

TITLE: Systematic review of contemporary improvement interventions on care coordination, discharge support and transitional care from the patient experience perspective

Authors:

Tiago S Jesus, PhD, OTD^{1,2}; Brocha Z. Stern, PhD, OTR³; Dongwook Lee, OTD, OTR⁴; Manrui Zhang, PhD, MPH²; Jan Struhar, DPT⁵; Allen W. Heinemann, PhD^{6,7}; Neil Jordan, PhD^{8,9}; Anne Deutsch, PhD, RN, CRRN^{6,7,10}

1. Division of Occupational Therapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA.
2. Center for Education in Health Science, Institute for Public Health and Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.
3. Institute for Healthcare Delivery Science, Department of Population Health Science and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA
4. Center for Child Development & Research, Sensory EL, ROK; Dept. of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Medicine, Korehab Clinic, UAE
5. Nerve, Muscle and Bone Innovation Center & Oncology Innovation Center, Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL, USA.
6. Center for Rehabilitation Outcomes Research, Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL, USA.
7. Dept. of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.
8. Dept. of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Dept. of Preventive Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.
9. Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Hines VA Hospital, Hines, IL, USA
10. Center for Health Care Outcomes, RTI International, Chicago, IL, USA.

Word count: 3477; **Number figures:** 1; **Number tables:** 4

Corresponding author: Tiago Jesus

Contact Information

Tiago S Jesus, PhD, OTD (He/Him/His)

The Ohio State University; College of Medicine, School of Health & Rehabilitation Sciences,

Division of Occupational Therapy; tiago.jesus@osumc.edu

453 West 10th Ave. Columbus, OH 43210

Main Phone: 614-292-1706; Fax: 614-292-0210

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: TSJ, AH, AD; Data curation: TSJ, BZS, MZ, DL, JS; Methodology: TSJ, AH, BZS, NJ, AD Project administration: TSJ; Supervision: AH, AD; Roles/Writing - original draft: TSJ; and Writing - review & editing: TSJ, AH, BZS, NJ, AD.

Declarations:

Tiago S. Jesus completed part of this work and Manrui Zhang the totally of this work under a grant from the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR; 90ARHF0003). NIDILRR is a center within the Administration for Community Living (ACL), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The contents of this publication do not necessarily represent the policy of NIDILRR, ACL, or HHS, and the reader should not assume endorsement by the U.S. federal government. Dr Jesus initiated this work with the Northwestern University's affiliation (under the grant support mentioned) and the work was completed with The Ohio State University's affiliation.

Conflicts of Interest:

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

TITLE: Improving care coordination and discharge support evaluated from the patient experience perspective: systematic review of the contemporary evidence

Abstract

Aim: To synthesize the impact of improvement interventions related to care coordination and discharge support on patient experience measures.

Method: Systematic review. Searches were completed in six scientific databases, five specialty journals and through snowballing. Eligibility included studies in English (2015-2022) on improving care coordination, discharge support, or transitional care assessed by standardized patient experience measures as a primary outcome. Two independent reviewers made eligibility decisions and performed quality appraisals.

Results: Of 1087 papers initially screened, 15 were finally included. Seven studies (three randomized controlled trials [RCTs]) focused on care coordination activities and used enhanced supports (e.g., improvement coaching; tailoring for vulnerable populations) for Patient-Centered Medical Homes or other primary care sites. Effectiveness was mixed or neutral relative to standard supports or models of care. Eight studies (three RCTs) focused on enhanced discharge support, including patient education (e.g., “teach back” method) and telephone follow-up or transitional support; mixed or neutral results on the patient experience were also found and with more substantive risks of bias.

Conclusion: Enhanced supports for improving care coordination, discharge education, and post-discharge follow-up had mixed or neutral effectiveness for improving the patient experience with care, compared to standard or simpler improvement approaches. Studies on the improvement of patient experiences, especially for enhanced patient discharge, need further strengthening such as including the patient perspective for its co-development.

Key words: Patient Experience; Patient Satisfaction; Person-centered Care; Quality Improvement; Discharge Planning; Care Coordination

Background:

The *patient experience* with care is an integral component of healthcare quality and a construct used to assess the *person-centeredness* of healthcare delivery, informing quality-improvement (QI) activities.¹⁻³ Specifically, *patient experience* refers to how patients have experienced valuable aspects of healthcare delivery, such as physician communication, involvement in decision-making, getting timely appointments, or supports to care coordination and discharge planning in the transitions across settings to address care fragmentation issues.¹

As synthesized in several systematic reviews, better patient experiences with care have been associated with improved treatment adherence and to improved patient and health system outcomes (e.g., reduced healthcare utilization or malpractice litigation).⁴⁻⁷ For example, a recent systematic review found that better scores on standardized patient experience

measures were associated with greater self-reported physical and mental health, lower frequency and length of hospitalizations, and fewer emergency room visits.⁴ Furthermore, improving the patient experience of care has been recognized as a QI aim in itself, under the goal of improving the person-centeredness of care.^{8 9}

Many health systems increasingly reimburse providers for the value of care, including patient experience scores. The US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) has developed the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) surveys and quality measures, which have been widely used to track, publicly report, and compare providers' patient experience performance.¹⁰ Within selected pay-for-performance programs, the US Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services uses CAHPS scores, reflecting patient experience of care, when computing payment incentives.¹¹ Several other countries require providers to monitor and improve patient experience.^{12 13} Overall, healthcare systems, organizations, and frontline practitioners are increasingly subject to quality mandates, value-based incentives, or market pressures (e.g., customer loyalty) to develop systematic activities to improve their patient experience performance,¹⁴ including for care coordination and discharge support.^{15 16}

Reducing care fragmentation, improving continuity of care, and preventing medication errors or rehospitalizations can be achieved by interventions such as supported discharge, case management programs, transitional care services, use of care coordinators as well as models of care such as patient-centered medical homes (PCMHs). Systematic reviews have addressed the effectiveness of these health service interventions, and many of these have been shown to be effective for a set of health, quality of life, and health system outcomes (e.g., reduced rehospitalizations).¹⁷⁻²⁰ For example, interventions to facilitate the transition from hospital to

home when started in the hospital and continued in the community through telephone or other telehealth follow-up or scheduled home visits can be effective in reducing hospital readmission, especially when tailored to each patient.^{18 19 21}

However, we found no systematic review focused on the impact that care coordination, discharge support, or transitional care activities have on the patient's experience with care. A recent overview of systematic reviews for care coordination interventions found patient experiences were rarely addressed or synthesized as outcomes of these interventions.²² Here, we aim to synthesis the contemporary literature (2015-2022) on the impact of care coordination, discharge support, and transitional care activities on patient experience as assessed by formal patient-reported experience measures.

Methods

Design: We registered (PROSPERO: CRD42022358337) a systematic review protocol that focused on synthesizing the English-language contemporary evidence (2015-2022) addressing health service interventions to improve the patient-reported experience with care. Here, we focus on the impact of interventions related to enhanced care coordination, discharge support, or transitional care activities. We use the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidance for the review report.

Eligibility:

We included controlled trials, longitudinal observational studies with controls, and pre-post designs with >30 participants. We excluded qualitative, cross-national studies, or any study not assessing the impact on patient-reported experience measures. Studies needed to have full texts available, focus on improving the patient experience (i.e., one of no more than two primary outcomes measures) and report inferential statistics (e.g., p-values) about the impact of the intervention on a patient experience measure.

For patient experience outcomes, we included studies that used standardized, quantitative patient experience assessments (e.g., validated surveys, their items or composite domains, or surveys that were externally collected and routinely used across providers, including for value-based reimbursement). We excluded studies that assessed patient experiences only with non-standardized, qualitative, or other non-validated instruments. Measures that were not patient-reported (e.g., observational) were excluded. We did not synthesize the impact of the interventions on measures other than patient-reported experience with care.

For participants, we included health systems, organizations, providers, networks, settings, or service units, including any health professionals or staff. We excluded health service interventions exclusively delivered by students or clinicians-in-training. Those providing patient experience feedback could be the patient, family/informal caregivers, or proxy respondents.

For context, we had no geographic restriction, but we only included English-language articles published in 2015 or thereafter, to reflect contemporary interventions responsive to the more recent focus, mandate, or incentives for improving the patient experience of care. For example,

value-based reimbursements that included patient experience scores did not emerge in the US until 2013.²³

For this review, we only included health-service improvement interventions focused on *care coordination* (i.e., systematic organizational, service line, or service unit strategies to address fragmentation of care delivery and enhance continuity of care²²), *discharge support* (i.e., patient education in preparation for discharge and/or post-discharge education or follow-up support either in the environment or by telephone or other telehealth/web-based mechanisms¹⁸), and *transitional care* (i.e., subset of intermediate, time-limited set of actions to ensure the coordination or continuity of care as patients transfer between different settings or levels of care²⁴), which often involves a single point of contact to optimize service access, communication, and coordination.²⁵

Search:

We searched six scientific databases (PubMed/MEDLINE, CINAHL, EconLit, PsycINFO, DOAJ, and Scopus) using a combination of free-text words with indexed terms that reflect our eligibility criteria. We restricted the search for English language and publications after January 2015.

Supplementary Appendix 1 shows the detailed searches for each database.

We also conducted targeted searches within the *Patient Experience Journal*, *Journal of Patient Experience*, *Medical Care*, and *Health Expectations*. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery* was searched since January 2020, when the journal became peer reviewed. These were journals with frequent papers identified in the initial database searches. Finally, we conducted snowballing strategies (e.g., citation-tracking, similar publications in PubMed) using the final

included articles and reference lists of similar systematic reviews, including those identified through the searches.

Selection:

Two independent reviewers (TJ first reviewer; DL, JS, or MZ for the second reviewer role) conducted the title-and-abstract screenings and then the full text reviews against the eligibility criteria. Reviewer consensus was achieved on the final inclusion within a round of discussion, with no need for third reviewer involvement.

Data Extraction

The research team built a data extraction form that they used to chart data such as study characteristics and context, patient experience measures and metrics, interventions, analytic approaches, and results pertaining to patient-reported experience with care. The data were charted initially by the first author (TJ) and verified by a second author (BS), with subsequent rounds for any flagged extractions until they reached consensus. **Supplementary Appendix 2** provides detailed, consensus-based data extractions for each included study.

Quality Assessment

The quality assessment was performed independently by TJ and BS. The Cochrane-suggested risk of bias criteria for Effective Practice and Organization of Care (EPOC) reviews were used for the controlled trials, while the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute's quality assessment tools were used for the pre-post studies and observational studies that assessed or compared the effects of health service interventions.

As planned in the review protocol, we did not grade the strength of the evidence across the research studies and their design. Covering a range of health service or QI interventions, contexts, assessments, and study designs, our review is configurative (not aggregative) in nature. We tabulated the consensus-based appraised risks of bias for each study's context and design, based on the respective checklist-based methodological assessment; those detailed assessments are in **Supplementary Appendix 3**.

Analytic plan

We tabulated and synthesized the results per two major inclusion categories: 1) care coordination and 2) discharge support and follow up. The latter included transitional care because the included studies that had this component were in relation to discharge support. Within each category, we tabulated the methods and appraised the risk of bias for each study, and then synthesized the interventions and their findings, ordered by study design (starting with RCTs) and publication date within the same design. Given the configurative nature of the review and the heterogeneity of interventions and study contexts, we did not conduct a meta-analysis.

Results

Figure 1 provides the PRISMA flowchart.




Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart of the systematic review.

Among the 1087 unique papers screened, 138 full texts were assessed for eligibility and 15 were included.^{15 16 26-38} The absence of impact assessment with inferential statistics was the main reason for exclusion at the full-text assessment. Among papers included, seven focused

on enhanced care coordination supports (e.g., over and beyond models of care based on a PCMH), whereas eight focused on enhanced discharge supports, specifically for enhanced patient education, reengineered discharge, telephone follow-up including for transitional care, or a mix of those interventions.

a) Enhanced care coordination supports – primary care level ($n=7$)

Table 1 summarizes each study’s methods (e.g., design, context) and risks of bias; **Table 2** summarizes the intervention and study findings.

Context-wise, all studies were multi-site PCMHs or other primary care practices, all from a network or integrated health system in the US: Veterans’ Health Administration (VHA),³²⁻³⁴ a statewide PCMH network,³⁵ Federally Qualified Health Centers,³⁶ a Safety Net Medical Homes’ Initiative,³⁸ or academically-affiliated primary care practices.³⁷

Three studies were RCTs for facilitating site-based improvement projects. A recent RCT at the VHA, with the fewest appraised risks of bias (Table 1), used QI facilitation (e.g., coaching) on the site’s use of a care-coordination improvement toolkit – beyond its internal dissemination (control); both groups improved, with no significant benefit for the more resource-intensive arm.³⁴

Another RCT focused on the impact of augmented care coordination for patients with high risk of hospitalization (beyond standard PCMH; control group) and found improvements in 2 of 6 care coordination items.³³ The remaining RCT encouraged the selection of high-value care-

	Design & Analysis	Context / Setting	Risk of Bias – level (within each study design) & Described risks	
Noël et al., 2022	RCT (cluster-randomized) of QI approaches. Multivariable difference-in-differences with adjustment for clustering and patient characteristics.	Patient-Centered Medical Homes, primary care; 12 sites (6 intervention, 6 control) within the Veterans Health Administration system, USA	RC T	Different pre and post groups. Non-coached clinics had significantly lower baseline values for the outcome, thus greater improvement margins.
Zulman et al., 2019	Secondary survey of a RCT (patient-level randomization) for quality improvement. Logistic regression, using intention-to-treat analyses. Sensitivity analyses with adjustment.	Patient-Centered Medical Homes, primary care; 5 sites within the Veterans Health Administration system, USA	RC T	No baseline outcomes. Controls were from the same sites, with potential for contamination. Not all patients randomized to the intervention received the intervention. Patients may not distinguish the intervention from the previously-provided support (control). Self-selected sites participated in the program, with 5% greater experience scores than the national average for several health care experience survey questions. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Dorr et al., 2016	Pragmatic RCT (cluster-randomized) for quality improvement. Adjusted difference-in-differences analysis and generalized estimating equation approach.	Patient-Centered Medical Homes, primary care; 8 sites (4 intervention, 4 control), Oregon, USA	RC T	Use of P value threshold of $P < .10$ and all significant changes identified ranged between $P > 0.5$ and $P < .10$. No correction for multiple comparisons. Different pre and post groups. Small number of clusters. Selection and respondent bias unable to be adjusted for, e.g., those motivated to take part in the experiment and respond in the pre- and post-periods.
Nembar et al., 2020	Clustered, non-randomized multi-site controlled before-and-after study. Difference-in-differences analysis.	Patient-Centered Medical Homes (Federally Qualified Health Centers), primary care; 12 sites (6 intervention, 6 control) within a primary care network, USA	NR - CT	No randomization. Centers part of one network and from one state. Selection bias for participant sites.
Jones et al., 2019	Comparative, retrospective cohort study (one intervention group; two comparators). Multivariable logistic regression models (sensitivity analyses).	Patient-Centered Medical Homes, primary care; 510 sites (25 with intervention, 485 control) within the Veterans Health Administration system, USA	Obs-C	Observational, retrospective study. No baseline outcome measured. Outcome measure does not address homeless-specific concerns and service needs. Limited response rate. Site-specific inclusion criteria for the intervention. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Tung et al., 2018	Comparative repeated cross-sectional design with serial random samples. Adjusted difference-in-differences analysis and cross-sectional adjusted post-intervention generalized estimating equations.	Safety Net Medical Home Initiative's primary care practices; 24 sites randomly selected from 65 intervention sites (13 sites included in analyses), USA	Obs-C	Observational study. Baseline patient experience assessed 13 months after intervention began. All analyses at clinic level with inability to follow individual patients over time. Potential selection bias: only 13 of the 24 clinics that completed baseline surveys were included in the analyses as they also completed the post-intervention ones. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Nguyen et al., 2020	Comparative retrospective study. Adjusted differences-in-differences and regression models (inverse probability weighting in primary analysis; used sensitivity analyses).	Academically-affiliated primary care practices; 50 sites (13 intervention, 37 comparison) affiliated with Harvard Medical School, USA	Obs-C	Observational study with external comparators with unknown practice patterns. There may have been similar practice changes in the comparison sites in line with general health care reform initiatives. Although adjusted models were used, the study does not control for variation in the size, structure, and composition of the care teams. No correction for multiple comparisons.

Table 1: Summary of study methods and risk-of-bias assessment: Enhanced care coordination supported for Patient-Centered Medical Homes or other primary care practices.

Legend: RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; NR-CT: Non-Randomized Controlled Trial; Obs-C: Observational, comparative study. QI: Quality Improvement

	Intervention type <i>Enhanced Care Coordination Supports:</i>	Design	HCSHS Score	Top-Box Score	SHEP ^a Categorical	PACIC ^b Score	Top Box Score	CSI Score	CG- CAHPS Score	PES Score	Results (Descriptive Synthesis)
Noël et al., 2022	Enhanced QI facilitation & coaching (beyond QI toolkit dissemination) Centralized, guided coaching of the participant VA primary-care clinics under a PCMH model. Coaching including a site visit, distance coaching, and cross-site learning on the use of a care coordination improvement toolkit (intervention) vs. internal toolkit dissemination alone (control)	RCT	+	x							Both the intervention and control groups had significant pre-post care improvements in the patient experience of care coordination, but with no significant between-group difference over time (95% CI (- 0.47, 0.50)) – i.e., no benefit for adding the more resource-intensive facilitating coaching component.
Zulman et al., 2019	Augmented care coordination activities for high-risk patients (beyond standard PCMH) Augmented care coordination activities for patients at high risk for hospitalization. Activities include home visits, health coaching, accompaniment to specialists, and intensive social work. These activities were delivered in addition to the standard PCMHs' support (control).	RCT	x	+	x	+	+	x			Care coordination outcomes: Intervention had better results than the controls for 2/6 SHEPS items: talked about health goals (73.1% vs. 68.4%; 95% CI= 1.00–1.59) and talked about barriers to taking care of health (60.4% vs. 54.8%; 95% CI= 1.02–1.56). PACIC chronic illness care scale: Intervention group had higher mean scores (2.91 vs. 2.75, $P=.022$). Trust outcomes: Intervention better than controls (60.5% vs. 53.1%; 95% CI=1.10–1.66). Satisfaction outcomes: Intervention better than controls for satisfaction with primary care services (36.5% vs. 31.7%; 95% CI= 1.05–1.47) but not for other items or total score. Perceived access outcomes: no significant differences.
Dorr et al., 2016	Encouraging selection of high-value care coordination QI goals from a 12-item list (beyond standard QI) Encouragement of PCMH sites (state of Oregon) for selecting QI goals from a list of 12 high value elements in addition to the standard QI facilitation (control): standard QI had IT-based milestone reporting, financial incentives on self-selected QI goals, and QI practice facilitator.	RCT							+	x	The intervention performed better in 2 of 11 composite items, including "Follow-up on test results" ($p=.091$) and "Patients' rating of the provider" ($p=.091$). The control group performed better in "Access to care" ($p=.093$).
Nemh ard et al., 2020	Nurses take on added coordination & navigating support for high-risk patients , i.e., socially vulnerable (beyond PCMH).	NR-CT							x		Difference-in-differences analysis showed no significant difference in patient care experiences between the groups ($p= 0.07$).

	Nursing staff taking on additional coordination and navigation support roles for high-risk, socially vulnerable patients. Nurses also led weekly panel management meetings with enrollees' primary care and behavioral health providers. New role supported by training, a "playbook", and new electronic dashboard. Feedback reports provided to nurses on their performance.										
Jones et al., 2019	Tailoring PCMH model to homeless patients (beyond standard model)	Obs -C			+	x					In adjusted analyses, compared to same-facility controls, intervention group had better experiences in access ($p<.001$), communication ($p<.01$), office staff helpfulness/courtesy ($p<.01$), provider ratings ($p<.05$), and comprehensiveness ($p<.05$). When compared to facilities without intervention, significant differences were found for communication and self-management support ($p<.05$). Care coordination and shared decision-making were not significantly different for the intervention group versus either comparator.
	Homeless-tailored medical home with tailored resources (above standard VA primary care - controls) to enhance access, address social determinants, and facilitate housing placement. For instance, providers are trained to deliver care for the homeless and further coordinate care with other services (e.g., mental health, addiction, and social).										
Tung et al., 2018	Practice transformation guided and tailored to the safety net context	Obs -C				+	x				In the adjusted models, groups did not have significantly different total PACIC scores (95% <i>CI</i> : -1.1 to 16.5). However, at completion of the intervention, a 10-point higher PCMH capability score was associated with 8.9 points higher total PACIC score (95% <i>CI</i> : 3.1–14.7). Greater patient experience scores in favor of the high capability group were also observed in 4/5 subdomains (patient activation, delivery system design, contextual care, and follow-up/coordination).
	Practice transformation guided by eight <i>change concepts</i> , based on medical home principles tailored to the safety-net setting, supported locally by a Regional Coordinating Center with practice coaches. While all sites had the same intervention, the study compares high-improvement medical home transformation (high-capability settings) vs. low-improvement settings (controls).										
Nguyen et al., 2020	Learning collaborative facilitating a primary-care practice transformation	Obs -C								+ X	Relative to comparison practices, the communication score in intervention practices increased by 1.47 percentage points on a 100-point scale ($P = .02$) between pre and post periods. No significant immediate improvements in the 5 other composite measures of patient experience of care.
	Learning collaborative for a primary care transformation initiative (multi-year, multi-site, phased, using lump sum payments) toward a team-based care. The collaborative included regular care team huddles, coaching, triannual 1.5-day learning sessions, and monthly webinars to discuss QI strategies.										

Table 2: Enhanced care coordination for Patient-Centered Medical Homes (PCMHs) or other primary care practices evaluated from the patient experience perspective as a primary outcome. **Keys:** Results per measure & metric: + significant positive impact; x non-significant impact.

Legend: HCSHS: Health Care (System) Hassles Scale; SHEP: VA's Survey of Healthcare Experiences of Patients (adapted from CAHPS); PACIC: Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care; CSI: Consumer Satisfaction Index; CG-CAHPS: Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and System Clinician & Group Survey; PES: Patient Experience Survey; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; NR-CT: Non-Randomized Controlled Trials; PPT: Pre-Post Test study; Obs-C: Observational, comparative study. QI: Quality Improvement. VA: Veterans Administration. IT: Information Technology. ^a Jones et al. specifically reported use of the PCMH-SHEPS. ^b Tung et al. reported use of a modified version of the PACIC.

coordination QI goals (beyond standard QI facilitation: control group) and found mixed results.³⁵ These RCTs had some appraised risks of bias (e.g., potential contamination;³³ selection bias³⁵).

Among other study types, one non-randomized trial focused on nurses taking on additional care coordination and navigation support for socially vulnerable patients, beyond a PCMH model (control), and found close but no significant differences between groups ($p=0.07$).³⁶ Finally, three observational studies (tailoring PCMH model to homeless patients;³² practice transformation tailored to the safety nets;³⁸ learning collaborative³⁷) showed mixed results and had substantive risks of bias (Table 1).

b) Enhanced discharge or follow-up supports - after hospital or surgical care ($n=8$)

Table 3 summarizes the methods and **Table 4** the interventions and results for the studies on enhanced discharge support, including patient education or follow-up. All studies were based in the US.

Among the three RCTs, two focused on patient discharge education using the *teach back* method, after a health literacy assessment²⁶ or as part of a multi-modal language-concordant discharge support and telephone follow-up.²⁷ None of the study interventions led to better experience results than standard care. The other RCT was on a web-based, surgical patient education tool for pre-operative & follow-up instructions, and found improvements in the overall experience score.²⁸ However, several risks of bias were appraised in all the RCTs such

	Design & Analysis	Setting	Risk of Bias – level (within each study design) & Described risks	
van Eck et al., 2018	Single-site RCT (patient-level randomization) with posttest measure only. T test and analysis of variance on covariates.	Private practice orthopedic clinic, outpatient and ambulatory surgery; Kerlan Jobe Orthopaedic Clinic, California, USA	RCT	Single site with 2 surgeons. Patients not blinded to group allocation. No baseline outcomes. No correction for multiple comparisons. Limited follow-up time (only two weeks of post-assessment).
Griffey et al., 2015	Single-center RCT (patient-level randomization) with intention-to-treat analysis. Multivariable ordinal logistic regression.	Hospital, emergency department; Barnes Jewish Hospital, St. Louis, Missouri, USA	RCT	No baseline outcomes assessed. Single site. Convenience sampling prior to randomization. About 40% loss to follow-up. No random sequence generation for group assignment or allocation concealment. Contamination may have occurred. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Chan et al., 2015	RCT (patient-level randomization stratified by language). χ^2 test on the top-box scores. Sensitivity and subgroup analyses.	Safety-net hospital, various units (internal medicine, family medicine, cardiology, neurology); San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center, California, USA	RCT	No baseline outcomes assessed. Single site. Only one month of post-intervention data. Medical teams not blinded to presence of intervention, and possible contamination across nurses within the hospital. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Centrella-Nigro & Alexander, 2017	Nonrandomized trial, two units of one hospital. Independent T tests.	Community Magnet-designated hospital, medical units (intervention unit mainly neurological patients, control unit mainly genitourinary and infectious diseases); Northern New Jersey, USA	NR-CT	No randomization. Clinical differences in units. Difference in baseline outcomes not adjusted for. Baseline characteristics not assessed or adjusted for. Potential for contamination because all units were in a single hospital. No correction for multiple comparisons. Lack of transparent reporting of participant numbers pre- and post-intervention. No combined analysis of between-group and between-time.
Cancino et al., 2017	Nonrandomized posttest design, two control groups with standard discharge (one in same unit and one in different unit). χ^2 test on the top-box scores.	Safety-net hospital, adult inpatient family medicine (adult general medical units as one comparator); Boston Medical Center, Massachusetts, USA	NR-CT	No randomization. No baseline characteristics or outcomes data. No adjustment for covariates or correction for multiple comparisons. Low response rate. Possibility for contamination as some controls were within the same unit. Nurses selected patients (potential selection bias). Results not transferable to sites with higher baseline scores.
Schreiter et al., 2021	Historical cohort of matched controls at patient level. Wilcoxon rank-sum for scores and Fisher exact test for % of top-box scores.	Academic hospital, transition from surgery; University of Wisconsin Hospital, Wisconsin, USA	Obs-C	No randomization. Historical controls even though matched for some clinical indicators. Single site. No baseline outcomes assessed. Unadjusted analyses for outcome of patient experience. No correction for multiple comparisons.
Thum et al., 2022	Pre- and post-test, one organization with multiple units. χ^2 on top-box scores and Kruskal-Wallis for the percentile rank change.	Academic tertiary care center and its affiliated community hospital; Thomas Jefferson University Hospital and affiliate, USA	PPT	No control group. Eligibility criteria not clearly described. Single pretest (although long preintervention period). No establishment of stable baseline through multiple measurement time points. No report on the numbers of surveys used for the analysis, only those mailed. No correction for multiple comparisons.
March et al., 2022	Pre- and post- test, single-center retrospective review of a pilot program. χ^2 test on the top-box score after T test on baseline characteristics.	Hospital, pharmacy; Methodist University Hospital, Memphis, Tennessee, USA	PPT	Retrospective, single-site pre-post-test analysis not adjusted for covariates. No establishment of stable baseline through multiple measurement time points. No correction for multiple comparisons. Intervention not delivered to all the eligible patients (business hours). No report on the number of patient experience surveys collected. Risks of selected findings: two different designs for two outcomes.

Table 3: Summary of study methods and risk-of-bias assessment: discharge education and follow-up or transitional support from an inpatient or surgical setting. Legend: RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; NR-CT: Non-Randomized Controlled Trial; PPT: Pre-Post Test study; Obs-C: Observational, comparative study.

			OAS - CAHPS	CAHPS	CTM-3		HCAHPS		Pres Ganey	
	Intervention Type <u>Discharge education & post-discharge supports:</u>	Design	Score	Score	Score	Top-Box	Top-Box	Percentile	Top-Box	Results - Descriptive Synthesis
van Eck et al., 2018	Web-based, Surgical Patient Education Tool for pre-operative & follow-up instructions The intervention group received access to an interactive web-based education tool in addition to routine perioperative instructions. The tool included instructions 14 days before and after the surgery, including preoperative instructions, day-of-surgery expectations, and postoperative precautions. A random subset of intervention patients also accessed links to videos demonstrating the surgery.	RCT	+	x						Statistically significant higher OAS CAHPS total patient experience score for the intervention vs. control (97 ± 5 vs. 94 ± 8 ; $P = .019$). At the domain level, groups only significantly differed for “recovery” (92 ± 13 for intervention vs. 82 ± 23 for control; $P = .001$). No significant difference in total patient satisfaction score based on addition of video.
Griffey et al., 2015	Teach back for discharge instructions , after health literacy assessment <i>Teach back</i> , after a rapid health literacy assessment, applied to discharge instructions. Delivered by trained medical student Research Assistant (RA) alongside charge nurses who have had <i>teach back</i> education. Control group had usual discharge instructions.	RCT		x						No significant differences in the multivariable models for any the 4 items on the standard patient-reported experience measure (P values from 0.19 to 0.81), even though the intervention group had higher comprehension of medication ($P < .02$), self-care ($P < .03$), and follow-up instructions ($P < .0001$).
Chan et al., 2015	Language-concordant discharge support, follow up and transitional support , based on the ReEngineered Discharge, including <i>teach back</i> & motivational interviewing Language-concordant, nurse-led, hospital-based, tailored discharge support, follow-up, and care transition intervention (in addition to usual discharge planning as control group). Language-concordant inpatient nurse visits, motivational interviewing, <i>teach back</i> , discharge materials (a booklet in the patients’ native language - conceptually like that used in ReEngineered Discharge (RED)), and phone follow-up that included, for example, a nurse organizing post-discharge services for participants or transportation plans for scheduled appointments, including instructions for arranging follow-up services, if necessary.	RCT			x	x	x			No statistically significant differences between groups in CTM-3 scores (80.5 % vs. 78.5 %; $p = 0.18$) or HCAHPS discharge communication domain score (74.8 % vs. 68.7 %; $p = 0.11$), medicine communication (44.5 % vs. 53.1 %; $p = 0.13$), or nurse communication (67.9 % vs. 64.9 %; $p = 0.43$) scores. When stratified by language, no significant differences were seen.
Centre lla-	Teach back for discharge instructions , after 1-hour training of nurses	NR-CT		+	x					Significant improvement in top box percentages for 1 of 7 tested items for the intervention group, on information about new

Nigro & Alexander, 2017	Teach-back implementation, after 1-hour, multi-modal training of nurses. Regular audits of charts by nurse supervisors for assessing fidelity.									medicine: 53.2% vs. 78.5%, $p = .025$. That item had a non-significant change for the control group: $p = .932$
Cancio et al., 2017	Use of the ReEngineered Discharge (RED) Toolkit for selected high-complexity cases	NR-CT							+ x	Better top box percentages on the item about instructions: 61% vs. 35% same-unit controls ($p < .001$) vs 41% other-units controls (both $p < .001$). No significant difference on the item about feeling ready to be discharged: 45% vs. 35% same-unit controls ($P = .15$) vs. 51% other-units' controls ($p = .25$).
	Implementation of the ReEngineered Discharge (RED) Toolkit: 12-item patient education & discharge preparation processes. A trained nurse delivered the RED to about three patients a day, selected based on high-complexity discharge planning or history of readmissions.									
Schreier et al., 2021	Transitional follow-up support (telephone) after hospital discharge with possible remediation plans and resources	Obs-C							+ x	Intervention got greater percentages of top-box scores than controls in 5 of 11 items: asking about having the needed help (100% vs. 93%, $p < .01$), educational materials (68% vs. 55% $p < .01$), understanding of responsibilities (69% vs. 59%, $p = .02$), instructions on whom to call with post-discharge questions (76% vs. 69%; $p = .04$), and global experience (57% vs. 46%, $p = .02$). But the readiness for and discharge satisfaction were similar.
	Telephone-based, continued follow-up care delivered by nurses after hospital discharge for: medication reconciliation, patient education about key symptoms that warrant contact with providers and ensuring that contact nurse information and follow-up appointments are in place, including remediation care (e.g., same-day clinic appointment, visit to the emergency room, or direct ward admission) if required.									
Thum et al., 2022	Teach back and new discharge summary, with workflow redesign	PPT					+	+	x	Improved top-box percentages: Care Transitions, 52.4%–54.5% ($p < .001$); Discharge Information, 87.4%–90.1% ($p < .001$). Improved percentile rank 45.2–74.3 ($p = .0202$) for Discharge Information. The change in the percentiles for Care Transitions did not reach statistical significance: 56.8–65.8 ($p = .0591$).
	Nurses were trained in <i>teach back</i> intervention, their workflow was redesigned to accommodate the role, and a new discharge summary was created – linked to a <i>hard stop</i> in the electronic health record.									
March et al., 2022	Pharmacist-led discharge education & follow-up on medication reconciliation	PPT					+			Significant improvement in the top-box scores (52.6% vs. 67.3%; $p = < .001$) in the composite of medication-related HCAHPS results and its specific items: “tell you what the medicine was for” (67.7% vs. 81.9%; $p = .018$), “describe possible medicine side effects” (37.7% vs. 58.9%; $p = 0.004$), and “understood the purpose of taking medications” (52.3% vs. 63.7%; $p = .035$).
	Pharmacist-led medication reconciliation and education, sensitive to health literacy levels, prior and post discharge following alerts from the Electronic Medical Recording system.									

Table 4: Discharge education and post-discharge follow-up (e.g., transitional care supports) after inpatient or surgical care evaluated from the patient experience perspective as a primary outcome.

Legend: OAS-CAHPS: Outpatient and Ambulatory Surgery Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and System; CAHPS: Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and System; CTM-3: Care Transitions Measure; HCAHPS: Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; NR-CT: Non-Randomized Controlled Trials; PPT: Pre-Post Test study; Obs-C: Observational, comparative study.

single-center study,²⁶⁻²⁸ limited follow-up,^{27 28} or no correction for multiple comparisons (Table 3).²⁶⁻²⁸

Two non-randomized trials were found: one on the implementation of *ReEngineered Discharge* for three patients a day that nurses selected as complex cases,¹⁶ the other on *teach back* discharge education by nurses.³¹ Both achieved improvements in selected patient experience items (e.g., information provision). In turn, an observational study with historical controls focused on a telephone follow-up after hospital discharge with possible remediation plans or rescue resources (e.g., same-day clinic appointment);¹⁵ it achieved higher percentages of top-box scores (i.e., highest score on the given patient experience items) compared to controls for 5 of the 11 patient experience items. Several risks of bias applied to the three studies (Table 3), including risks of contamination and unadjusted analyses.

Finally, two pre-post studies were included, one using *teach back* and other discharge redesigns,²⁹ the other a pharmacist-led discharge education and follow-up intervention.³⁰ These provided either positive or mixed results (improvement in top box percentages but not in the percentile ranks with peer providers). In addition to the uncontrolled study design, these studies had multiple substantive risks of bias (Table 3), limiting the ability to draw conclusions.

Discussion

This knowledge synthesis addresses a gap in the literature regarding the impact of care coordination or discharge support improvement on standardized patient experience measures. Health-service improvement activities, including enhanced supports or tailoring for vulnerable

populations, achieved mixed to null improvements in the patient experience with the care coordination or discharge processes, compared to standard models of care or simpler quality-improvement supports. This was found by seven studies (including three multi-site RCTs) on enhanced QI support provided to PCHMs or other primary care practices. It was also found by eight studies on enhanced discharge support such as patient education, reengineered discharge, and/or telephone follow-up or transitional support. These latter studies, as a body of literature, had a greater risk of bias.

Several risks of bias were identified in the reviewed literature across the study designs, limiting the internal and external validity of the findings. The studies on enhanced discharge support were typically single center. Even the multi-site studies on enhanced care coordination were performed within a network or organization. Hence, it is unknown how the findings apply elsewhere. For instance, the study with the lowest appraised risks of bias found that the more resource-intensive type of QI support provided to PCMH units was not superior to the dissemination of the QI tool alone for driving improvements in patient experience of care coordination activities. But this finding directly applies to the VHA. The VHA has been subject to systematic QI programs, studies, or activities,^{39 40} which may have contributed to building the capacity for effective QI activities across their units as merely supported by an online QI tool, even without a centralized and more costly QI facilitation. The same may not apply to other healthcare organizations and development circumstances. Because context is a vital variable in QI science,⁴¹ future studies may consider generating evidence with validity across organizations and networks and their varied sets of circumstances. QI collaboratives or hubs, including those

externally funded, might equitably foster the capacity to develop and assess QI activities across service delivery organizations, say within a jurisdiction within the US.⁴²

Varied study designs were included here. While RCTs can produce the most solid evidence when well conducted, a wider range of designs were included to reflect real-world improvement activities and evaluations, including pragmatic constraints.⁴³ Study limitations within each design were reflected in the appraised risks of bias, especially among the single-center discharge support studies. Moreover, studies' delivery of the tested intervention was sometimes pragmatically constrained, too. For instance, a pharmacist-led patient education intervention was performed for patients discharged only during particular hours.³⁰ Similarly, a reengineered discharge support program was capped at a number of patients per day as selected by nurses as "complex" cases.¹⁶ These limitations may affect the fidelity of the improvement interventions and accuracy of the results and may often reflect budget or other limitations (e.g., human resources, in-house improvement or research expertise) for the conduct or evaluation of QI activities.⁴³ Percentile ranks (i.e., provider ranks in patient experience performance relative to peers) were used as an additional metric only in one included paper (with a pre-post design), showing mixed results while the percentage of top-box scores had positive results.²⁹ Reporting results in more than one metric of a patient experience measure can be important, especially for percentile ranks in pre-post studies to partly overcome the lack of a control group or the use of historical ones. Overall, the inclusion of varied study designs, interventions, and patient experience measures and metrics may inform further improvement activities and its study, at varying levels of available resources.

Across study designs, some common intervention approaches were found, such as enhanced supports for QI facilitation on care coordination^{34 35} or tailored approaches for at-risk populations (e.g., socially vulnerable, homeless),^{32 33 36 38} often showing mixed patient experience results relative to standard supports. In turn, discharge support approaches that used a *reengineered discharge* or *teach back* strategies were also common but with less favorable results when compared to studies and reviews on other outcomes, such as reducing readmissions.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ For example, one recent systematic review of *teach back* strategies applied to discharge education identified a 45% reduction in 30-day readmission.⁴⁶ Here, studies using the *teach back* method had mixed results overall^{26 27 29 31} but neutral results in the RCTs,^{26 27} either as the main strategy²⁶ or as part of a multi-modal strategy that also included a reengineered discharge, motivational interviewing, follow-up and transitional support, and overall language-concordant supports.²⁷ When found to be effective compared to a control intervention, the *teach back* method was used in isolation and specifically improved the patient experience with receiving information about new medicines.³¹ For transitional care post discharge, which was rarely addressed in the body of literature reviewed, the multi-modal intervention that included this component found neutral results,²⁷ whereas the intervention specifically focused on this component found positive results in five patient experience items.³⁰ Further research could compare the cost-effectiveness of multi-modal and single-method improvement approaches as well as determine whether multi-modal interventions, due to their complexity, are delivered with fidelity to the main active ingredients of the intervention.^{47 48}

To be impactful on the patient experience, it may be key for studies to assess how patient-centered (e.g., how attentive, respectful, responsive, with genuine interest) was the delivery of

a *teach back*, telephonic transitional support, and other supportive patient-provider communications intervention. This might include how tailored the communication was to the individual patient¹⁸ to avoid the risks of being perceived as just another *box-ticking* exercise.⁴⁹ Finally, in alignment with growing focus on coproduction and on experience-based codesign for health-service improvement activities,^{50 51} the patient experience with care can be further engaged all the way through from the intervention codesign to its evaluation. The literature reviewed here had no focus on engaging the patient perspective in the codesign of the improvement interventions.

All the included studies were conducted in the US, which may result from multiple factors. First, the CAHPS program in the US provides established, widely used standardized patient experience measures, which was a criterion for inclusion. Second, providers' performance on CAHPS measures is publicly reported and included in some value-based purchasing programs,¹¹ which may have driven the interest of providers to develop and report these improvement. Third, CAHPS has been a primary quality target of a "person-centered" medical home, with the US National Committee for Quality Assurance recommending administration of the CAHPS PCMH survey for PCMH transformation, and a related study found that CAHPS surveys were considered actionable for PCMH transformation.⁵² Fourth, the VHA in the US has its own patient experience measurement system, which was used a standardized assessment measure in studies externally reported and included here.^{33 34} Fifth, improvement activities otherwise fitting the study eligibility criteria from other countries may have been conducted but not reported in English or through peer-reviewed journals.

This review has several limitations. First, it excluded articles published in languages other than English or in the grey literature, which affects representativeness but reflects peer-reviewed knowledge readily available to an international audience. Second, representativeness is also affected by the exclusion of articles published before 2015, which allowed for a synthesis of contemporary approaches in an ever-changing healthcare delivery landscape. Third, for the data extraction, the second reviewer performed only confirmation tasks while two independent reviewer roles were used for all other tasks. Fourth, we did not perform a formal grading of the evidence or of the risks of bias within or across study types, within heterogenic health service delivery contexts, interventions, and study methods. Fifth, we did not include studies that used patient experience as a secondary study outcome. While including these studies may have added to the pool of evidence, it would have risked including studies in which improving the patient experience of care was not a primary intention.

Conclusion:

Enhanced support for improving care coordination and discharge support had mixed or neutral results for improving the patient experience with care beyond standard care or simpler supports. Substantial risk of bias and lack of comparison between improvement approaches impede firmer conclusions, especially for the studies on enhanced discharge support, which were also typically single center. The multi-site studies on enhanced care coordination were also limited by being performed within an integrated delivery system, network, or organization, limiting the generalizability of the results across organizational and service delivery contexts.

412 Improving the person-centeredness of care may require strengthening the capacity to fund,
413 design, conduct, and evaluate improvement studies focused on patient experience across
414 providers and their networks. Improving the patient experience with care coordination and
415 discharge may require the strengthening of the improvement studies, and further engaging the
416 patient perspective from the intervention development to its evaluation.

417

418

References

1. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. What Is Patient Experience? Rockville, MD [Available from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/cahps/about-cahps/patient-experience/index.html>] accessed December 2022.
2. Berwick DM. A user's manual for the IOM's 'Quality Chasm' report. *Health affairs (Project Hope)* 2002;21(3):80-90. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.21.3.80 [published Online First: 2002/05/25]
3. Nundy S, Cooper LA, Mate KS. The Quintuple Aim for Health Care Improvement: A New Imperative to Advance Health Equity. *Jama* 2022;327(6):521-22. doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.25181 [published Online First: 2022/01/22]
4. Navarro S, Ochoa CY, Chan E, et al. Will Improvements in Patient Experience With Care Impact Clinical and Quality of Care Outcomes?: A Systematic Review. *Medical care* 2021;59(9):843-56. doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001598 [published Online First: 2021/06/25]
5. Goldfarb MJ, Bibas L, Bartlett V, et al. Outcomes of Patient- and Family-Centered Care Interventions in the ICU: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Critical care medicine* 2017;45(10):1751-61. doi: 10.1097/ccm.0000000000002624 [published Online First: 2017/07/28]
6. Park M, Giap TT, Lee M, et al. Patient- and family-centered care interventions for improving the quality of health care: A review of systematic reviews. *International journal of nursing studies* 2018;87:69-83. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.07.006 [published Online First: 2018/07/30]
7. Rathert C, Wyrwich MD, Boren SA. Patient-centered care and outcomes: a systematic review of the literature. *Med Care Res Rev* 2013;70(4):351-79. doi: 10.1177/1077558712465774 [published Online First: 2012/11/20]
8. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. . Washington, DC, 2001.
9. National Quality Forum. The Care We Need: Driving better outcomes for people and communities: NQF, 2020.
10. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. The CAHPS Program Rockville, MD [Available from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/cahps/about-cahps/cahps-program/index.html>] accessed December 22.
11. Elliott MN, Beckett MK, Lehrman WG, et al. Understanding The Role Played By Medicare's Patient Experience Points System In Hospital Reimbursement. *Health Affairs* 2016;35(9):1673-80. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0691
12. Jamieson Gilmore K, Corazza I, Coletta L, Allin S. The uses of Patient Reported Experience Measures in health systems: A systematic narrative review. *Health policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)* 2023;128:1-10. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2022.07.008 [published Online First: 2022/08/08]
13. Mihaljevic AL, Doerr-Harim C, Kalkum E, Strunk G. Measuring patient centeredness with German language Patient-Reported Experience Measures (PREM)-A systematic review and qualitative analysis according to COSMIN. *PLoS One* 2022;17(11):e0264045. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0264045 [published Online First: 2022/11/30]
14. Quigley DD, Elliott MN, Slaughter ME, et al. Shadow Coaching Improves Patient Experience With Care, But Gains Erode Later. *Medical care* 2021 doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001629 [published Online First: 2021/08/14]
15. Schreiter NA, Fisher A, Barrett JR, et al. A telephone-based surgical transitional care program with improved patient satisfaction scores and fiscal neutrality. *Surgery* 2021;169(2):347-55. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2020.09.015 [published Online First: 2020/10/24]

16. Cancino RS, Manasseh C, Kwong L, et al. Project RED impacts patient experience. *J Patient Exp* 2017;4(4):185-90. doi: 10.1177/2374373517714454 [published Online First: 20170616]
17. John JR, Jani H, Peters K, et al. The Effectiveness of Patient-Centred Medical Home-Based Models of Care versus Standard Primary Care in Chronic Disease Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised and Non-Randomised Controlled Trials. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17(18) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17186886 [published Online First: 20200921]
18. Gonçalves-Bradley DC, Lannin NA, Clemson L, et al. Discharge planning from hospital. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2022;2(2):Cd000313. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000313.pub6 [published Online First: 20220224]
19. Coffey A, Leahy-Warren P, Savage E, et al. Interventions to Promote Early Discharge and Avoid Inappropriate Hospital (Re)Admission: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;16(14) doi: 10.3390/ijerph16142457 [published Online First: 20190710]
20. Oyesanya TO, Loflin C, Byom L, et al. Transitions of care interventions to improve quality of life among patients hospitalized with acute conditions: a systematic literature review. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2021;19(1):36. doi: 10.1186/s12955-021-01672-5 [published Online First: 20210129]
21. Braet A, Weltens C, Sermeus W. Effectiveness of discharge interventions from hospital to home on hospital readmissions: a systematic review. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep* 2016;14(2):106-73. doi: 10.11124/jbisir-2016-2381
22. Duan-Porter W, Ullman K, Majeski B, et al. Care Coordination Models and Tools-Systematic Review and Key Informant Interviews. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;37(6):1367-79. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-07158-w [published Online First: 20211026]
23. Centers for Medicare & Medication Services. HCAHPS: Patients' Perspectives of Care Survey 2021 [Available from: HCAHPS: Patients' Perspectives of Care Survey.
24. Coleman EA, Boult C. Improving the quality of transitional care for persons with complex care needs. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003;51(4):556-7. doi: 10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.51186.x
25. Sezgin D, O'Caoimh R, O'Donovan MR, et al. Defining the characteristics of intermediate care models including transitional care: an international Delphi study. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2020;32(11):2399-410. doi: 10.1007/s40520-020-01579-z [published Online First: 20200519]
26. Griffey RT, Shin N, Jones S, et al. The impact of teach-back on comprehension of discharge instructions and satisfaction among emergency patients with limited health literacy: A randomized, controlled study. *J Commun Healthc* 2015;8(1):10-21. doi: 10.1179/1753807615y.0000000001
27. Chan B, Goldman LE, Sarkar U, et al. The effect of a care transition intervention on the patient experience of older multi-lingual adults in the safety net: results of a randomized controlled trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30(12):1788-94. doi: 10.1007/s11606-015-3362-y
28. van Eck CF, Toor A, Banffy MB, Gambardella RA. Web-based education prior to outpatient orthopaedic surgery enhances early patient satisfaction scores: a prospective randomized controlled study. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2018;6(1):2325967117751418. doi: 10.1177/2325967117751418 [published Online First: 20180126]
29. Thum A, Ackermann L, Edger MB, Riggio J. Improving the discharge experience of hospital patients through standard tools and methods of education. *J Healthc Qual* 2022;44(2):113-21. doi: 10.1097/jhq.0000000000000325
30. March KL, Peters MJ, Finch CK, et al. Pharmacist transition-of-care services improve patient satisfaction and decrease hospital readmissions. *J Pharm Pract* 2022;35(1):86-93. doi: 10.1177/0897190020958264 [published Online First: 20200918]
31. Centrella-Nigro AM, Alexander C. Using the teach-back method in patient education to improve patient satisfaction. *J Contin Educ Nurs* 2017;48(1):47-52. doi: 10.3928/00220124-20170110-10

32. Jones AL, Hausmann LRM, Kertesz SG, et al. Providing positive primary care experiences for homeless veterans through tailored medical homes: The Veterans Health Administration's homeless patient aligned care teams. *Med Care* 2019;57(4):270-78. doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001070
33. Zulman DM, Chang ET, Wong A, et al. Effects of intensive primary care on high-need patient experiences: survey findings from a Veterans Affairs randomized quality improvement trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2019;34(Suppl 1):75-81. doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-04965-0
34. Noël PH, Barnard JM, Leng M, et al. The Coordination Toolkit and Coaching project: cluster-randomized quality improvement initiative to improve patient experience of care coordination. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;37(1):95-103. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-06926-y [published Online First: 20210609]
35. Dorr DA, Anastas T, Ramsey K, et al. Effect of a pragmatic, cluster-randomized controlled trial on patient experience with care: The Transforming Outcomes for Patients through Medical Home Evaluation and Redesign (TOPMED) study. *Med Care* 2016;54(8):745-51. doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000000552
36. Nembhard IM, Buta E, Lee YSH, et al. A quasi-experiment assessing the six-months effects of a nurse care coordination program on patient care experiences and clinician teamwork in community health centers. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020;20(1):137. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-4986-0 [published Online First: 20200224]
37. Nguyen KH, Chien AT, Meyers DJ, et al. Team-based primary care practice transformation initiative and changes in patient experience and recommended cancer screening rates. *Inquiry* 2020;57:46958020952911. doi: 10.1177/0046958020952911
38. Tung EL, Gao Y, Peek ME, et al. Patient experience of chronic illness care and medical home transformation in safety net clinics. *Health Serv Res* 2018;53(1):469-88. doi: 10.1111/1475-6773.12608 [published Online First: 20170530]
39. Braganza MZ, Kilbourne AM. The Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI) Impact Framework: Measuring the Real-world Impact of Implementation Science. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2021;36(2):396-403. doi: 10.1007/s11606-020-06143-z [published Online First: 20200901]
40. Hagedorn H, Hogan M, Smith JL, et al. Lessons learned about implementing research evidence into clinical practice. Experiences from VA QUERI. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2006;21 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S21-4. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00358.x
41. Coles E, Anderson J, Maxwell M, et al. The influence of contextual factors on healthcare quality improvement initiatives: a realist review. *Systematic reviews* 2020;9(1):94. doi: 10.1186/s13643-020-01344-3 [published Online First: 20200426]
42. The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center. Quality Improvement Hub collaborative aims to enhance health care across Ohio 2023 [Available from: <https://wexnermedical.osu.edu/departments/innovations/urology/quality-improvement-hub> accessed October 20, 2023].
43. Jesus TS, Papadimitriou C, Pinho CS, Hoenig H. Key Characteristics of Rehabilitation Quality Improvement Publications: Scoping Review From 2010 to 2016. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2018;99(6):1141-48.e4. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.08.491 [published Online First: 20170928]
44. Berkowitz RE, Fang Z, Helfand BK, et al. Project ReEngineered Discharge (RED) lowers hospital readmissions of patients discharged from a skilled nursing facility. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 2013;14(10):736-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2013.03.004 [published Online First: 2013/04/24]
45. Gardner RL, Pelland K, Youssef R, et al. Reducing Hospital Readmissions Through a Skilled Nursing Facility Discharge Intervention: A Pragmatic Trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors*

- Association 2020;21(4):508-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2019.10.001 [published Online First: 2019/12/10]
46. Oh EG, Lee HJ, Yang YL, Kim YM. Effectiveness of Discharge Education With the Teach-Back Method on 30-Day Readmission: A Systematic Review. *J Patient Saf* 2021;17(4):305-10. doi: 10.1097/pts.0000000000000596
47. Meddings J, Manojlovich M, Ameling JM, et al. Quantitative Results of a National Intervention to Prevent Hospital-Acquired Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection: A Pre-Post Observational Study. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;171(7_Suppl):S38-s44. doi: 10.7326/m18-3534
48. Swindle T, Selig JP, Rutledge JM, et al. Fidelity monitoring in complex interventions: a case study of the WISE intervention. *Arch Public Health* 2018;76:53. doi: 10.1186/s13690-018-0292-2 [published Online First: 20180829]
49. Jesus TS, Papadimitriou C, Bright FA, et al. Person-Centered Rehabilitation Model: Framing the Concept and Practice of Person-Centered Adult Physical Rehabilitation Based on a Scoping Review and Thematic Analysis of the Literature. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2022;103(1):106-20. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2021.05.005 [published Online First: 20210703]
50. Green T, Bonner A, Teleni L, et al. Use and reporting of experience-based codesign studies in the healthcare setting: a systematic review. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2020;29(1):64-76. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2019-009570 [published Online First: 20190923]
51. Jesus TS, Stern BZ, Struhar J, et al. The use of patient experience feedback in rehabilitation quality improvement and codesign activities: Scoping review of the literature. *Clin Rehabil* 2023;37(2):261-76. doi: 10.1177/02692155221126690 [published Online First: 20220916]
52. Quigley DD, Qureshi N, AlMasarweh L, Hays RD. Using CAHPS patient experience data for patient-centered medical home transformation. *The American journal of managed care* 2021;27(9):e322-e29. doi: 10.37765/ajmc.2021.88745 [published Online First: 2021/09/18]