

How to implement and use findings from patient experience surveys in Australian general practice: A qualitative expert consultation study

Hyun Jung Song ^{1*}, Sarah Dennis ^{2,3,1}, Jean-Frédéric Levesque ^{4,1}, Mark Fort Harris ¹

1 Centre for Primary Health Care and Equity, University of New South Wales, Kensington, Australia

2 Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

3 Ingham Institute for Applied Medical Research, Liverpool, Australia

4 NSW Agency for Clinical Innovation, Chatswood, Australia

*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify barriers (patient, provider, practice, and system levels) to consider when implementing patient experience surveys in Australian general practice, and enablers of their systematic use to inform service improvement in clinical practice as well as the broader health system.

Methods and Analysis: An expert consultation and qualitative content analysis of cross-sectional, open-text survey data. Data was collected from key international and Australian experts in the areas of measurement and quality improvement in general practice.

Results: Participants discussed the importance of ensuring value and relevance of surveys to stakeholders. Lack of resources, IT infrastructure, capacity building, and sustained funding were identified as barriers to implementing surveys. Participants discussed the importance of clearly defining and communicating the purpose of surveys and agreed on the value of using patient experience to inform reflective, team-based learning at the practice level. Opinions differed on the use of patient experience data at the system-level, with some questioning its utility or fairness for external performance reporting. Others recommended the aggregation and reporting of this data under certain conditions, including for the purpose of triangulation with other quality and outcome data. The study identified an evidence gap in the assessment and interpretation of patient experience data at all levels, including the analysis and contextualisation of survey findings at the system level.

Conclusion: Patient experience surveys have potential for guiding practice level quality improvement but many barriers to their implementation remain. There is need for greater research and policy efforts to understand how this information can be used at the system level for improving Australian primary care.

KEYWORDS

Patient satisfaction, Performance measures, Surveys, Healthcare quality improvement, General practice
NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

36 KEY MESSAGES

What is already known about this subject?

Patient reported experience measures (PREMs) are widely recognised to be key indicators of health care quality. This information is typically collected through surveys across health care settings and evidence suggests its usefulness in informing service improvement. In Australia, we currently lack knowledge on how PREMs can be administered, implemented, and interpreted and used for quality improvement in primary care.

What does this study add?

This qualitative study consulted with international and Australian experts to develop an understanding of how PREMs can be implemented and used at the general practice and system-levels to inform service improvement. Experts agreed on the value of using PREMs information for reflective learning and improvement of clinical practice, but disagreed on how this data could be aggregated and reported at the system-level. Some suggestions on how this could be achieved at the system-level were provided.

How might this impact on clinical practice or future developments?

Previous literature has identified the importance of interpreting and assessing PREMs data prior to use. This study highlights the need for a more structured approach to this step at the practice-level and identifies a significant gap in this area at the system-level. Greater research and policy efforts are needed to address these practice and knowledge gaps.

37

38 PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STATEMENT

39 This research focused on the views of key stakeholders in primary care practice and research that did
40 not include patient participants. Thus, patients were not invited to comment on the study design and
41 were not consulted to develop patient relevant outcomes or interpret the results. Furthermore, patients
42 were not invited to contribute to the writing or editing of this document for readability or accuracy.

43

44 1. INTRODUCTION

45

46 Patient feedback on their experience of care is one of the core quality dimensions for health system
47 performance and is a widely recognised promoter of patient-centred care (1, 2). Collecting this
48 information is an important step in ensuring that services are responsive to patients' needs and

49 preferences. Positive patient experience has also been shown to be associated with higher levels of
50 safety and clinical effectiveness of health services (3).

51

52 Patient reported experience measures (PREMs) are most commonly collected through surveys and
53 their potential for improving the quality of health services increasingly recognised (4-6). In clinical
54 practice, assessing patient experience can provide useful insights into how patients observe, interact
55 with and are impacted by the care environment, and highlight specific areas for improvement (7-9).
56 Measurement and public reporting of PREMs data has also been shown to strengthen the health care
57 system by fostering accountability and transparency, and by providing an important stimulus for service
58 improvement (10, 11). Despite this potential, operationalising patient surveys can be a difficult task in
59 health care. One study identified several barriers to implementing surveys that exist at organisational
60 and professional levels of health care, including those relating to organisational culture, adequate staff
61 time and knowledge to administer and interpret data for use (12). Extensive qualitative research done
62 in the United Kingdom (UK) has documented other barriers which include the limited perceived validity
63 and credibility of the surveys by practice staff (13-16). Beyond the challenges of implementing surveys,
64 researchers have also noted a lack of evidence surrounding how the collection of patient experience
65 information can be meaningfully used for improvements in service delivery, which often leads to barriers
66 to applying this information for change (4, 6, 17).

67

68 There is a particular evidence gap in Australia, especially in primary care. Policy and practice efforts to
69 systematically collect and report on patient survey data in Australia have been primarily focused on
70 acute care settings (18). In primary care, there is very little published evidence to tell if patient
71 experience is being measured in a standardised, robust way. Patient feedback on their primary care
72 experience is mainly collected using commercially provided general practice accreditation surveys –
73 some of which have been validated for use – and are done infrequently (19, 20). While findings from
74 these surveys can be reported back to the individual practices, very little is known about how this
75 information is used or reported (18). At a broader level, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)
76 conducts a national survey that collects information about access to general practice based services

77 from a random sample of individuals each year (21). However, there is no evidence to suggest that this
78 is used for quality improvement activities in primary care.

79

80 The aim of this study was to identify key barriers at multiple levels (patient, provider, practice, and
81 system) to consider when implementing patient experience surveys in Australian general practice, and
82 how PREMs data can be used to inform service improvement in clinical practice as well as the broader
83 health system.

84

85 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

86

87 This expert consultation study used qualitative content analysis of cross-sectional, open-text survey
88 data. Expert consultations have been used previously in primary care literature to capture key
89 stakeholder views and recommendations on a range of topics relating to the development of patient-
90 centred interventions and models of care (22-24). Given limited examples of PREMs-driven quality
91 improvement in Australian primary care, we also sought the expertise of international participants with
92 experiential knowledge in this area. The SRQR checklist guided the writing of this paper (25).

93

94 **2.1 Sample and recruitment**

95

96 Participants were recruited through a mix of purposive and snowball sampling, initially using contacts
97 known to the researchers, then inviting experts recommended by the participants. Stakeholders were
98 selected for their expertise locally and/or internationally (OECD-based countries) in topics relating to
99 quality improvement and/or patient surveys, including the design, implementation and coordination of
100 survey programs, with a focus on primary care. Participants who were actively engaged in patient care
101 and service improvement were invited from academia, clinical practice, consumer representative
102 organisations, and primary health governance or administration (e.g. employees of Primary Health
103 Networks (PHNs)). Letters of invitation and study background documents were emailed to a total of 37
104 experts.

105

106 **2.2 Data collection**

107

108 Qualitative data was collected between June 2018 and January 2019 using a questionnaire with open-
109 ended questions. The survey was administered in three ways based on the participant's preference.
110 Seventeen participants completed the questionnaire online via a secure, individualised link (Qualtrics).
111 Two participants completed and returned an electronic hard copy of the questionnaire (Microsoft Word)
112 (**Appendix 1**). One participant wished to be surveyed by telephone, and their responses were recorded
113 and transcribed.

114

115 The survey questions were designed to elicit information on the following: key considerations in
116 administering and operationalising patient experience surveys in general practice (e.g. methodological
117 issues); stakeholder-specific challenges (at patient-, provider-, practice-, and system-levels); and
118 recommendations for using and reporting survey findings at various levels. Participants were asked to
119 draw from specific experiences and examples from their local contexts wherever relevant.

120

121 **2.3 Data analysis**

122

123 Data was analysed and managed in Microsoft Word. De-identified responses from all sources were
124 extracted and compiled into a single document for analysis. Data from Australian and international
125 respondents were analysed together in order to extract issues in patient experience surveys that are
126 common and relevant across primary care settings.

127

128 Firstly, all responses were carefully read and assessed for pertinence to the questions being asked and
129 reorganised into appropriate response categories prior to analysis (HJS). Using a process described by
130 Graneheim and Lundman (26), the text was decontextualised into smaller 'meaning units', which were
131 then assigned more context-descriptive codes. Similar codes were clustered into sub-categories and
132 then into broader categories, which were based on the stages of implementing patient experience
133 surveys. These were issues relating to: 1) survey administration in clinical practice, and 2) interpretation
134 and use of findings at the practice-level and system-level. Finally, themes were developed from
135 underlying meanings and interactions between the categories. An iterative process of reflection and

136 discussion between the wider research team guided data analysis, including multiple revisions and the
 137 final refinement of the themes.

138

139 **2.4 Ethics**

140

141 This study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of New South
 142 Wales (HC16529). All participants provided their written informed consent to participate.

143

144 **3. RESULTS**

145

146 **3.1 Participants**

147

148 Of the 37 experts invited to participate, fifteen did not reply or declined participation. Two invitees agreed
 149 to participate but withdrew from the study prior to participation. In total, 20 participants were included in
 150 the study (response rate = 54%) from Australia, New Zealand, United States, Canada, UK, and
 151 Switzerland. Most participants (n=16, 80%) reported being currently active in primary care research,
 152 with a median of 15-19 years of experience. Participant characteristics are described in **Table 1**.

153

154 **Table 1. Characteristics of participants (n=20)**

Participant characteristics		Number (% total or range, as indicated)
Sex	Male	13 (65%)
	Female	7 (35%)
Current profession	GP-academic	9 (45%)
	Academic/professor/researcher	7 (35%)
	Practicing GP	3 (15%)
	Survey program director	1 (5%)
Country where they are based	Australia	10 (50%)
	New Zealand	3 (15%)
	United Kingdom	3 (15%)
	United States	2 (10%)
	Canada	1 (5%)
	Switzerland	1 (5%)
Years of experience: (median in bold)		
Primary care research	0-9 years	3 (15%)
	10-14 years	4 (20%)
	15-19 years	3 (15%)
	20-24 years	3 (15%)
	25+ years	7 (35%)

Primary care practice	0-9 years 10-14 years 15-19 years 20-24 years 25+ years	6 (30%) 1 (5%) 0 (0%) 3 (15%) 10 (50%)
Health administration, governance, management	0-9 years 10-14 years 15-19 years 20-24 years 25+ years	13 (65%) 3 (15%) 0 (0%) 3 (15%) 1 (5%)
Patient advocacy & Consumer representation	0-9 years 10-14 years 15-19 years 20-24 years 25+ years	19 (95%) 0 (0%) 1 (5%) 0 (0%) 0 (0%)
Self-reported level of expertise in:		
Patient-centred care	Did not answer or None Beginner Intermediate Proficient Expert	1 (5%) 1 (5%) 5 (25%) 7 (35%) 6 (30%)
Survey administration	Did not answer or None Beginner Intermediate Proficient Expert	2 (10%) 1 (5%) 6 (30%) 3 (15%) 8 (40%)

155

156

157 3.2 Findings from content analysis

158

159 3.2.1 Administering patient experience surveys

160

161 Experts discussed their views on key areas for consideration at various stakeholder levels when
 162 implementing patient surveys in clinical practice (**Table 2**). Participants emphasised the importance of
 163 ensuring that patient experience surveys have value and relevance to stakeholders. Experts also
 164 discussed the lack of resources, IT infrastructure, capacity building, and sustained funding as barriers
 165 to implementing surveys at all levels. Furthermore, the importance of establishing a robust sampling
 166 strategy to ensure representativeness was discussed. At the practice level, experts highlighted the
 167 importance of an organisational culture of quality improvement that places patient surveys as a core
 168 business practice. They felt this was integral to alleviating the challenge of ensuring fit of patient surveys

169 with practice workflow. At the system level, experts raised the importance of putting in place an
 170 accountability or governance framework to oversee surveys across practices, which they felt was
 171 currently lacking. It was agreed that relevant stakeholders, including consumers, need to be engaged
 172 throughout the design and implementation processes. A recommended approach was supporting
 173 continued engagement through the participatory process of co-design. Respondents felt this would give
 174 participants a sense of ownership over the survey process and would make the purpose and outcome
 175 of the surveys both meaningful and actionable.

176

177 **Table 2. Areas to address in administering patient experience surveys in clinical practice**

<p>Patients</p>	<p>Survey needs to capture what is meaningful and relevant to patient experience.</p> <p>Purpose of survey needs to be clearly communicated to patients.</p> <p>Survey needs to be specific to particular patient contexts (e.g. culture, language), or incorporate diverse perspectives.</p> <p>Sampling strategy needs to ensure representativeness of patients to fit survey purpose and generate meaningful findings.</p> <p>Interpretation of questions may vary by patients (e.g. health literacy, background). Survey administration needs to be done in a setting and format that is conducive to patient participation.</p> <p>Ensure confidentiality and privacy of data and assure patients that their data will be anonymised and safely stored.</p> <p>Dissemination of survey findings needs to reach a wide and diverse audience, in a timely fashion.</p>
<p>Providers</p>	<p>Providers need to see the value of patient survey to their work: e.g. What matters to clinicians? e.g. What information will be relevant to their clinical practice? e.g. What is feasible to achieve?</p> <p>Purpose of survey needs to be made clear to providers.</p> <p>The survey needs to fit with provider schedule and workflow.</p> <p>Providers need to be upskilled in all aspects of patient survey and implementation of findings (e.g. recruitment, administration, data management, analysis and interpretation).</p> <p>Providers need to be able to easily access and extract data from patient surveys.</p>
<p>Practices</p>	<p>Practice requires a culture of quality improvement that integrates patient surveys as part of core business.</p> <p>Practices need to have sense of ownership of survey process – co-design needs to take practice needs into account & have benefit for practice improvement.</p> <p>Practice needs to have clear purpose for doing the survey, or if being coordinated by an external entity, then have that purpose be made clear to them.</p> <p>Practices are resistant to surveys if their purpose is solely for performance reporting (e.g. connected to punitive sanctions). Quality improvement is a better lever for change.</p>

	<p>If surveys are done too often or concurrently with other research or quality improvement activities, staff will be at risk of survey fatigue.</p> <p>Adequate resources need to be in place for survey and implementation: Skilled workforce to carry out surveys IT systems in place for management and use of data Dedicated time and space</p>
System	<p>Nationally there needs to be a stronger culture of quality in the Australian health system.</p> <p>The system needs to commit to building an evidence base on how to use patient surveys for QI in general practice. e.g. Partnership with academia</p> <p>There is a need for strong governance and accountability framework for overseeing patient surveys at national and regional levels.</p> <p>Implementing surveys will require a communication strategy so that all stakeholder groups are continuously engaged and understand the purpose and functioning of this work.</p> <p>There needs to be a unified system of IT for data sharing or aggregation at regional levels.</p> <p>Surveys will require committed and long-term funding and resources to enable practices to continue this work.</p> <p>There needs to be partnership and alignment with PHNs and other entities to help support and operationalise this work.</p>

178

179

180 3.2.2 Practice-level interpretation and use of PREMs data

181

182 *Usefulness of patient experience information for improving services at the practice-level*

183 Participants felt strongly that applying patient feedback on their experience of care can affect positive
 184 change for practices. **Box 1** presents a summary of these views. There was a consensus that patient
 185 experience surveys are useful for reflective learning and improvement especially at the individual
 186 practice-level, as “*most practices operate more as an island than part of a system*” in Australia. Experts
 187 felt that through reflective learning, patient experience surveys had the potential to provide a valuable
 188 opportunity for practices to identify gaps in service and areas for improvement that otherwise may go
 189 unnoticed. By doing so, surveys were viewed to be critically valuable to the work of individual clinicians.

190

191 **Box 1. A summary of expert views on the value of using patient experience surveys for quality** 192 **improvement**

- Highlights gaps in service and areas for improvement for the practice, even when things seem to be running smoothly.
- Can be powerful tools for change, especially if results are consistent about a specific issue (e.g. poor comments).
- Reveals to clinicians what patients are experiencing, and how this is related to their satisfaction with care.
- Empowers patients to have direct input on service provision.
- Gives clinicians a chance to reflect on their performance, and how to help patients make the most informed decisions. Valuable to their clinical work.
- Results of surveys can be used to create patient-centred metrics (not externally generated ones) that reflect patients' perceptions of good quality care.
- If the metrics can be easily entered into the patient's electronic health record, this would be helpful.

193

194

195

Table 3. Examples of responses highlighting themes

Theme	Examples of responses
Interpreting and analysing findings through reflective, team-based learning	Q1: <i>"Patient surveys, if done well, can be powerfully helpful in directing practice improvement and very informative in helping individual clinicians improve their care when shared in a safe, reflective, learning environment."</i> (GP Academic, USA, 3M11).
Embedding surveys into continuous quality improvement in practices	Q2: <i>"One issue is timeliness – survey results are often quite old, yet we haven't worked out good ways of getting real time feedback – easier in hospital where patients are more of a captive audience."</i> (GP Academic, UK, 04M17).
Use of PREMs for system-level performance reporting	Q3: <i>"This would be disastrous in my opinion – PRM (patient reported measures) are not a performance tool - the culture is not ready for it and will not be for a number of years."</i> (GP, Australia, 1M02). Q4: <i>"[Data that is used for] a lot of quality improvement type of cycles are very context specific and so what may be relevant for a particular context may not be at all relevant for another context [...] If you aggregate too much you may lose the nuances of a particular setting."</i> (GP Academic, New Zealand, 2F18) Q5: <i>"National [aggregation and reporting] is useless. The only point of doing surveys for quality improvement is if they can meaningfully be reported for the relevant operational unit (e.g. practice) to be able to take action."</i> (GP Academic, UK, 4M17) Q6: <i>"Patient experience is an internationally recognised measure that can be used with other output and process measures to inform service improvement efforts and monitor national progress on certain issues."</i> (Academic, Australia, 1F03) Q7: <i>"Access to care is a recognised national indicator of quality that has traction at the national, meso (e.g. PHN) and service levels."</i> (Academic, Australia, 1F03) Q8: <i>"I would hope performance reporting should use patient experience as one of a number of qualitative and quantitative measures of quality."</i> (Academic, Australia, 1F09) Q9: <i>"Particularly with patient experience you may get qualitative data that actually helps you inform [practice] in a way that you might not have otherwise been able to extract just with your quant data."</i> (GP Academic, New Zealand, 2F18)

Use of PREMs data for service planning and care commissioning	Q10: “[Data] Should be aggregated at the level where planning of resources takes place. They can be used to support practices [to] respond to the needs of their patients within specific geographical contexts (regions).” (Academic, Canada, 5F19)
---	--

196

197

198 *Analysing and interpreting findings through reflective, team-based learning*

199 Participants noted that many practices may not be sufficiently familiar with how to interpret and apply
200 findings of patient experience surveys, given that they are not currently standard practice in Australia.

201 Thus, they recommended a guided approach to supporting practice staff and providers in analysing the
202 data and interpreting findings to inform clinical practice. Some suggested that this ‘sense-making role’
203 could be performed by an external, system-level organisation, such as PHNs, which could provide
204 analytical support to practices as part of guiding continuous quality improvement and service planning.

205 Others recommended that interpretation of data should be performed as an internally driven process
206 within the practice. To do this, participants recommended the use of a reflective, team-based learning
207 approach among practice staff.

208

209 It was strongly emphasised that all practice staff should be engaged in the process of using the findings
210 for practice improvement. The most frequently recommended method for this reflective exercise was to
211 have regular whole-of-practice meetings, during which staff would review findings together, unite
212 around a shared purpose, and agree on actions to be taken. Some experts felt that this team-based
213 learning approach would be a “*more palatable option*” for practice staff compared to an externally
214 directed initiative, as it would provide a safe environment for staff to discuss and reflect on their
215 performance in relation to peers and identify areas to improve (**Table 3, Q1**).

216

217 Participants also discussed the benefit of collaborative learning between clinicians outside of individual
218 practices, citing the potential for such initiatives to drive improvement “*above and beyond that which*
219 *could be achieved by internal reporting only*”. One recommendation was to establish peer learning
220 groups (e.g. communities of practice) among clinicians in the region or PHN, or among colleagues from
221 other practices that serve similar patient populations.

222

223 *Analysing and interpreting findings with patients*

224 Participants emphasised the importance of partnering with patient stakeholders as an integral part of
225 interpreting and applying patient survey findings in a patient-centred way. Several respondents
226 discussed that this was not being done sufficiently in Australia. International examples were provided
227 to highlight this potential, including the engagement of Patient Participation Groups in the UK. Experts
228 discussed a general need to better establish the evidence on how patient groups and practices can
229 work together to support practice improvement.

230

231 *Embedding surveys into continuous quality improvement in practices*

232 It was discussed that after reflecting on the survey findings, these results needed to be applied
233 systematically to improve practice on a continuous basis, for instance, within a formal framework of
234 improvement such as Plan-Do-Study-Act. There were varying opinions as to how frequently surveys
235 should be implemented for continuous quality improvement, in order to address patient concerns in a
236 timely way and to monitor improvements over time. One participant recommended that practices collect
237 and audit patient experience information every “*six months or one year*”. Others suggested the
238 possibility of establishing real-time or immediate feedback collection in practices, although this was not
239 discussed in greater detail aside from comments on the difficulty of operationalising this activity in
240 general practice (**Table 3, Q2**).

241

242

243 **3.2.3 System-level interpretation and use of PREMs data**

244

245 Opinions varied widely on the usefulness of using or reporting on data at levels beyond individual
246 practices. Many agreed that analysing and using data at the system-level could pose significant
247 challenges relating to data aggregation and interpretation.

248

249 *Use of PREMs for system-level performance reporting*

250 Using information collected from individual practices for external performance reporting was a
251 controversial topic, and there was some doubt as to whether it was an appropriate use of patient
252 experience surveys. Participants were especially opposed to linking performance with punitive
253 sanctions for individual practices and clinicians. Experts cautioned that in such cases, survey efforts
254 would be met with strong resistance from practices (**Table 3, Q3**). Furthermore, some experts felt that
255 since data collected from individual practices likely have a more localised focus, it would be “*generally*
256 *not helpful and event harmful*” to directly use such context-specific findings for benchmarking and
257 making cross-practice comparisons. Without proper contextualisation and analysis of PREMs data,
258 many argued that system-level assessment of quality could be misleading and unfair. They thus advised
259 against transferring and reporting this information outside of practices (**Table 3, Q4, Q5**).

260

261 Other participants saw the value of patient experience surveys for system-level reporting, for instance,
262 in offering a broader view of health care performance and ensuring greater transparency and
263 accountability in how services are being delivered (**Table 3, Q6**). At the same time, they recognised the
264 risks involved and stressed the importance of aggregating and reporting on this data under specific
265 conditions.

266

267 Firstly, it was suggested that surveys incorporate measures that have relevance beyond individual
268 practices. One recommendation was to use measures of patient experience that are broadly relevant
269 and applicable to multiple levels. The proposed benefit of using such measures was that the data can
270 be easily extracted, aggregated and compared across practices without need for significant
271 contextualisation; at the same time, they provide actionable information at the practice level. One
272 example was the use of patient-reported access to care (e.g. waiting times for appointments, frequency
273 of visits with a preferred GP), similar to those currently being measured through the national ABS patient
274 experience survey (21) (**Table 3, Q7**).

275

276 A suggested means of contextualising PREMs data at the system-level was to view and understand
277 this information in triangulation with other data sources. Several participants pointed out that interpreting
278 PREMs within the context of other measures of quality would build a more complete and multi-faceted
279 understanding of the quality of services delivered to patients. (**Table 3, Q8**). They also recommended
280 using PREMs with various measures of outcome, to observe possible interactions between patient
281 experience (i.e. process of care) and outcome (i.e. impact of care), such as those relating to health and
282 well-being, or service utilisation patterns (**Table 3, Q9**). For instance, outcome measures were
283 suggested to be useful for contextualising PREMs data, including offering an explanation as to why
284 patients may be experiencing care in a certain way. A suggested example was to look at actual waiting
285 times for appointments together with patients' experience or satisfaction with waiting times.

286

287 *Use of PREMs data for service planning and care commissioning*

288 Some experts discussed the value of PREMs-based reporting as a roadmap to drive patient-centred
289 service planning. By providing policy makers with a broad overview of how well practices and the health
290 care system are performing in these areas, targeted changes could be made to enhance service
291 provision and delivery to improve patient experience. For this purpose, participants recommended
292 reporting PREMs specifically at levels where planning of resources and care commissioning take place
293 (**Table 3, Q10**). Suggested measures for service planning purposes included patient experience of
294 continuity, coordination, and comprehensiveness of care. These measures were viewed as being
295 important factors to consider in driving improved models of care, particularly in the context of chronic
296 and complex care that require a multidisciplinary and team-based approach. Findings from these
297 measures were viewed to have potential to influence resource allocation and planning to close service
298 gaps, and to support targeted workforce training and development to guide improvement in these areas.

299

300

301 **4. DISCUSSION**

302

303 We aimed to ascertain stakeholder views on how to implement patient experience surveys in Australian
304 general practice and use PREMs data to inform quality improvement at multiple levels of primary care.

305 Participants considered that in order to successfully develop and implement surveys in clinical practice,
306 they should contain information that is relevant to patients, providers, and practices. Surveys should
307 also be administered in a user-friendly way that captures a representative sample of patients. Findings
308 should be managed and disseminated appropriately. Finally, the need to ensure sufficient infrastructure
309 such as IT systems, as well as resources such as staff time and continued funding was discussed.
310 These key considerations were similar to those identified in administering patient surveys in other care
311 settings in literature (12, 17, 27).

312

313 Perceived relevance of the survey was considered to be an integral factor in the implementation of
314 surveys in general practice. This suggests that rigorous research is needed to inform the development
315 of the survey to ensure it measures what matters to patients, providers, and practices. Currently, the
316 science behind the development of validated survey tools – including research to identify relevant
317 indicators of patient experience – is limited in Australian primary care and requires further development
318 (28). Furthermore, in order to ensure that all stakeholders find relevance and value in the survey activity,
319 the purpose of the survey needs to be clearly defined and communicated to all involved, supporting
320 previous research that has identified the clarity of survey objective as a factor in the success of patient
321 surveys (16).

322

323 Defining the purpose of surveys also has significance for implementing findings. The aim of the survey
324 directly influences what measures need to be included, as well as the levels to which the resulting data
325 can be meaningfully aggregated and reported. Furthermore, it allows the governing entity to develop a
326 clear sense of planning, including rollout, analysis and use of the resulting information. Experts also
327 highlighted the importance of strong leadership and an accountability framework to plan and regularly
328 monitor these activities.

329

330 Studies have shown that providing survey feedback alone is insufficient for practice staff to identify and
331 action changes, since they are often unsure what to do with PREMs data (6, 16, 29) – a sentiment
332 shared by our own participants. Once PREMs data have been collected, the critical next step is to take

333 time and effort to make sense of this information before planning for change (30). However, literature
334 suggests that health care staff are typically not given sufficient guidance on how to meaningfully
335 interpret survey information, and have difficulty finding the time to provide thoughtful feedback (6, 12).
336 Experts from our study also felt that the assessment and interpretation phase is a challenge for staff in
337 general practice.

338

339 Some suggestions were given to address this challenge. Respondents recommended holding regular
340 practice meetings in which staff reflect together on what the data means and what findings are relevant
341 for practice change. Research has found evidence to support the effectiveness and durability of
342 reflective, team-based learning activities to engage clinicians with the results, facilitate ownership, and
343 offer a valuable opportunity to challenge any scepticisms about the findings (29, 31). Many respondents
344 felt that patient experience surveys are in fact best suited for this purpose of practice improvement
345 through reflective learning, as a way to ensure that staff are supported to critically and openly discuss
346 potentially sensitive feedback information.

347

348 Respondents also discussed the possibility of collaborative learning between staff of different practices,
349 including through communities of practice, a peer-learning method based on sustained interactions and
350 knowledge enhancement between practitioners around a shared domain of interest. A recent feasibility
351 study in Australia found that communities of practice are an acceptable and potentially sustainable
352 method of peer learning among regional GP colleagues (32). Similar comparative peer-learning
353 methods between clinicians have been trialled internationally and found to support improvements in
354 patient-centred care and enhance professional confidence (33-35).

355

356 Finally, the need to engage patients in the interpretation and planning phases was discussed, and
357 Patient Participant Groups (PPGs) in the UK were cited as an example. PPGs have been implemented
358 in a large number of general practices in the UK; however, due to a lack of nationally agreed roles, their
359 tasks and engagement level have been thought to vary greatly by practice (36). This points to a need

360 for greater research efforts to understand collaborative learning between patients and practices, and
361 how patient input in survey processes can be established in a more concrete way.

362

363 While there was near universal agreement on the usefulness of using PREMs data to inform service
364 improvement at the practice-level, the use of survey findings at the system-level was controversial. For
365 some participants, there was concern about any use of practice-level PREMs data at the system level,
366 especially if attached to punitive sanctions on providers or practices. Aggregating or reporting this
367 information beyond practices was thought to be potentially unfair and stigmatising, especially if
368 contextual differences in patient experience of care were ignored. However, if done under certain
369 conditions, the reporting of this information at various levels was thought to be useful to document
370 system performance, to monitor and target areas for improvement, and for service planning. This view
371 supports current views about public reporting suggesting that it promotes accountability by ensuring
372 transparency to patients, acting on key levers of change in healthcare, especially when the public
373 reporting aligns with other levers (37). For system-level reporting, experts suggested the use of
374 measures that are broadly relevant to multiple levels for aggregation; aside from this, no detailed
375 explanations were provided as to how the appropriate analysis or interpretation of data could be
376 achieved at the system-level. Literature also appears to be limited in this area, which requires further
377 attention.

378

379 Finally, among the suggested use of PREMs for quality improvement at the system-level, respondents
380 discussed using PREMs in triangulation with other measures of quality and outcome to gain a
381 comprehensive picture of system performance. One idea could be to use PREMs together with patient-
382 reported outcome measures (PROMs), which can elicit patients' perspectives on the process and
383 impact of care they receive (38). An example of a validated PROM for this purpose is the patient
384 activation measure (PAM), which captures patients' health literacy and capacity for self-management
385 (39). This measure has been used in large scale studies to assess and monitor activation levels in
386 patient populations (40), and combined with PREMs, could be used to monitor the effectiveness of
387 health services in improving patient experience and capacity at a broad level, or in certain communities.
388 Findings from these combined measures, for instance, could be harnessed to enhance system

389 responsiveness to the needs of underserved groups in Australia, such as Aboriginal and Torres Strait
390 Islander peoples.

391

392 Although one of the limitations of this study is the small sample size, which may inhibit drawing
393 conclusive evidence, its strengths are in the collective expertise and knowledge of its participants who
394 are among the leading primary care experts in the areas of patient experience and service improvement.
395 International participants drew from their academic knowledge and local experiences to provide
396 information that are relevant also to the Australian primary care context. Furthermore, Australian
397 participants – many through their on-the-ground experience as practitioners – were able to provide
398 practical suggestions on how to implement and use patient experience information for improving
399 services.

400

401 Overall, the systematic collection and use of patient experience was viewed to have strong potential for
402 change in clinical practice, and subsequently in the transformation of care delivery to patients. In
403 Australia, there is very little evidence guiding the interpretation and use of PREMs data once it has been
404 collected. This study is the first of its kind to document recommendations on how to collect, interpret,
405 and use PREMs for service improvement in Australian primary care. It has highlighted the need for
406 greater research and policy efforts to strengthen the assessment and interpretation of PREMs data at
407 all levels, and to understand how this information can be aggregated and reported to inform meaningful
408 changes to the primary care system.

409

410

411 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

412 The authors would like to acknowledge the participants of this study for volunteering their time
413 to respond to the questionnaire.

414

415 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

416 Dr Levesque is a member of the Strategic Advisory Board of the Integrated Healthcare Journal.

417 The authors declare no other conflicts of interest.

418

419 **FUNDING**

420 The research reported has been conducted as part of the author's (HJS) doctoral study at the

421 University of New South Wales. Funding was provided as part of her scholarship.

422

423 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

424 De-identified data that support the findings of this study may be available on reasonable

425 request from the corresponding author (hyun.song@unsw.edu.au). The data are not publicly

426 available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

427

428 **REFERENCE**

429 1. Murray CJ, Frenk J. A framework for assessing the performance of health systems.
430 Bull World Health Organ. 2000;78(6):717-31.

431 2. Picker Institute. Using patient feedback: a practical guide to improving patient
432 experience. Oxford; 2009.

433 3. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between
434 patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. BMJ Open. 2013;3(1):e001570.

435 4. Carter M, Davey A, Wright C, Elmore N, Newbould J, Roland M, et al. Capturing patient
436 experience: a qualitative study of implementing real-time feedback in primary care. British
437 Journal of General Practice. 2016;66(652):e786.

438 5. Coulter A, Locock L, Ziebland S, Calabrese J. Collecting data on patient experience is
439 not enough: they must be used to improve care. BMJ : British Medical Journal.
440 2014;348:g2225.

441 6. Gleeson H, Calderon A, Swami V, Deighton J, Wolpert M, Edbrooke-Childs J.
442 Systematic review of approaches to using patient experience data for quality improvement in
443 healthcare settings. BMJ Open. 2016;6(8):e011907.

444 7. NSW Agency for Clinical Innovation. Patient Experience and Consumer Engagement:
445 A Framework for Action Chatswood, NSW2015 [Available from:
446 [https://www.aci.health.nsw.gov.au/ data/assets/pdf file/0005/256703/peace-
447 framework.pdf](https://www.aci.health.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/256703/peace-framework.pdf).

- 448 8. Wong ST, Haggerty J. Measuring patient experiences in primary health care : a review
449 and classification of items and scales used in publicly-available questionnaires. Vancouver,
450 Canada: Centre for Health Services and Policy Research (CHSPR); 2013.
- 451 9. Coulter A. Patient feedback for quality improvement in general practice. *BMJ*.
452 2016;352:i913.
- 453 10. Rechel B, McKee M, Haas M, Marchildon GP, Bousquet F, Blumel M, et al. Public
454 reporting on quality, waiting times and patient experience in 11 high-income countries. *Health*
455 *Policy*. 2016;120(4):377-83.
- 456 11. Berwick DM, James B, Coye MJ. Connections between quality measurement and
457 improvement. *Med Care*. 2003;41(1 Suppl):I30-8.
- 458 12. Davies EA, Meterko MM, Charns MP, Nealon Seibert ME, Cleary PD. Factors affecting
459 the use of patient survey data for quality improvement in the Veterans Health Administration.
460 *BMC Health Services Research*. 2011;11(1):334.
- 461 13. Reeves R, Seccombe I. Do patient surveys work? The influence of a national survey
462 programme on local quality-improvement initiatives. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*.
463 2008;17(6):437.
- 464 14. Barry HE, Campbell JL, Asprey A, Richards SH. The use of patient experience survey
465 data by out-of-hours primary care services: a qualitative interview study. *BMJ Quality*
466 *& Safety*. 2016;25(11):851.
- 467 15. Asprey A, Campbell JL, Newbould J, Cohn S, Carter M, Davey A, et al. Challenges to
468 the credibility of patient feedback in primary healthcare settings: a qualitative study. *British*
469 *Journal of General Practice*. 2013;63(608):e200.
- 470 16. Boiko O, Campbell JL, Elmore N, Davey AF, Roland M, Burt J. The role of patient
471 experience surveys in quality assurance and improvement: a focus group study in English
472 general practice. *Health Expect*. 2015;18(6):1982-94.
- 473 17. Scott J, Heavey E, Waring J, De Brún A, Dawson P. Implementing a survey for patients
474 to provide safety experience feedback following a care transition: a feasibility study. *BMC*
475 *Health Services Research*. 2019;19(1):613.
- 476 18. Gardner K, Parkinson A, Banfield M, Sargent GM, Desborough J, Hehir KK. Usability
477 of patient experience surveys in Australian primary health care: a scoping review
478 [class="reftools" href="#FN1">*](#). *Australian Journal of Primary Health*. 2016;22(2):93-9.
- 479 19. Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP). Patient feedback
480 requirements 2019 [Available from: [https://www.racgp.org.au/running-a-practice/practice-](https://www.racgp.org.au/running-a-practice/practice-standards/patient-feedback-requirements)
481 [standards/patient-feedback-requirements](https://www.racgp.org.au/running-a-practice/practice-standards/patient-feedback-requirements)].
- 482 20. Kalucy L, Katterl R, Jackson-Bowers E. Patient Experience of health care
483 performance. Adelaide: Primary Health Care Research & Information Service (PHCRIS);
484 2009.
- 485 21. Australian Bureau of Statistics. 4839.0 - Patient Experiences in Australia: Summary of
486 Findings, 2018-19 Canberra, ACT2019 [updated 12 November 2019. Available from:
487 <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/4839.0>].
- 488 22. Levesque JF, Haggerty JL, Burge F, Beaulieu MD, Gass D, Pineault R, et al. Canadian
489 Experts' Views on the Importance of Attributes within Professional and Community-Oriented
490 Primary Healthcare Models. *Healthc Policy*. 2011;7(Spec Issue):21-30.
- 491 23. Haggerty J, Burge F, Levesque JF, Gass D, Pineault R, Beaulieu MD, et al.
492 Operational definitions of attributes of primary health care: consensus among Canadian
493 experts. *Ann Fam Med*. 2007;5(4):336-44.
- 494 24. Suter E, Mallinson S, Misfeldt R, Boakye O, Nasmith L, Wong ST. Advancing team-
495 based primary health care: a comparative analysis of policies in western Canada. *BMC Health*
496 *Services Research*. 2017;17(1):493.
- 497 25. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting
498 qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med*. 2014;89(9):1245-51.
- 499 26. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research:
500 concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*.
501 2004;24(2):105-12.

- 502 27. Davies E, Cleary PD. Hearing the patient's voice? Factors affecting the use of patient
503 survey data in quality improvement. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*. 2005;14(6):428.
- 504 28. Song HJ, Dennis S, Levesque J-F, Harris MF. What matters to people with chronic
505 conditions when accessing care in Australian general practice? A qualitative study of patient,
506 carer, and provider perspectives. *BMC Family Practice*. 2019;20(1):79.
- 507 29. Reeves R, West E, Barron D. Facilitated patient experience feedback can improve
508 nursing care: a pilot study for a phase III cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMC Health Serv
509 Res*. 2013;13:259.
- 510 30. Kumah E, Osei-Kesse F, Anaba C. Understanding and Using Patient Experience
511 Feedback to Improve Health Care Quality: Systematic Review and Framework Development.
512 *J Patient Cent Res Rev*. 2017;4(1):24-31.
- 513 31. Brookes O, Brown C, Tarrant C, Archer J, Buckley D, Buckley LM, et al. Patient
514 experience and reflective learning (PEARL): a mixed methods protocol for staff insight
515 development in acute and intensive care medicine in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(7):e030679.
- 516 32. Song HJ, Harris M, Li F-Y, Green J, Knight A. Connecting General Practitioners
517 Through a Peer-Facilitated Community of Practice for Chronic Disease Care. *Ann Fam Med*.
518 2020;18(1).
- 519 33. Davies E, Shaller D, Edgman-Levitan S, Safran DG, Oftedahl G, Sakowski J, et al.
520 Evaluating the use of a modified CAHPS survey to support improvements in patient-centred
521 care: lessons from a quality improvement collaborative. *Health Expect*. 2008;11(2):160-76.
- 522 34. Watt G. GPs at the Deep End. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2011;61(582):66.
- 523 35. Rohrbasser A, Harris J, Mickan S, Tal K, Wong G. Quality circles for quality
524 improvement in primary health care: Their origins, spread, effectiveness and lacunae– A
525 scoping review. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(12):e0202616.
- 526 36. Gillam S, Newbould J. Patient participation groups in general practice: what are they
527 for, where are they going? *BMJ*. 2016;352:i673.
- 528 37. Levesque J-F, Sutherland K. What role does performance information play in securing
529 improvement in healthcare? a conceptual framework for levers of change. *BMJ Open*.
530 2017;7(8):e014825-e.
- 531 38. Kingsley C, Patel S. Patient-reported outcome measures and patient-reported
532 experience measures. *BJA Education*. 2017;17(4):137-44.
- 533 39. Hibbard JH, Stockard J, Mahoney ER, Tusler M. Development of the Patient Activation
534 Measure (PAM): conceptualizing and measuring activation in patients and consumers. *Health
535 services research*. 2004;39(4 Pt 1):1005-26.
- 536 40. Blakemore A, Hann M, Howells K, Panagioti M, Sidaway M, Reeves D, et al. Patient
537 activation in older people with long-term conditions and multimorbidity: correlates and change
538 in a cohort study in the United Kingdom. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2016;16(1):582.
- 539