our study highlights both where current care  
187 transition efforts are having the greatest impact and where gaps may still remain to improve patient  
188 experience.

189 Improving patient experience during care transitions from hospital to home has gained much  
190 attention over the last 10 years [4-9]. However, Canada has only focused on capturing patient  
191 experience recently [10,14,17-20]. Our study provides a deeper dive into areas for system improvement  
192 at a time when care coordination and communication practices were likely further hindered due to the  
193 COVID-19 pandemic [21,22]. Previous studies have demonstrated the role between high quality care  
194 transitions and post-discharge outcomes [1,3,9,12,23]. Interestingly, our study demonstrates higher  
195 patient experience scores than was reported in the only other cross-sectional study of patient experience  
196 across multiple Canadian provinces [20]. While some differences may be due to our focus on discharge  
197 management rather than patient satisfaction which was included in this study, our results likely  
198 represent the increasing attention on care transition quality and hospital-specific initiatives that are  
199 underway in Ontario [16]. The positive linear time trend reported in our non-implementing cohort is a  
200 reflection of these efforts. Our study strengthens prior work by providing repetitive cross-sectional  
201 measurement of patient experience over time allowing the identification of persistent gaps in patient  
202 experience across the largest Canadian province. Our study found a poor receipt of information on what  
203 to do if problems arise following hospitalization with just under 60% reporting positive scores. This  
204 finding may identify persistent gaps in this particular area but may also be a reflection of challenges in

205 care coordination and health systems' access patients' and families' have voiced they face once home  
206 [17].

207 While many interventions aim to help address poor post-discharge outcomes stemming from  
208 poor communication such as self-care behaviors or emergency department visits and readmissions [1-  
209 3], few have evaluated the impact on patient experience [24-27]. Our paper is one of the first to use  
210 Canadian patient experience measures to evaluate its association with the widespread implementation  
211 of a novel discharge communication tool. Our study is comparable to US studies which have studied  
212 the impact of care interventions on patient experience using identical or similar questions [26,27].  
213 Patients randomized to receive a tailored discharge care plan along with one-on-one discussions with a  
214 health care provider on symptom recognition, medication reconciliation, and strategies for navigating  
215 the health system along with care coordination when needed were not found to have improved patient  
216 experience [26]. It is also possible that the impact of these care interventions lays more in the fidelity of  
217 the tool however –such as a higher engagement of caregivers or use of teach-back [13]. This may help  
218 explain why patients discharged from hospitals implementing PODS had a higher odds of having  
219 discussed the help they would need once leaving hospital, given patients may rely on caregivers for  
220 tasks beyond what public home care provides.

221 PODS was not found to improve patient experience measures related to discharge management.  
222 First, PODS was not found to improve the odds of reporting understanding of medications. In order to  
223 allow PODS to be usable across a wide range of patient populations and care systems, medication  
224 instructions were not standardized. Moreover, other province-wide care models centered on medication  
225 instructions were underway at the time of PODS implementation across Canada. Second, PODS was  
226 not found to improve understanding of what to do if problems arise after discharge from hospital. As a  
227 written form used prior to discharge to document instructions, PODS may do a better job of  
228 highlighting signs and symptoms patients and their families should watch out after leaving hospital,  
229 rather than where to seek care when complications arise. Prior studies have shown that seeking care

230 when complications arise are influenced by system issues such as access to and relationships to primary  
231 care or specialist follow-ups, access issues which were unmeasured in our study [28,29]. Lastly, as  
232 PODS implementation did not include post-discharge reinforcements, care coordination or follow-up,  
233 this may help explain why questions centered on discharge management were not associated with  
234 implementation of our tool, unlike other care interventions [1].

235 Our study has several limitations. First, our study used hospital aggregate data, not individual  
236 patient data, and we cannot make causal inferences on the individual impact of receiving PODS on  
237 patient experience. While it is possible that individuals left a fully or partially implementing hospital  
238 with no PODS, this would make the likelihood of seeing an association less likely – and may have  
239 contributed in the partially implementing cohort. Second, the response rate for the survey is low across  
240 participating hospitals, with some hospitals having lower responses for certain time periods, and our  
241 results may not be representative of patient experience at all Ontario hospitals. This may be offset  
242 however by the wide representation of responses across both medical and surgical units and the similar  
243 low response rate in all cohorts which is consistent with response rates reported for this nationally used  
244 survey [10,20]. Future patient-level studies would benefit from a nonresponse adjustment being  
245 applied. Moreover, the likelihood that hospitals with the most interest in improving their patient  
246 experience were involved is high and may help explain why our study reported overall higher patient  
247 experience scores in all cohorts than reported previously [20]. Third, as the entire CPES-IC survey was  
248 not used in our study, it is possible we did not capture all aspects of care transition quality, and further  
249 research would be strengthened by the inclusion of patient-reported outcome measures. However, at  
250 minimum, we feel the chosen questions do reflect content areas in PODS and gaps in communication  
251 which have been identified in need of improvement [11,16,19].

252 Our study demonstrated an improvement to patient experience measures that center on  
253 discharge planning among individuals discharged home from Ontario medical and surgical units who  
254 implemented PODS. Our study highlights that while PODS is a promising discharge instruction tool,

255 further refinement may be necessary in particular in areas which center on discharge management.

256 Further research would benefit by including patient experience measures when evaluating new models

257 of care or care interventions.

## 258 **Acknowledgments**

259           We would like to acknowledge Emily Myers, Program Lead of Patient Experience at the  
260 Ontario Hospital Association in providing valuable insights and data surrounding the CPES-IC Survey.  
261 We would also like to acknowledge our patient and caregiver advisory committee members: Audrey  
262 Chaput, Anna Foat, Gwen Cole, Trevor Manson and John Rae who collaborated in this work as  
263 outlined in the methods.

## 264 **Funding statement**

265           Karen Okrainec holds an Early Researcher Award from the Government of Ontario and an  
266 award from the Mak Pak Chiu and Mak-Soo Lai Hing Chair in GIM at the University of Toronto.  
267 Karen Okrainec and Shoshana Hahn-Goldberg are funded as Co-Principal Investigators and Audrey  
268 Chaput as Principal (Knowledge User) Applicant on a Canadian Institute of Health Research  
269 Transitions in Care Grant. Neither funder had any involvement in the design, conduct or analyses of  
270 this project.

## 271 **Declaration of authors competing interests**

272           None.

## 274 **References**

- 275 1. Jack BW, Chetty VK, Anthony D, Greenwald JL, Sanchez GM, Johnson AE, et al. A  
276 reengineered hospital discharge program to decrease rehospitalization: a randomized trial. *Ann*  
277 *Intern Med*. 2009 Feb;150(3):178–87. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-150-3-200902030-00007
- 278 2. Williams MV, Li J, Hansen LO, Forth V, Budnitz T, Greenwald JL, et al. Project BOOST  
279 implementation: lessons learned. *South Med J*. 2014 Jul;107(7):455–65. doi:  
280 10.14423/SMJ.00000000000000140
- 281 3. Coleman EA, Parry C, Chalmers S, Min SJ. The care transitions intervention: results of a  
282 randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006 Sep;166(17):1822-8. doi:  
283 10.1001/archinte.166.17.1822
- 284 4. HCAHPS Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems. CAHPS  
285 hospital survey [Internet]. Baltimore, MD: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; 2021  
286 [updated 2021 Sep 30; cited 2021 Oct 1]. Available from: <https://www.hcahpsonline.org>
- 287 5. Graham MM, Norris CM. A new way to listen to patients: heeding patient reported experiences  
288 to improve quality of care. *Can J Cardiol*. 2019 Oct;35(10):1265-6. doi:  
289 10.1016/j.cjca.2019.05.026
- 290 6. Aoki T, Yamamoto Y, Nakata T. Translation, adaptation and validation of the Hospital  
291 Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) for use in Japan: a  
292 multicentre cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Nov 19;10(11):e040240. doi:  
293 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040240
- 294 7. Judan-Ruiz EA, Mina RJL, Macindo JRB. Psychometric properties of the Filipino version of  
295 Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS): a cross-  
296 cultural validation study. *J Patient Exp*. 2020 Apr 2;7(6):1526-34. doi:  
297 10.1177/2374373520912083

- 298 8. Zun AB, Ibrahim MI, Mokhtar AM, Halim AS, Wan Mansor WNA. Translation, cross-cultural  
299 adaptation, and validation of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and  
300 Systems (HCAHPS) into the Malay language. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019 Jun  
301 10;16(11):2054. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16112054
- 302 9. Coleman EA, Mahoney E, Parry C. Assessing the quality of preparation for posthospital care  
303 from the patient's perspective: the care transitions measure. *Med Care*. 2005 Mar;43(3):246-55.  
304 doi: 10.1097/00005650-200503000-00007
- 305 10. Hadibhai S, Lacroix J, Leeb K. Developing the first pan-Canadian acute care patient experience  
306 survey. *Patient Exp J*. 2018;5(3):25-33. doi:10.35680/2372-0247.1227
- 307 11. Hahn-Goldberg S, Okrainec K, Huynh T, Zahr N, Abrams H. Co-creating patient-oriented  
308 discharge instructions with patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers. *J Hosp Med*. 2015  
309 Dec;10(12):804-7. doi: 10.1002/jhm.2444
- 310 12. Oh EG, Lee HJ, Yang YL, Kim YM. Effectiveness of discharge education with the teach-back  
311 method on 30-day readmission: a systematic review. *J Patient Saf*. 2021 Jun;17(4):305-10. doi:  
312 10.1097/PTS.0000000000000596
- 313 13. Hahn-Goldberg S, Huynh T, Chaput A, Krahn M, Rac V, Tomlinson G, et al. Implementation,  
314 spread and impact of the Patient Oriented Discharge Summary (PODS) across Ontario  
315 hospitals: a mixed methods evaluation. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021 Apr 17;21(1):361. doi:  
316 10.1186/s12913-021-06374-8
- 317 14. Canadian Institute for Health Information. Patient experience in Canadian hospitals –  
318 methodology notes [Internet]. Ottawa, ON: CIHI; 2019 [cited 2021 Mar 15]. Available from:  
319 [https://secure.cihi.ca/free\\_products/cpes-patient-experience-methodology-notes-april2019-en-](https://secure.cihi.ca/free_products/cpes-patient-experience-methodology-notes-april2019-en-web.pdf)  
320 [web.pdf](https://secure.cihi.ca/free_products/cpes-patient-experience-methodology-notes-april2019-en-web.pdf)
- 321 15. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
322 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement:



- 323 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008 Apr;61(4):344-9. doi:  
324 10.1016/j.ijisu.2014.07.013
- 325 16. Health Quality Ontario. Evidence to improve care – quality standards [Internet]. Toronto, ON:  
326 HQO; date unknown [updated 2021; cited 2021 Jul 29]. Available from:  
327 [https://www.hqontario.ca/Evidence-to-Improve-Care/Quality-Standards/View-all-Quality-](https://www.hqontario.ca/Evidence-to-Improve-Care/Quality-Standards/View-all-Quality-Standards/Transitions-between-hospital-and-home/About)  
328 [Standards/Transitions-between-hospital-and-home/About](https://www.hqontario.ca/Evidence-to-Improve-Care/Quality-Standards/View-all-Quality-Standards/Transitions-between-hospital-and-home/About)
- 329 17. Kiran T, Wells D, Okrainec K, Kennedy C, Devotta K, Mabaya G, et al. Patient and caregiver  
330 experience in the transition from hospital to home - brainstorming results from group concept  
331 mapping: a patient-oriented study. *CMAJ Open*. 2020 Mar 2;8(1):e121-e133. doi:  
332 10.9778/cmajo.20190009
- 333 18. Kemp KA, Santana MJ, Southern DA, McCormack B, Quan H. Association of inpatient  
334 hospital experience with patient safety indicators: a cross-sectional, Canadian study. *BMJ Open*.  
335 2016 Jul 1;6(7):e011242. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011242
- 336 19. Kiran T, Wells D, Okrainec K, Kennedy C, Devotta K, Mabaya G, et al. Patient and caregiver  
337 priorities in the transition from hospital to home: results from province-wide group concept  
338 mapping. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2020 May;29(5):390-400. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2019-009993
- 339 20. Davidson MJ, Lacroix J, McMartin S, Kudhail R, Hart K, Diestelkamp N. Patient experiences  
340 in Canadian hospitals. *Healthc Q*. 2019 Oct;22(3):12-4. doi: 10.12927/hcq.2019.26024
- 341 21. Key T, Kulkarni A, Kandhari V, Jawad Z, Hughes A, Mohanty K. The patient experience of  
342 inpatient care during the COVID-19 pandemic: exploring patient perceptions, communication,  
343 and quality of care at a university teaching hospital in the United Kingdom. *J Patient Exp*. 2021  
344 Mar 3;8:2374373521997742. doi: 10.1177/2374373521997742
- 345 22. Verma AA, Hora T, Jung HY, Fralick M, Malecki SL, Lapointe-Shaw L, et al. Characteristics  
346 and outcomes of hospital admissions for COVID-19 and influenza in the Toronto area. *CMAJ*.  
347 2021 Mar 22;193(12):e410-8. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.202795

- 348 23. Hahn-Goldberg S, Jeffs L, Troup A, Kubba R, Okraïneç K. "We are doing it together"; the  
349 integral role of caregivers in a patients' transition home from the medicine unit. PLoS ONE.  
350 2018 May 24;13(5):e0197831. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0197831
- 351 24. Backman C, Chartrand J, Crick M, Burry RD, Dingwall O, Shea B. Effectiveness of person-  
352 and family-centred care transition interventions on patient-oriented outcomes: A systematic  
353 review. Nurs Open. 2021 Mar;8(2):721-54. doi: 10.1002/nop2.677
- 354 25. Okraïneç K, Lau D, Abrams HB, Hahn-Goldberg S, Brahmhbhatt R, Huynh T, et al. Impact of  
355 patient-centered discharge tools: A systematic review. J Hosp Med. 2017 Feb;12(2):110-7. doi:  
356 10.12788/jhm.2692
- 357 26. Chan B, Goldman LE, Sarkar U, Schneidermann M, Kessell E, Guzman D, et al. The effect of a  
358 care transition intervention on the patient experience of older multi-lingual adults in the safety  
359 net: results of a randomized controlled trial. J Gen Intern Med. 2015 Dec;30(12):1788-94. doi:  
360 10.1007/s11606-015-3362-y
- 361 27. Kangovi S, Mitra N, Grande D, White ML, McCollom S, Sellman J, et al. Patient-centered  
362 community health worker intervention to improve posthospital outcomes: a randomized clinical  
363 trial. JAMA Intern Med. 2014;174(4):535-43. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.14327
- 364 28. Lam K, Abrams HB, Matelski J, Okraïneç K. Factors associated with attendance at primary care  
365 appointments after discharge from hospital: a retrospective cohort study. CMAJ Open. 2018  
366 Dec 3;6(4):e587-e593. doi: 10.9778/cmajo.20180069
- 367 29. Griffiths S, Stephen G, Kiran T, Okraïneç K. "She knows me best": a qualitative study of  
368 patient and caregiver views on the role of the primary care physician follow-up post-hospital  
369 discharge in individuals admitted with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or congestive  
370 heart failure. BMC Fam Pract. 2021 Sep 7;22(1):176. doi: 10.1186/s12875-021-01524-7


371

## 372 **Supporting information**

### 373 **S1 Fig. GEE model fits with site level data**


**Fig 1. Percentages of positive patient experience by cohort over time, accounting for site level clustering, using GEE.**

*Help Needed After Leaving Hospital*




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.01.22274547>; this version posted May 3, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

*Information in Writing about Symptoms to Look Out For*



## Clear Understanding about Medications



## Information about What to Do if Worried After Leaving Hospital

