

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

3

4 **Authors:**

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

8 1. Division of Occupational Therapy, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences,
9 College of Medicine, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA.

10 2. Center for Education in Health Science, Institute for Public Health and Medicine,
11 Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.

12 3. Institute for Healthcare Delivery Science, Department of Population Health Science
13 and Policy, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY, USA

14 4. Center for Child Development & Research, Sensory EL, ROK; Dept. of Physical
15 Medicine and Rehabilitation Medicine, Korehab Clinic, UAE

16 5. Nerve, Muscle and Bone Innovation Center & Oncology Innovation Center, Shirley
17 Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL, USA.

18 6. Center for Rehabilitation Outcomes Research, Shirley Ryan AbilityLab, Chicago, IL,
19 USA.

20 7. Dept. of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Medicine, Northwestern University
21 Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.

22 8. Dept. of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Dept. of Preventive Medicine,
23 Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.

24 9. Center of Innovation for Complex Chronic Healthcare, Hines VA Hospital, Hines, IL,
25 USA

26 10. Center for Health Care Outcomes, RTI International, Chicago, IL, USA.

27

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

29

30 **Corresponding author:** Tiago Jesus

31 **Contact Information**

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

33 The Ohio State University; College of Medicine, School of Health & Rehabilitation Sciences,
34 Division of Occupational Therapy; tiago.jesus@osumc.edu

35 453 West 10th Ave. Columbus, OH 43210

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

37

38 **Author contributions:**

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

42

43 **Declarations:**

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

52

53 **Conflicts of Interest:**

54 All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

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

57

58 **Abstract**

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

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

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

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

79

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

82

83 **Background:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

126

127 **Methods**

128

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

135 **Eligibility:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

167 **Search:**

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

171 **Supplementary Appendix 1** shows the detailed searches for each database.

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

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

179 **Selection:**

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

184 **Data Extraction**

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

191 **Quality Assessment**

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

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

203 **Analytic plan**

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


212

213 **Results**

214

215 **Figure 1** provides the PRISMA flowchart.

216



217
218 **Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart of the systematic review.**

219
220 Among the 1087 unique papers screened, 138 full texts were assessed for eligibility and 15
221 were included.^{15 16 26-38} The absence of impact assessment with inferential statistics was the
222 main reason for exclusion at the full-text assessment. Among papers included, seven focused

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

227

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

229

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

231 summarizes the intervention and study findings.

232 Context-wise, all studies were multi-site PCMHs or other primary care practices, all from a

233 network or integrated health system in the US: Veterans’ Health Administration (VHA),³²⁻³⁴ a

234 statewide PCMH network,³⁵ Federally Qualified Health Centers,³⁶ a Safety Net Medical Homes’

235 Initiative,³⁸ or academically-affiliated primary care practices.³⁷

236 Three studies were RCTs for facilitating site-based improvement projects. A recent RCT at the

237 VHA, with the fewest appraised risks of bias (Table 1), used QI facilitation (e.g., coaching) on the

238 site’s use of a care-coordination improvement toolkit – beyond its internal dissemination

239 (control); both groups improved, with no significant benefit for the more resource-intensive

240 arm.³⁴

241 Another RCT focused on the impact of augmented care coordination for patients with high risk

242 of hospitalization (beyond standard PCMH; control group) and found improvements in 2 of 6

243 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 | Ob s-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 | Ob s-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 | Ob s-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 | SHEP ^a Top-Box | PACIC ^b Categorical | CSI Top Box | 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 | 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, <i>P</i> = .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" (<i>p</i> =.091) and "Patients' rating of the provider" (<i>p</i> =.091). The control group performed better in "Access to care" (<i>p</i> =.093). |
| Nemhard 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 (<i>p</i> = 0.07). |

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

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

262

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

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

267 Among the three RCTs, two focused on patient discharge education using the *teach back*
268 method, after a health literacy assessment²⁶ or as part of a multi-modal language-concordant
269 discharge support and telephone follow-up.²⁷ None of the study interventions led to better
270 experience results than standard care. The other RCT was on a web-based, surgical patient
271 education tool for pre-operative & follow-up instructions, and found improvements in the
272 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. |

274

275

276

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; <i>P</i> = .019). At the domain level, groups only significantly differed for “recovery” (92 ± 13 for intervention vs. 82 ± 23 for control; <i>P</i> = .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 (<i>P</i> values from 0.19 to 0.81), even though the intervention group had higher comprehension of medication (<i>P</i> < .02), self-care (<i>P</i> < .03), and follow-up instructions (<i>P</i> <.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 %; <i>p</i> = 0.18) or HCAHPS discharge communication domain score (74.8 % vs. 68.7 %; <i>p</i> = 0.11), medicine communication (44.5 % vs. 53.1 %; <i>p</i> = 0.13), or nurse communication (67.9 % vs. 64.9 %; <i>p</i> = 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: $p = .932$ | |
| Cancino et al., 2017 | Use of the ReEngineered Discharge (RED) Toolkit for selected high-complexity cases | NR-CT | | | | | | + | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| Schreiter et al., 2021 | Transitional follow-up support (telephone) after hospital discharge with possible remediation plans and resources | Obs-C | | | | | | + | 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 | | | | | + | + | 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. | | | | | | | | |

278

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

281 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
 282 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
 283 study; Obs-C: Observational, comparative study.

284

285 single-center study,²⁶⁻²⁸ limited follow-up,^{27 28} or no correction for multiple comparisons (Table
286 3).²⁶⁻²⁸

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

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

301

302 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

403

404 **Conclusion:**

405 Enhanced support for improving care coordination and discharge support had mixed or neutral
406 results for improving the patient experience with care beyond standard care or simpler
407 supports. Substantial risk of bias and lack of comparison between improvement approaches
408 impede firmer conclusions, especially for the studies on enhanced discharge support, which
409 were also typically single center. The multi-site studies on enhanced care coordination were
410 also limited by being performed within an integrated delivery system, network, or organization,
411 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

419 References

420

- 421 1. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. What Is Patient Experience? Rockville, MD [Available
422 from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/cahps/about-cahps/patient-experience/index.html> accessed
423 December 2022.
- 424 2. Berwick DM. A user's manual for the IOM's 'Quality Chasm' report. *Health affairs (Project Hope)*
425 2002;21(3):80-90. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.21.3.80 [published Online First: 2002/05/25]
- 426 3. Nundy S, Cooper LA, Mate KS. The Quintuple Aim for Health Care Improvement: A New Imperative to
427 Advance Health Equity. *Jama* 2022;327(6):521-22. doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.25181 [published
428 Online First: 2022/01/22]
- 429 4. Navarro S, Ochoa CY, Chan E, et al. Will Improvements in Patient Experience With Care Impact Clinical
430 and Quality of Care Outcomes?: A Systematic Review. *Medical care* 2021;59(9):843-56. doi:
431 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001598 [published Online First: 2021/06/25]
- 432 5. Goldfarb MJ, Bibas L, Bartlett V, et al. Outcomes of Patient- and Family-Centered Care Interventions in
433 the ICU: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Critical care medicine* 2017;45(10):1751-61.
434 doi: 10.1097/ccm.0000000000002624 [published Online First: 2017/07/28]
- 435 6. Park M, Giap TT, Lee M, et al. Patient- and family-centered care interventions for improving the
436 quality of health care: A review of systematic reviews. *International journal of nursing studies*
437 2018;87:69-83. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.07.006 [published Online First: 2018/07/30]
- 438 7. Rathert C, Wyrwich MD, Boren SA. Patient-centered care and outcomes: a systematic review of the
439 literature. *Med Care Res Rev* 2013;70(4):351-79. doi: 10.1177/1077558712465774 [published
440 Online First: 20121120]
- 441 8. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. .
442 Washington, DC, 2001.
- 443 9. National Quality Forum. The Care We Need: Driving better outcomes for people and communities:
444 NQF, 2020.
- 445 10. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. The CAHPS Program Rockville, MD [Available from:
446 <https://www.ahrq.gov/cahps/about-cahps/cahps-program/index.html> accessed December 22.
- 447 11. Elliott MN, Beckett MK, Lehrman WG, et al. Understanding The Role Played By Medicare's Patient
448 Experience Points System In Hospital Reimbursement. *Health Affairs* 2016;35(9):1673-80. doi:
449 10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0691
- 450 12. Jamieson Gilmore K, Corazza I, Coletta L, Allin S. The uses of Patient Reported Experience Measures
451 in health systems: A systematic narrative review. *Health policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*
452 2023;128:1-10. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2022.07.008 [published Online First: 2022/08/08]
- 453 13. Mihaljevic AL, Doerr-Harim C, Kalkum E, Strunk G. Measuring patient centeredness with German
454 language Patient-Reported Experience Measures (PREM)-A systematic review and qualitative
455 analysis according to COSMIN. *PLoS One* 2022;17(11):e0264045. doi:
456 10.1371/journal.pone.0264045 [published Online First: 2022/11/30]
- 457 14. Quigley DD, Elliott MN, Slaughter ME, et al. Shadow Coaching Improves Patient Experience With
458 Care, But Gains Erode Later. *Medical care* 2021 doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001629 [published
459 Online First: 2021/08/14]
- 460 15. Schreiter NA, Fisher A, Barrett JR, et al. A telephone-based surgical transitional care program with
461 improved patient satisfaction scores and fiscal neutrality. *Surgery* 2021;169(2):347-55. doi:
462 10.1016/j.surg.2020.09.015 [published Online First: 2020/10/24]

- 463 16. Cancino RS, Manasseh C, Kwong L, et al. Project RED impacts patient experience. *J Patient Exp*
464 2017;4(4):185-90. doi: 10.1177/2374373517714454 [published Online First: 20170616]
- 465 17. John JR, Jani H, Peters K, et al. The Effectiveness of Patient-Centred Medical Home-Based Models of
466 Care versus Standard Primary Care in Chronic Disease Management: A Systematic Review and
467 Meta-Analysis of Randomised and Non-Randomised Controlled Trials. *Int J Environ Res Public*
468 *Health* 2020;17(18) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17186886 [published Online First: 20200921]
- 469 18. Gonçalves-Bradley DC, Lannin NA, Clemson L, et al. Discharge planning from hospital. *Cochrane*
470 *Database Syst Rev* 2022;2(2):Cd000313. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000313.pub6 [published
471 Online First: 20220224]
- 472 19. Coffey A, Leahy-Warren P, Savage E, et al. Interventions to Promote Early Discharge and Avoid
473 Inappropriate Hospital (Re)Admission: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
474 2019;16(14) doi: 10.3390/ijerph16142457 [published Online First: 20190710]
- 475 20. Oyesanya TO, Loflin C, Byom L, et al. Transitions of care interventions to improve quality of life
476 among patients hospitalized with acute conditions: a systematic literature review. *Health Qual*
477 *Life Outcomes* 2021;19(1):36. doi: 10.1186/s12955-021-01672-5 [published Online First:
478 20210129]
- 479 21. Braet A, Weltens C, Sermeus W. Effectiveness of discharge interventions from hospital to home on
480 hospital readmissions: a systematic review. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep*
481 2016;14(2):106-73. doi: 10.11124/jbisir-2016-2381
- 482 22. Duan-Porter W, Ullman K, Majeski B, et al. Care Coordination Models and Tools-Systematic Review
483 and Key Informant Interviews. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;37(6):1367-79. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-
484 07158-w [published Online First: 20211026]
- 485 23. Centers for Medicare & Medication Services. HCAHPS: Patients' Perspectives of Care Survey 2021
486 [Available from: HCAHPS: Patients' Perspectives of Care Survey.
- 487 24. Coleman EA, Boult C. Improving the quality of transitional care for persons with complex care needs.
488 *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003;51(4):556-7. doi: 10.1046/j.1532-5415.2003.51186.x
- 489 25. Sezgin D, O'Caoimh R, O'Donovan MR, et al. Defining the characteristics of intermediate care models
490 including transitional care: an international Delphi study. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2020;32(11):2399-
491 410. doi: 10.1007/s40520-020-01579-z [published Online First: 20200519]
- 492 26. Griffey RT, Shin N, Jones S, et al. The impact of teach-back on comprehension of discharge
493 instructions and satisfaction among emergency patients with limited health literacy: A
494 randomized, controlled study. *J Commun Healthc* 2015;8(1):10-21. doi:
495 10.1179/1753807615y.0000000001
- 496 27. Chan B, Goldman LE, Sarkar U, et al. The effect of a care transition intervention on the patient
497 experience of older multi-lingual adults in the safety net: results of a randomized controlled
498 trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30(12):1788-94. doi: 10.1007/s11606-015-3362-y
- 499 28. van Eck CF, Toor A, Banffy MB, Gambardella RA. Web-based education prior to outpatient
500 orthopaedic surgery enhances early patient satisfaction scores: a prospective randomized
501 controlled study. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2018;6(1):2325967117751418. doi:
502 10.1177/2325967117751418 [published Online First: 20180126]
- 503 29. Thum A, Ackermann L, Edger MB, Riggio J. Improving the discharge experience of hospital patients
504 through standard tools and methods of education. *J Healthc Qual* 2022;44(2):113-21. doi:
505 10.1097/jhq.0000000000000325
- 506 30. March KL, Peters MJ, Finch CK, et al. Pharmacist transition-of-care services improve patient
507 satisfaction and decrease hospital readmissions. *J Pharm Pract* 2022;35(1):86-93. doi:
508 10.1177/0897190020958264 [published Online First: 20200918]
- 509 31. Centrella-Nigro AM, Alexander C. Using the teach-back method in patient education to improve
510 patient satisfaction. *J Contin Educ Nurs* 2017;48(1):47-52. doi: 10.3928/00220124-20170110-10

- 511 32. Jones AL, Hausmann LRM, Kertesz SG, et al. Providing positive primary care experiences for
512 homeless veterans through tailored medical homes: The Veterans Health Administration's
513 homeless patient aligned care teams. *Med Care* 2019;57(4):270-78. doi:
514 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001070
- 515 33. Zulman DM, Chang ET, Wong A, et al. Effects of intensive primary care on high-need patient
516 experiences: survey findings from a Veterans Affairs randomized quality improvement trial. *J*
517 *Gen Intern Med* 2019;34(Suppl 1):75-81. doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-04965-0
- 518 34. Noël PH, Barnard JM, Leng M, et al. The Coordination Toolkit and Coaching project: cluster-
519 randomized quality improvement initiative to improve patient experience of care coordination. *J*
520 *Gen Intern Med* 2022;37(1):95-103. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-06926-y [published Online First:
521 20210609]
- 522 35. Dorr DA, Anastas T, Ramsey K, et al. Effect of a pragmatic, cluster-randomized controlled trial on
523 patient experience with care: The Transforming Outcomes for Patients through Medical Home
524 Evaluation and Redesign (TOPMED) study. *Med Care* 2016;54(8):745-51. doi:
525 10.1097/mlr.0000000000000552
- 526 36. Nembhard IM, Buta E, Lee YSH, et al. A quasi-experiment assessing the six-months effects of a nurse
527 care coordination program on patient care experiences and clinician teamwork in community
528 health centers. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020;20(1):137. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-4986-0
529 [published Online First: 20200224]
- 530 37. Nguyen KH, Chien AT, Meyers DJ, et al. Team-based primary care practice transformation initiative
531 and changes in patient experience and recommended cancer screening rates. *Inquiry*
532 2020;57:46958020952911. doi: 10.1177/0046958020952911
- 533 38. Tung EL, Gao Y, Peek ME, et al. Patient experience of chronic illness care and medical home
534 transformation in safety net clinics. *Health Serv Res* 2018;53(1):469-88. doi: 10.1111/1475-
535 6773.12608 [published Online First: 20170530]
- 536 39. Braganza MZ, Kilbourne AM. The Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI) Impact
537 Framework: Measuring the Real-world Impact of Implementation Science. *Journal of general*
538 *internal medicine* 2021;36(2):396-403. doi: 10.1007/s11606-020-06143-z [published Online First:
539 20200901]
- 540 40. Hagedorn H, Hogan M, Smith JL, et al. Lessons learned about implementing research evidence into
541 clinical practice. Experiences from VA QUERI. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2006;21 Suppl
542 2(Suppl 2):S21-4. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00358.x
- 543 41. Coles E, Anderson J, Maxwell M, et al. The influence of contextual factors on healthcare quality
544 improvement initiatives: a realist review. *Systematic reviews* 2020;9(1):94. doi: 10.1186/s13643-
545 020-01344-3 [published Online First: 20200426]
- 546 42. The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center. Quality Improvement Hub collaborative aims to
547 enhance health care across Ohio 2023 [Available from:
548 <https://wexnermedical.osu.edu/departments/innovations/urology/quality-improvement-hub>
549 accessed October 20, 2023.
- 550 43. Jesus TS, Papadimitriou C, Pinho CS, Hoenig H. Key Characteristics of Rehabilitation Quality
551 Improvement Publications: Scoping Review From 2010 to 2016. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
552 2018;99(6):1141-48.e4. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.08.491 [published Online First: 20170928]
- 553 44. Berkowitz RE, Fang Z, Helfand BK, et al. Project ReEngineered Discharge (RED) lowers hospital
554 readmissions of patients discharged from a skilled nursing facility. *Journal of the American*
555 *Medical Directors Association* 2013;14(10):736-40. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2013.03.004 [published
556 Online First: 2013/04/24]
- 557 45. Gardner RL, Pelland K, Youssef R, et al. Reducing Hospital Readmissions Through a Skilled Nursing
558 Facility Discharge Intervention: A Pragmatic Trial. *Journal of the American Medical Directors*

- 559 *Association* 2020;21(4):508-12. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2019.10.001 [published Online First:
560 2019/12/10]
- 561 46. Oh EG, Lee HJ, Yang YL, Kim YM. Effectiveness of Discharge Education With the Teach-Back Method
562 on 30-Day Readmission: A Systematic Review. *J Patient Saf* 2021;17(4):305-10. doi:
563 10.1097/pts.0000000000000596
- 564 47. Meddings J, Manojlovich M, Ameling JM, et al. Quantitative Results of a National Intervention to
565 Prevent Hospital-Acquired Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infection: A Pre-Post Observational
566 Study. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;171(7_Suppl):S38-s44. doi: 10.7326/m18-3534
- 567 48. Swindle T, Selig JP, Rutledge JM, et al. Fidelity monitoring in complex interventions: a case study of
568 the WISE intervention. *Arch Public Health* 2018;76:53. doi: 10.1186/s13690-018-0292-2
569 [published Online First: 20180829]
- 570 49. Jesus TS, Papadimitriou C, Bright FA, et al. Person-Centered Rehabilitation Model: Framing the
571 Concept and Practice of Person-Centered Adult Physical Rehabilitation Based on a Scoping
572 Review and Thematic Analysis of the Literature. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2022;103(1):106-20. doi:
573 10.1016/j.apmr.2021.05.005 [published Online First: 20210703]
- 574 50. Green T, Bonner A, Teleni L, et al. Use and reporting of experience-based codesign studies in the
575 healthcare setting: a systematic review. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2020;29(1):64-76. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-
576 2019-009570 [published Online First: 20190923]
- 577 51. Jesus TS, Stern BZ, Struhar J, et al. The use of patient experience feedback in rehabilitation quality
578 improvement and codesign activities: Scoping review of the literature. *Clin Rehabil*
579 2023;37(2):261-76. doi: 10.1177/02692155221126690 [published Online First: 20220916]
- 580 52. Quigley DD, Qureshi N, AlMasarweh L, Hays RD. Using CAHPS patient experience data for patient-
581 centered medical home transformation. *The American journal of managed care*
582 2021;27(9):e322-e29. doi: 10.37765/ajmc.2021.88745 [published Online First: 2021/09/18]
- 583
- 584