

# 1 Title page

2 The development of the gynecologic oncology pathway “VivaPathway GT” – a qualitative  
3 study about the transformation from an implicit to an explicit, evidence-based clinical  
4 pathway in a Berlin-based tertiary care hospital

5

6 Anne Büscher (0009-0000-8180-7372)<sup>1,2, #a, #b</sup>, Nicolle Reinhold (0009-0009-9434-072X)  
7 <sup>1, #a</sup>, Joachim Kugler (0000-0002-8478-4695) <sup>2, #b</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup> Vivantes – Netzwerk für Gesundheit, Berlin, Germany

10 <sup>2</sup> Medical Faculty, TU Dresden, Saxony, Germany

11

12 <sup>#a</sup> Current Address: Landsberger Allee 49, 10249 Berlin

13 <sup>#b</sup> Current Address: Helmholtzstr. 10, 01069 Dresden

14

15 \* Corresponding author

16 E-Mail: [anne.buescher@mailbox.tu-dresden.de](mailto:anne.buescher@mailbox.tu-dresden.de) (AB)

17

## 18 Authors contribution

19 Anne Büscher

- 20 • Conceptualization
- 21 • Formal Analysis
- 22 • Investigation
- 23 • Methodology
- 24 • Project Administration
- 25 • Writing – Original Draft Preparation
- 26 • Writing – Review & Editing

27

28 Nicolle Reinhold

- 29 • Conceptualization
- 30 • Validation

31

32 Joachim Kugler

33 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

- 34 • Conceptualization
- Supervision

## 35 **Full title**

36 The development of the gynecologic oncology pathway “VivaPathway GT” – a qualitative  
37 study about the transformation from an implicit to an explicit, evidence-based clinical  
38 pathway in a Berlin-based tertiary care hospital

## 39 **Short title**

40 Developing a Clinical Pathway in Oncology

41

## 42 **Abstract**

### 43 **Introduction**

44 Standardization in healthcare is crucial for comprehensive patient care, as emphasized by the  
45 WHO and quality management principles. Clinical pathways offer a structured approach to  
46 describing essential processes, particularly relevant in gynecologic oncology care. Despite  
47 their proven benefits, pathways remain underutilized, highlighting the need for explicit  
48 translation of implicit pathways.

49

### 50 **Materials and Methods**

51 This study employed semi-structured interviews with healthcare professionals to capture  
52 implicit gynecologic oncology pathway. Interviews were examined using qualitative content  
53 analysis. External requirements, legal mandates, and certification criteria were integrated into  
54 pathway development. A participatory approach involving interprofessional collaboration  
55 guided pathway refinement.

56

### 57 **Results**

58 The study applied the Pathway Association's 7-phase method, illustrating the development of  
59 VivaPathway GT. The explicit pathway, enriched with external requirements, comprised 26

60 steps, enhancing comprehensiveness and interprofessional involvement. Notable additions  
61 included pre-therapeutic tumor boards and detailed post-operative consultations.

62  
63 **Discussion**

64 Transitioning from implicit to explicit pathways is a is a demanding and challenging process  
65 emphasizing stakeholder engagement and IT support. Financial constraints pose challenges,  
66 but initiatives like quality contracts offer opportunities for resource allocation. The study  
67 validates hypotheses, confirming the efficacy of collaboration of involved professionals and  
68 integration of external requirements in pathway development.

69  
70 **Conclusions**

71 This study underscores the importance of explicit clinical pathways. It provides valuable  
72 insights for healthcare professionals facing similar challenges, emphasizing the need for  
73 ongoing evaluation and adaptation. Despite resource challenges, stakeholder collaboration  
74 and IT support are crucial for pathway effectiveness and relevance in evolving healthcare  
75 landscapes.

76  
77 **Keywords**

78 Clinical Pathways  
79 Gynecologic Oncology  
80 Participatory Approach

## 81 Introduction

82 Standardization in healthcare is a central factor in enhancing comprehensive patient care,  
83 emphasized by a clear call from the WHO [1]. In the healthcare management context, this  
84 entails describing processes within the domain of process quality. It represents the second  
85 dimension of quality management, alongside the first dimension of structural and the third  
86 dimension of outcome quality [2].

87 The patient, with their individual journey, is at the center of inpatient healthcare. This directs  
88 healthcare professionals in describing the essential processes through the implementation of  
89 clinical pathways. In a Cochrane review Rotter et al. [3] demonstrate that the use of clinical  
90 pathways has positive effects on the following outcomes: reduced likelihood of in-hospital  
91 complications, improved documentation quality, shorter length of stay, and reduced hospital  
92 costs. No differences were observed in terms of hospital readmission and in-hospital mortality.  
93 Moreover, the Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) system is clearly associated with the  
94 standardization of these processes, requiring them for structured resource management [4].  
95 Furthermore, in pursuit of the mitigation of liability risks, hospitals are advised to implement  
96 and rely on precise standardized processes [5].

97 In the future, the worth of standardizing clinical processes will continue to grow. Political  
98 directives in Germany already actively demand such standardization in other clinical areas.  
99 For instance, in the Guideline of the Joint Federal Committee (G-BA) on Measures for Quality  
100 Assurance in the Care of Patients with Proximal Femoral Fracture (QSFFx-RL) guideline,  
101 seven explicit Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are required [6]. The state government  
102 of Berlin designates certified centers with specific tasks (e. g. oncological centers) in hospital  
103 planning [7]. To meet these requirements, clinical pathways are an integral component. A  
104 recent study by Schmitt et al. [8] provides evidence of enhanced patient care in certified  
105 oncology clinics. The results show advantages in overall survival rates if cancer patients are  
106 initially treated in certified cancer centers. Thus, one of the largest hospitals in Berlin, a tertiary  
107 care hospital, is actively preparing for the certification as an oncological center.

108 The future calls for an increased emphasis on standardizing clinical processes to effectively  
109 address the diverse demands mentioned and create positive outcomes for all stakeholders.

110 Rotter et al. [9] described the three main characteristics of clinical pathways. The first quality  
111 is the translation of evidence-based medicine into existing (hospital) structures. Secondly,  
112 pathways outline a detailed sequence of steps. Thirdly, it describes the scope for a specific  
113 clinical issue or procedure.

114 The implementation of a standardized clinical pathways entails an organizational change. It is  
115 necessary to recognize that achieving successful change requires more than the  
116 implementation of standardized pathways; active engagement from both clinical and  
117 management staff is needed. According to Rotter et al. [9] “Passive, top-down strategies to  
118 promote and implement CPWs [Clinical Pathways] have little or no impact. Engagement of  
119 both clinical and management staff in the development and adoption of CPWs is required and  
120 multifaceted strategies should be used to implement this concept.”

121 Unfortunately, the valuable and necessary tool of CPWs is underutilized. In 2006, a global  
122 survey by the European Pathway Association found limited adoption of clinical pathways.  
123 Highest rates were in Estonia, Singapore, and the United States. Germany, along with other  
124 countries, reported usage for only 6 – 10 % of patients [10]. This suggests that if standards in  
125 clinical settings are followed, they are mainly implicitly adhered to. Thus, the term implicit  
126 pathway refers to the pathway that is lived in practice but not formally documented. These  
127 informal pathways represent the standards according to which staff routinely operate, based  
128 on their experiences and internal guidelines, without being explicitly documented. Explicit  
129 pathways are formally documented. In the mentioned tertiary care hospital, there is currently  
130 no explicit clinical pathway for gynecologic oncology care.

131 However, to avoid uncertainties and errors, meet the requirements and to empower all benefits  
132 of institutional knowledge management, implicitly pathways must be translated into explicit  
133 ones.

134 It leads to the following research question of this study: How can an implicit pathway be  
135 translated into an evidence-based, explicit clinical pathway? By using the example of a  
136 gynecologic oncology clinical pathway in a tertiary care hospital in Berlin.

137 The change management concept according to Lewin [11] will serve as a theoretical basis. He  
138 describes that participatory management approach involves active employee engagement in  
139 decision-making processes and the design of their work environment. It aims to recognize  
140 employees as valuable sources of ideas, experiences, and suggestions and encourages their  
141 involvement in improving work processes.

142 Based on this participatory approach the following hypotheses are formulated.

- 143 1. The translation of implicit clinical pathways into an explicit one through an  
144 interprofessional approach can be facilitated by integrating insights from interviews with  
145 involved health professionals in collaborative processes.
- 146 2. Adding external requirements, especially legal mandates, during the pathway  
147 development creates the essential connection between external demands and internal  
148 structures, cultivating a holistic and evidence-based explicit pathway.

149

## 150 **Material and Methods**

151 In order to address the research question and test the formulated hypotheses, semi-structured  
152 interviews will be conducted with involved health professionals. Thus, an interprofessional  
153 approach at the development process of the explicit clinical pathway will be used. These data  
154 will be analyzed using qualitative content analysis following Mayring's methodology [12]. The  
155 implicit gynecological oncological pathway will be captured through inductive coding. To  
156 enhance quality, the analysis will be independently performed by the second author.

157 In the second phase, guidelines and certification criteria, and legal requirements will be  
158 integrated into the coded sequence. Both the first and second authors contribute to this  
159 process.

160 Subsequently, a quality circle is convened, involving all stakeholders, including quality and  
161 process management. The implicit pathway, now enriched with external requirements, serves

162 as the basis for discussion. Additional steps are integrated based on the preferences of health  
163 professionals.

#### 164 **Ethical Considerations in non-interventional research with healthcare professionals**

165 The design of this research - a study involving semi-structured interviews with healthcare  
166 professionals - does not require an ethical approval. The study focuses on gathering insights  
167 into professional practices and perspectives. All participants were informed about the study's  
168 objectives and their rights, with written consent obtained for participation and audio recording,  
169 ensuring voluntary engagement and comprehension of the research's aims. Furthermore, as  
170 the participants are healthcare professionals familiar with ethical standards, the shared  
171 information was based on professional expertise, distinguishing our study from those  
172 potentially impacting patients or the public.

#### 173 **Selection of interview participants**

174 A total of 20 participants were interviewed. These participants not only represent the main  
175 stakeholders of the gynecologic oncology pathway but also include all other professional  
176 groups involved in this clinical and management process. The interview participants are four  
177 gynecologists, as well as one physician from the specialties of oncology, urology, palliative  
178 medicine, radiology, visceral surgery, pathology, radiation therapy, nuclear medicine, and  
179 anesthesia/pain medicine. All interviewed physicians held the position of chief or senior  
180 physician in their respective departments at the mentioned tertiary care hospital and have at  
181 least ten years of clinical experience. All of them are already involved in the implicitly used  
182 clinical pathway of gynecological oncological patients.

183 Furthermore, one representative from the following professional groups, each with at least five  
184 years of professional experience, was interviewed: psycho-oncology, nutritional science,  
185 physiotherapy, social services, nursing care of oncological unit, nursing admission  
186 management, and tumor documentation.

187 The interview participants were jointly selected by the first and the second authors. The second  
188 author is the head senior physician of the gynecologic tumor surgery department, while the  
189 first author is involved in hospital management. The interview participants were chosen to

190 ensure representation of all professional groups currently involved in the care of gynecologic  
191 oncology patients. Additionally, the certification criteria and corresponding evidence-based  
192 guidelines were reviewed to determine if there were any other possible professional groups to  
193 include. However, all necessary professional groups are already involved in the process of  
194 gynecological oncological patients. The interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis; no  
195 requested interviewee declined to participate in the study.

#### 196 **Data collection – Interviews**

197  
198 The recruitment period for this study began on May 20, 2022, and ended on March 13, 2023.  
199 In July and August 2022, the interviews were conducted by the first author. A final interview  
200 took place in March 2023. The majority of the interviews (13), were conducted via a video  
201 conferencing platform, while seven were conducted face-to-face. The latter took place in  
202 offices at the tertiary care hospital in Berlin. All interviews were carried out in the native  
203 language of all participants, which is German, and were recorded with the consent of the  
204 interviewees using a voice recorder app. The duration of the interviews ranged from 15 to 50  
205 minutes, with a median duration of 30 minutes. Apart from the interviewee and the interviewer,  
206 there were no other participants or observers.

207 All interviews were semi-structured. The interview participants were divided into two groups.  
208 Firstly, the group of the four gynecological physicians. These participants are from the leading  
209 department and, therefore, accompany patients from admission to discharge. Secondly, all  
210 other interviewees involved in individual steps of the clinical process. Consequently, two  
211 different questionnaires were developed to explore the current implicit pathway.

212 To develop the first interview questionnaire, the second author, the head senior physician of  
213 the gynecological department, was consulted regarding the current implicit pathway. In order  
214 to develop a questionnaire, questions were asked along this implicit process with 14 steps. At  
215 each step of these steps, several questions were developed to ask during the following  
216 interviews. About 1. how this step is reached, 2. what the content of this step is, and if 3. there  
217 are any standards like SOPs. In addition, it is asked what and 4. where it is documented, and  
218 5. how the further process proceeds after this step. This questionnaire was tested with the



219 head senior physician and adjusted accordingly. Thus, a structure and sequence of questions  
220 were established. However, there was sufficient flexibility to provide feedback on missing steps  
221 at any time. All gynecologists were interviewed using this first questionnaire. All other  
222 professional groups were interviewed using a second questionnaire. It starts by inquiring at 1.  
223 which step in the pathway they are contacted and 2. how. Furthermore, they are asked 3. if  
224 they are contacted again in the patient's process. Additionally, it was investigated 4. who or  
225 what determines whether their involvement follows. If so, 5. what purpose is achieved through  
226 their work and 6. where it is documented. This second questionnaire was also tested with one  
227 interviewee and then slightly adjusted. In addition, all interview participants were asked for any  
228 suggestions to improve both patient care and employee satisfaction. This request was made  
229 to ensure continuous improvement and engagement of all stakeholders in the development of  
230 new standards. The goal is to uphold the quality of care, especially with the anticipated  
231 increase in the number of patients in the future. At the beginning of the interviews, the  
232 participants were informed about the purpose of the survey, and all gave their consent for data  
233 processing.

### 234 **Interview Analysis**

235 The transcription of interview recordings was performed using the automated transcription  
236 service Amberscript. To enhance quality, the first author corrected the transcripts where  
237 necessary. The Mayring content analysis method was used [12].

238 An inductive approach was applied, as there were no existing codes that could serve as a  
239 basis. Even though the implicit process described by the senior physician (2. Author) formed  
240 the structure for the questionnaire, there was sufficient flexibility in the application of both  
241 questionnaires to recognize new process steps, or codes. These new codes could then serve  
242 as a basis in developing the explicit pathway. The transcripts were initially divided into parts;  
243 firstly, the results of gynecologists and secondly the answers of all other professionals. These  
244 sections were then paraphrased, summarized, and developed for category formation. Excel  
245 was used as the basis for this process.

246 The interviews with the gynecologists were analyzed in this manner by the first author, and  
247 then the codes were adjusted. The second author also analyzed the interviews for category  
248 formation. Different interpretations were discussed, and a common solution for a code was  
249 found.

250 The codes were named after the various steps of the implicit clinical pathway for gynecological  
251 oncological patients. Subsequently, the quality circle was conducted. All interview participants  
252 were invited. In a participatory approach here, the final explicit pathway was finalized and  
253 described in a digital flowchart.

254 The qualitative research methodology was conducted in accordance with the Quality  
255 Assurance Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) checklist. [13].

## 256 **Synthesizing Research Findings and Applying a 7-Phase Method for CPW**

### 257 **Development**

258 These research findings can provide support to others planning similar initiatives when the  
259 approach is presented in a concise and clear overview. Therefore, an existing theoretical  
260 framework will be utilized in a subsequent step. The Pathway Association has developed a 7-  
261 phase method for clinical pathways which assist in the development, implementation, and  
262 evaluation of clinical pathways [14]. The steps described above will be categorized into these  
263 phases, resulting in a brief overview of the process.

## 264 **Results**

265 The results section is presented in three parts. The first part demonstrates the application of  
266 the theoretical framework by the Pathway Association (table 2). In this section, the approach  
267 to developing the pathway is described. The second part illustrates the VivaPathway GT  
268 (flowchart 1), demonstrating the results of the interviews and additions of external  
269 requirements. The results section concludes with the third part. This section provides an  
270 overview of the differences between implicit and explicit pathways, emphasizing the changes  
271 from previously unwritten standards to the now finalized and formal pathway.

272

### 273 **1. Application of the theoretical framework by the Pathway Association**

274 The Results section demonstrates the application of the 7-phase method for clinical pathways  
275 to the VivaPathway GT. The first three columns illustrate the recommended approach by the  
276 Pathway Associations, specifying the phase's name and the questions to consider during  
277 development of a clinical pathway. The meaningful outcome is evident in the last column,  
278 demonstrating the practical development of VivaPathway GT through an interprofessional  
279 approach.

## 280           **2. The explicit VivaPathway GT**

281   Next, the developed gynecologic oncological pathway VivaPathway GT is presented in a  
282   flowchart 1.

283   The analysis of gynecologists' interviews indicates a notable consistency in their feedback  
284   regarding the steps in the care of gynecological oncology patients. The analysis reveals 14  
285   categories/steps. Variations were observed in consultation requests with related departments.  
286   These were conducted through the hospital information system (KIS), telephone contact, and  
287   in-person meetings.

288   Moreover, all remaining stakeholders in gynecological oncological care were interviewed as  
289   well. They were asked regarding their involvement in the overall process.

290   Both, results of the gynecologists and all other stakeholder, formed the basis for discussions  
291   within the quality circle. During the interviews, all participants were also asked for improvement  
292   suggestions to enhance the future explicitly described process. These suggestions were  
293   incorporated into the interdisciplinary and interprofessional quality circle discussions.

294   Steps that were already included in the implicit pathway during the interviews are marked with  
295   a continuous line of the steps in flowchart 1. All steps, which were added during quality circle  
296   (on basis of the interview results), are marked with dashed lines. Consequently, it becomes  
297   evident that the implicit and explicit pathways primarily differ in that the explicit pathway is more  
298   comprehensive, containing more steps. The implicit pathway comprised 14 steps, and this was  
299   expanded with an additional 12 individual steps, resulting in a total of 26 steps.

## 300           **3. Differences of implicit pathway to explicit VivaPathway GT**

301   The main differences from the implicit to the explicit pathway can be summarized as follows:

- 302           • 14 implicit to 26 explicit steps
- 303           • Addition of the pre-therapeutic tumor board conference (certification requirement)
- 304           • More detailed preoperative preparation based on professional groups
- 305           • Documented checks for the completeness of patient records
- 306           • Active review of all possible post-op consultations by other professional groups
- 307           (certification requirement)

- 308 • Initiation of discharge planning instead of general discharge (legal requirement)

309

## 310 **Discussion**

311 This study illustrates the development of the gynecologic oncology clinical pathway in a tertiary  
312 hospital in Berlin within a participatory development approach. The outcome is based on the  
313 implicitly lived pathway and has been complemented with external requirements. The  
314 development process is mapped onto the theoretical framework of pathway association,  
315 allowing it to be easily transferred and applied by other physicians and managers on their  
316 initiatives. The tabular overview in table 2 provides a simplified method for transferring.

### 317 **Transition from Implicit to Explicit Pathways**

318 The minimal deviations in the implicit pathway, as reported by the gynecologists, indicate that  
319 good coordination already exists without a written pathway. But when considering the pathway  
320 as a whole, it differs significantly from the pathway implicitly captured in the interviews. Though,  
321 the implicit pathway did not sufficiently anticipate the integration of other stakeholders.

### 322 **Top-down and bottom-up**

323 Notable is the significant increase in the number of steps in the explicit clinical pathway,  
324 particularly highlighting the interprofessional approach in the care of gynecologic oncology  
325 patients. Köth et al. [15] already emphasized the necessity for all involved parties to be  
326 represented in the pathway. Through collaborative development based on interviews and a  
327 shared quality circle, this was ensured. Frequently mentioned by involved professional groups  
328 responsible for post-operative patient care was the desire for earlier involvement in the  
329 process. This includes physiotherapy, psycho-oncologist, nutritionist, social worker, etc., who  
330 are now all separately represented in the pathway. The hospital's aim to become certified as  
331 an oncology center stems from leadership directives, representing a top-down approach to  
332 strategic planning.

333 The development of the clinical pathway VivaPathway GT is in line with the comprehensive  
334 findings in this field. Köth et al. [15] emphasized the importance of combining top-down and

335 bottom-up strategies. Evans-Lacko et al. [16] underscore the essential role of involving both  
336 management and clinical staff in the development and implementation process. In addition,  
337 this approach also aligns with the success factors outlined by De Allegro et al. [17] in the  
338 implementation of clinical pathways, with a particular emphasis on the multidisciplinary aspect.  
339 In determining the clinical pathway, we integrate interdisciplinary and interprofessional  
340 elements, fostering collaboration among different stakeholders for a more holistic and effective  
341 approach. This fusion of top-down and bottom-up strategies, coupled with interdisciplinary  
342 collaboration, forms the foundation of the commitment to advancing health practices in  
343 gynecologic oncology on a scientifically informed basis.

344 Even when looking at other developments in healthcare, such as the development and  
345 implementation of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs), similar success factors can  
346 be observed [18]. This underscores the consistent principles applicable across various  
347 healthcare interventions.

#### 348 **Compensating for Missing IT-Infrastructure**

349 The increase in steps from 12 to 26 can also be attributed to other reasons. Many checks have  
350 been introduced to ensure that previous steps are carried out and documented. Similarly,  
351 several steps of different professional groups have been introduced in the preparation for  
352 surgery. Both could theoretically be supported by an IT infrastructure, as well as the post-  
353 operative consultation of other professional groups. In this case, significantly fewer steps would  
354 be necessary. For example, a hospital information system (HIS) could automatically request a  
355 consultation with a physiotherapist once a specific diagnosis and procedure have been  
356 documented. Since this functionality is not currently available in the hospital's HIS, it has been  
357 separately integrated into the explicit clinical pathway.

358 A comparison can be drawn between the development and implementation of clinical pathways  
359 and another health intervention, such as Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs). The  
360 study by the Bertelsmann Foundation [18] described six success factors needed for the  
361 successful implementation of this intervention. Therefore, a relevant success factor is

362 supportive IT. This would even allow for the inclusion of PROMs assessments within the IT-  
363 based clinical pathway.

364 A competent IT infrastructure supporting the clinical pathway serves as an essential  
365 prerequisite for comprehensive documentation of patient records. It is through careful  
366 documentation that a meaningful evaluation can be conducted in the Plan-Do-Check-Act  
367 (PDCA) cycle. Another argument for the relevance of the IT-based representation is provided  
368 by Askari et al. [19]. He found, in a systematic review, an increased adherence to clinical  
369 pathways when software is used to support the pathway. Also, Ronellenfitsch [20] concludes  
370 that integration of clinical pathways into hospital information systems in the course of  
371 digitization in healthcare could be beneficial for the application and acceptance. Not only  
372 integration into HIS, but also the development of an innovative process mining solution is  
373 emphasized by Munoz-Gama et al. [21]. He explicitly calls for close collaboration between  
374 health professionals, IT specialists, and business process managers to develop a supportive  
375 evidence-based system.

### 376 **Underutilization of Clinical Pathways**

377 For the underutilization of clinical pathways in healthcare, there are various reasons. In this  
378 case, it did not result from health professionals' unwillingness to adhere to standards. The  
379 results indicate that gynecologists and all other stakeholders wish to work according to  
380 guidelines and internal standards. The gynecologists have already been working based on an  
381 implicit pathway, and all other stakeholders also adhere to their standards. However, these  
382 have not been consolidated for the care of gynecologic oncology patients until now.

383 However, limited financial and personnel resources Köth et al. [15] pointed out the necessity  
384 of effective outcomes required for the development and implementation of pathways, given the  
385 substantial resource investment. This assumption aligns with the results of the Bertelsmann  
386 Foundation [18] regarding the introduction of PROMs. Financial support is described as one  
387 of the success factors for implementation alongside other forms of support.

388 Since 2017, quality contracts in Germany have offered opportunities to allocate additional  
389 resources in clinical settings, for example for pathway developments [22]. They aim to provide

390 additional incentives for improved care. Explicit pathways are a necessary prerequisite for a  
391 quality contract and its evaluation. However, currently, this is offered for eight medical  
392 conditions such as endoprosthesis or obstetrics. In future, this could potentially be utilized as  
393 financial support to develop and implement pathways in hospitals with a participatory  
394 approach.

### 395 **Addressing the research question and validating the hypotheses**

396 Considering all results, the research question can be answered and the hypotheses can be  
397 confirmed:

#### 398 ***Research Question***

399 *How can an implicit pathway in gynecologic oncology be translated into an evidence-based,*  
400 *explicit care pathway in a tertiary care hospital in Berlin?*

401 Answer: The research question is addressed through a comprehensive process involving  
402 stakeholder interviews, analysis, and the development of the VivaPathway GT. The translation  
403 of the implicit pathway is achieved by integrating insights from interviews with health  
404 professionals and incorporating external requirements.

#### 405 ***Hypothesis 1***

406 The interprofessional translation of implicit pathways, guided by stakeholder interviews,  
407 facilitates the development of explicit pathways.

408 Confirmation: The stakeholder interviews and subsequent Mayring analysis form the  
409 foundation for the explicit VivaPathway GT, demonstrating that an interprofessional approach  
410 is effective in translating implicit pathways.

#### 411 ***Hypothesis 2***

412 Integrating external requirements, especially legal mandates, during development establishes  
413 a vital connection between external demands and internal structures, resulting in a holistic and  
414 evidence-based pathway.

415 Confirmation: External requirements, including legal mandates, are integrated into the  
416 VivaPathway GT during the development phase. This ensures a connection between external  
417 demands and internal structures, aligning the pathway with evidence-based practices.



418 The successful development of the explicit pathway, VivaPathway GT, validates both  
419 hypotheses, highlighting the importance of stakeholder collaboration and the incorporation of  
420 external requirements in achieving a comprehensive and evidence-based care pathway in  
421 gynecologic oncology.

## 422 **Conclusions**

423 In conclusion, this study presents a valuable contribution to the development of clinical  
424 pathways. The results offer a helpful guide for other healthcare professionals facing similar  
425 challenges and requirements. However, it is important to acknowledge that disruptions may  
426 occur in different settings, and while the health professionals in this study were willing to  
427 implement a standardized pathway, it remains a sincere resource challenge due to the  
428 significant time and effort required for a participatory approach involving all stakeholders.

429 The necessity of transitioning from implicit to explicit pathways cannot be overstated, as  
430 demonstrated by the formalization, standardization, and documentation of clinical workflows.

431 The study aligns with previous research underscores the significance of multidisciplinary, both  
432 top-down and bottom-up approaches in this process in order to adequately consider the needs  
433 of all stakeholders.

434 Furthermore, the study highlights the crucial role of IT support in securing, refining, and  
435 evaluating pathway processes, with the potential to incorporate patient perspectives and adapt  
436 to evolving structures and external mandates over time. However, the explicit description of a  
437 pathway is a precondition for its integration into HIS and process mining tool.

438 In the face of financial and resource limitations, initiatives such as quality contracts offer  
439 opportunities to allocate resources for pathway development and evaluation, ultimately  
440 contributing to improved patient care.

441 In addressing the research question and validating the hypotheses, the study demonstrates  
442 the effectiveness of an interprofessional approach guided by stakeholder input and the  
443 integration of external requirements in developing evidence-based and comprehensive clinical  
444 pathways. The successful development of the explicit pathway, VivaPathway GT, underscores  
445 the importance of stakeholder collaboration and the incorporation of external mandates in

446 achieving a robust and adaptable care pathway for gynecologic oncology patients. However,  
447 ongoing evaluation and adaptation are essential to ensure the pathway's effectiveness and  
448 relevance among changing healthcare landscapes.

449

450

## 451 Acknowledgments

## 452 References

- 453 1. World Health Organization. (2022). GLOBAL PATIENT SAFETY ACTION PLAN  
454 2021–2030. Towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care, 31 January 2022.  
455 [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from:  
456 [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-eng.pdf?sequence=1)  
457 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- 458 2. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *The Milbank quarterly*.  
459 1966;83(4):691-729. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00397.x.
- 460 3. Rotter T, Kinsman L, James E, Machotta A, Gothe H, Willis J, Snow P, Kugler J.  
461 Clinical pathways: effects on professional practice, patient outcomes, length of stay  
462 and hospital costs. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*.  
463 2010;(3):CD006632. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006632.pub2.
- 464 4. Tuschen KH, Trefz U. *Krankenhausentgeltgesetz: Kommentar mit einer umfassenden*  
465 *Einführung in die Vergütung stationärer Krankenhausleistungen*. 2nd ed.  
466 Kohlhammer Verlag; November 2009.
- 467 5. Schmiedhofer M, Blum K, Gambashidze N, Rösner H, Strametz R. KhaSiMiR 21 –  
468 Krankenhausstudie zur Sicherheit durch Management innerklinischer Risiken 2021–  
469 22: Ergebnisse der aktuellen Befragung zur Implementierung des klinischen  
470 Risikomanagements. Presented at the 22. Deutschen Kongress für  
471 Versorgungsforschung (DKVF), Berlin, 04.-06.10.2023. Düsseldorf: German Medical  
472 Science GMS Publishing House; 2023. Doc23dkvf377. doi:10.3205/23dkvf377.  
473 Published on October 2, 2023.
- 474 6. Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss. Richtlinie über Maßnahmen zur Qualitätssicherung  
475 zur Versorgung von Patienten mit einer hüftgelenknahen Femurfraktur gemäß § 136  
476 Absatz 1 Satz 1 Nummer 2 für nach § 108 SGB V zugelassene Krankenhäuser. G-  
477 BA; 2024 Jan 01. Available at [https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-](https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-RL_2023-12-06_iK-2024-01-01.pdf)  
478 [RL\\_2023-12-06\\_iK-2024-01-01.pdf](https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-RL_2023-12-06_iK-2024-01-01.pdf)
- 479 7. Senatsverwaltung Berlin für Gesundheit, Pflege und Gleichstellung. Ausweisung von  
480 besonderen Aufgaben von Zentren im Land Berlin. 11.12.2018. Available at  
481 [https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-](https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php)  
482 [versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php](https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php)
- 483 8. Schmitt J, Klinkhammer-Schalke M, Bierbaum V, Gerken M, Bobeth C, Rößler M,  
484 Dröge P, Ruhnke T, Günster C, Kleihues-van Tol K, Schoffer O. Initial Cancer  
485 Treatment in Certified Versus Non-Certified Hospitals: Results of the WiZen  
486 Comparative Cohort Study. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2023;120:647-54. DOI:  
487 10.3238/arztebl.m2023.0169
- 488 9. Rotter T, de Jong RB, Lacko SE, et al. Clinical pathways as a quality strategy. In:  
489 Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, et al., editors. *Improving healthcare quality in*  
490 *Europe: Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies*  
491 [Internet]. Copenhagen (Denmark): European Observatory on Health Systems and  
492 Policies; 2019. (Health Policy Series, No. 53.) Chapter 12. Available from:  
493 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK549262/>

- 494 10. Vanhaecht K, Bollmann M, Panella M, et al. Prevalence and use of clinical pathways  
495 in 23 countries – an international survey by the European Pathway Association.  
496 Volume 10, Issue 1. Published 2006. DOI: 10.1177/205343540601000106.
- 497 11. Lewin K. Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. Edited by  
498 Cartwright D. Harper & Row; 1951.
- 499 12. Mayring P, Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. 11th ed. Beltz;  
500 Weinheim, Germany: Basel, Switzerland: 2010. pp. 48–109.
- 501 13. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research  
502 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal  
503 for Quality in Health Care. 2007 Dec;19(6):349–57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042.
- 504 14. European Pathway Association. Pathway Facilitator Tools. European Pathway  
505 Association; 2021 [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://e-p-](https://e-p-a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/)  
506 [a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/](https://e-p-a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/)
- 507 15. Köth H, Miller K, Lein M, Weikert S, Schmidt D, Heymann S, Eveslage K,  
508 Ronellenfitsch U, Schwarzbach M, Spies C, Vargas Hein O. Development and effects  
509 of a multicampus clinical pathway: “laparoscopic prostatectomy”. Perioperative  
510 Medicine. 2009;1(3):173-180. ISSN 1875-2772.  
511 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.periop.2009.05.008>.
- 512 16. Evans-Lacko S, Jarrett M, McCrone P, et al. Facilitators and barriers to implementing  
513 clinical care pathways. BMC Health Serv Res. 2010;10:182.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-10-182>
- 515 17. De Allegri M, Schwarzbach M, Loerbroks A, Ronellenfitsch U. Which factors are  
516 important for the successful development and implementation of clinical pathways? A  
517 qualitative study. BMJ quality & safety. 2011 Mar 1;20(3):203-8.  
518 doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.042465
- 519 18. Bertelsmann Stiftung. Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs): ein  
520 internationaler Vergleich Herausforderungen und Erfolgsstrategien für die Umsetzung  
521 von PROMs in Deutschland. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung; 2021 [Accessed  
522 February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://www.bertelsmann-](https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BSt_PROMs-Implementierung_final.pdf)  
523 [stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user\\_upload/BSt\\_PROMs-Implementierung\\_final.pdf](https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BSt_PROMs-Implementierung_final.pdf)
- 524 19. Askari M, Tam JLYY, Klundert J. The effectiveness of clinical pathway software in  
525 inpatient settings: A systematic review. Int J Med Inform. 2021;147:104374.  
526 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2020.104374.
- 527 20. Ronellenfitsch U, Schwarzbach M. Patientenorientierte Versorgungssteuerung im  
528 Krankenhaus. In: Klauber J, Wasem J, Beivers A, Mostert C, editors. Krankenhaus-  
529 Report 2021. Springer; 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-62708-2\_4
- 530 21. Munoz-Gama J, Martin N, Fernandez-Llatas C, et al. Process mining for healthcare:  
531 Characteristics and challenges. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2022;127:103994.  
532 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2022.103994>.
- 533 22. Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss (G-BA). Qualitätsverträge nach § 110a SGB V.  
534 [Internet]. 2017. [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://www.g-](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)  
535 [ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)  
536 [qualitaetsvertraege/](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)"
- 537  
538  
539  
540

## 541 **Supporting information captions**

### 542 **Competing Interests Statement:**

543 The authors of this manuscript declare the following potential competing interests in  
544 accordance with PLOS guidelines:

545

546 **Anne Büscher:** As the administrative manager at Vivantes Klinikum Friedrichshain, I am  
547 administratively involved in the implementation and management of the clinical pathway  
548 discussed in this manuscript. My role involves general administrative and managerial functions  
549 within the whole hospital.

550 **Dr. Nicolle Reinhold:** Dr. Reinhold is a senior physician in gynecology at Vivantes Klinikum  
551 Friedrichshain and directly involved in patient care and the development of gynecologic  
552 oncology practices.

553 All interviews conducted for this research involved participants associated with Vivantes  
554 Klinikum Friedrichshain, and their identities are familiar to the authors due to their roles within  
555 the hospital. No financial interests, employment, consultancy, or any other competing interests  
556 that could compromise the objectivity of this research are present.

557 This statement is made to ensure transparency and adhere to PLOS policy on competing  
558 interests.

<b>Interview-participants Medical doctors &gt; 10 yrs of clinical experiences</b>	Gynecology	Oncology	Urology	Palliative medicine	Radiology	Visceral surgery	Pathology	Radiation therapy	Anesthesia / pain medicine	Nuclear medicine
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Interview-participants Other involved professionals &gt; 5 yrs of professional experience</b>	Psycho-oncology	Nutritional science	Physiotherapy	Social services	Nursing care of oncological unit	Nursing admission management	Tumor documentation			
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
<b>Age group</b>	30 – 39		40 – 49			50 – 59		60 -69		
	4		6			7		3		
<b>Gender</b>	Female					Male				
	10					10				

1 Table 1: Characteristics of interview participants / Numbers of persons

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.14.24305788>; this version posted April 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



No.	Phase	Questions to consider	Interprofessional Approach for VivaPathway GT
1	Screening phase	Is a care pathway the right tool for the problem we need to solve; who will be the owner of the project / care pathway?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The benefits of a clinical pathway for gynecological oncological patients were identified through research and legal requirements.</li> <li>Currently lacking an explicit pathway for gynecologic oncology.</li> <li>Until now there is an implicit pathway.</li> <li>Necessity to translate implicit standards into explicit pathways.</li> <li>Owner of the project is head senior physician of the gynecological department and a member of the hospital management.</li> </ul>
2	Project management phase	Do we have the right people, time, budget to start a project, what are our goals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Right people: Certification criteria and other external requirements were assessed for stakeholders relevant to participating in the pathway.</li> <li>Time: A 2-year timeline was established, starting from the development of interview questions to the pathway's approval in the quality circle.</li> <li>Budget: An additional budget could not be considered.</li> <li>Goals: The aim is to transform the previously implicit pathway for patients diagnosed with C48.8 + 51 - C59 into an explicit pathway, considering all relevant external requirements.</li> </ul>
3	Diagnostic and objectification phase	What is our current practice? Based on four perspectives: own organization & team, vision of patient & family, available evidence & legislation, and external partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The implicit pathway, the current practice, is examined through semi-structured interviews with all identified stakeholders. First with the leading department of gynecologists, then with all other involved professional groups.</li> <li>Interview results were investigated by Mayring analysis (Transcription and Correction, Formation of Analysis Section, Paraphrasing and Summarizing, formation of Categories/Codes, Application of Codes)</li> <li>In this way the organizations and team perspective were identified.</li> <li>Available research evidence was identified through guidelines. Legal issues were added.</li> <li>Vision of patient, family and external partners are missing and will be added after evaluation of one year. (Basis will be results of patient surveys and inquiries from referring healthcare providers.)</li> </ul>
4	Development phase	Design and development of the care pathway, based on input from previous phases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results of the Mayring analysis serve as the foundation for pathway development.</li> <li>Integration of insights from previous phases, including interviews, improvement suggestions, guidelines, inclusion of certification criteria and external requirements.</li> <li>Concluding discussion of individual steps in the quality circle, involving all relevant stakeholders.</li> </ul>

			Collaboratively, additional enhancements and modifications were made and approved.
5	Implementation phase	Piloting and adjusting the care pathway, followed by implementation for daily use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approved VivaPathway GT was implemented in the intranet with a workflow (access for all employees is ensured.)</li> <li>• The pathway was tested for practical implementation on five patients jointly by the head senior physician (No changes were made following the testing.)</li> <li>• The pathway was presented in the hospital-wide gynecological working group.</li> <li>• Training sessions were provided to all involved in the process. The pathway is also an integral part of the onboarding concepts.</li> </ul>
6	Evaluation phase	Evaluation of the care pathway: effect, usability and compliance to the care pathway	Evaluation will follow after one year of implementation.
7	Continuous follow-up phase	Keeping the pathway alive by monitoring, adjusting the pathway	The continuous follow-up phase will follow after the evaluation phase.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.14.24305788>; this version posted April 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

1 Table 2: Application of the 7-Phase Method for CPW according to the Pathway Association





medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.14.24305788>; this version posted April 15, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

