

A framework for chronic care quality: results of a scoping review and Delphi survey

Grace Marie V. Ku^{1,2,3}
Willem Van De Put¹
Deogratias Katsuva¹
Mohamad Ali Ag Ahmed^{4,5}
Megumi Rosenberg⁵
Bruno Meessen⁶

¹Department of Public Health, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium

²Faculty of Medicine & Pharmacy, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

³Faculty of Medicine & Surgery, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines

⁴Institut Universitaire SHERPA, Montreal, Canada

⁵Department of Health Management, Evaluation and Policy, School of Public Health, University of Montreal, Canada

⁶World Health Organization Centre for Health Development, Kobe, Japan

⁷Department of Health Financing and Economics, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

Corresponding author:

Grace Marie V. Ku

Department of Public Health, Institute of Tropical Medicine

Nationalestraat 155, 2000 Antwerp, Belgium

gku@itg.be

ABSTRACT

Frameworks conceptualising quality of care abound and vary; some concentrate on specific aspects (e.g., safety, access, effectiveness), others all-encompassing. However, to our knowledge, tailoring to systematically arrive at a comprehensive care for chronic conditions quality (CCCQ) framework has never been done. We conducted scoping review and Delphi survey to produce a CCCQ framework, comprehensively delineating aims, determinants and measurable attributes.

With the assumption that specific groups (people with chronic conditions, care providers, financiers, policy-makers, etc) view quality of care differently, we analysed 48 scientific and 26 grey literature deductively and inductively using the Institute of Medicine's quality of care framework as the foundation. We produced a zero-version of the quality of chronic care framework, detailing aims, healthcare system determinants, and measurement mechanisms. This was presented in a Delphi survey to 49 experts with diverse chronic care expertise/experience around the world. Consensus was obtained after the first round, with the panel providing suggestions and justifications to expand the agreed-upon components. Through this exercise, a comprehensive CCCQ framework encompassing the journey through healthcare of people with chronic conditions was developed. The framework specifies seven CCCQ 'aims' and identifies health system determinants which can be acted upon with 'organising principles' and measured through chronic care quality 'attributes' related to structures, processes and outcomes. Tailoring quality of care based on the nature of the diseases/conditions and considering different views can be done to ensure a comprehensive offer of healthcare services, and towards better outcomes that are acceptable to both the health system and PwCCs.

Key words: chronic conditions; quality of care framework; quality aims; quality determinants; quality attributes

BACKGROUND

The underpinnings of care quality emerged in the 19th century, ranging from underscoring the importance of handwashing to prevent infection, to correlating poor living conditions with increased mortality and the establishment of hospital standards to assess healthcare outcomes [1]. In 1966, Donabedian introduced a framework for healthcare quality measurement laying the groundwork for (modern-day) healthcare quality [2]. Near the end of the 20th century, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) called for designing safer health systems, thereby improving quality of care [3]. The early 21st century brought forth a framework for quality of care [4] and a revision [5] by the IOM, identifying six aims of quality in healthcare. It also saw the emergence of care quality frameworks by various (international) agencies, including the World Health Organization (WHO) [6,7].

However, the aforementioned frameworks apply to quality in healthcare in general. Establishing criteria and a quality framework specific for chronic care can be “messy”. Due to chronicity – with most conditions lasting throughout the lifetime of the person – priorities and attention to increase the likelihood of “desired effects” (usually favourable health outcomes) would be different, as compared to acute diseases. Beyond biomedical needs, it is crucial to support the psychosocial aspects of people with chronic conditions (PwCC) for them to *adapt and self-manage in the face of social, physical, and emotional challenges* [8]. The reality of multimorbidity has to be acknowledged. Furthermore, it should be recognised that the main drivers of chronic conditions, including most social, structural, commercial determinants, are beyond the health system. Additionally, there are various interests of different stakeholders and actors (e.g. healthcare providers, policy decision-makers, financiers, regulators, other sectors), which may be congruent or disparate. Diverse contexts, for instance, low-resource settings with competing priorities and facing double/triple burden of disease, would also be influential.

Looking into what factors matter for good-quality healthcare for chronic conditions therefore requires taking different perspectives of various stakeholders and data sources and making use of different lenses (Figure 1).

With the above considerations in mind, we conducted this study to produce a framework that comprehensively delineates aims, determinants and measurable attributes of quality of care specifically for chronic conditions.

Conceptual Issues and Definitions

Instead of ‘reinventing the wheel’, we adopted the latest version of the quality-of-care framework put forward by the Institute of Medicine (5), noting that this is generic and needs to be contextualized.

We defined aims, determinants and attributes as follows:

- (1) ‘Aim’ – any broad category of importance with intrinsic value, as a desired final outcome that is achieved to denote that care is of good quality. Since the IOM’s framework for quality-of-care reports [4,5], the consensus converges around a list of six aims: effectiveness; efficiency; safety; equity; accessibility, timeliness, affordability; and person-centredness. While we are aware that different documents/reports have extended or reorganized this list, we took the IOM quality aims as our starting point.

- (2) *'Determinant'* – any actionable factor which has direct effect on achieving any dimension of quality of care. These can be considered as the 'elements' presented in models for chronic care. The determinants also correspond to the "health system determinants" as described by WHO [8] to support a health system in delivering healthcare. Determinants may extend to systemic challenges health system-wise, including arrangements within a system or a model of health service delivery and the conditions/limitations/opportunities to be found in family, community resources, the environment, and the community itself.
- (3) *Attribute* – any variable of importance that measures achievement of specific quality aim(s) or fulfilment of (some of) its determinants. It can relate to a specific chronic condition or in general. This can be considered as the overall measurable characteristics of the different aims and/or determinants of good quality healthcare, as well as actions on determinants (along organising principles) to achieve the quality aims, for which direct indicators and criteria can be formulated (usually based on context).

METHODOLOGY

This paper draws specific results from a larger programme of work commissioned by WHO. The request was to produce a comprehensive conceptualization of "quality health services for chronic conditions" that can be used by actors considering interventions to improve health services for chronic conditions, in this case, purchasing arrangements as an instrument for improvement, with a particular attention to policy needs of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Here, we concentrate on the components relative to the framework, specifically the determinants, actions and some of their organising principles, and measurable attributes. The chronic care quality aims have already been presented in an earlier paper [9].

We reviewed relevant literature and convened international stakeholders for chronic care and quality in a Delphi survey.

Scoping review

We conducted a scoping review following the PRISMA extension guidelines [10] to systematically identify available information on quality of care for chronic conditions, identifying key concepts. We selected works that have acknowledged and unpacked the plurality of quality in chronic care, and which proposed/made use of frameworks or looked into two or more IOM aims of care quality and studied or demonstrated implementation. The scoping review protocol is available from <https://www.itg.be/en/research/research-themes/quality-of-care-for-chronic-conditions>.

Scientific publications

On 2 February 2022, search for scientific publications was conducted in the PubMed and Science Direct data bases using specific search terms: *'chronic condition'*/*'chronic illness'*/*'chronic disease'*; *'quality of healthcare'*; *'innovative care for chronic conditions'*; *'chronic care model'*; *'quality criteria'*; *'quality indicators'*; specific chronic conditions considered among top drivers of chronic disease burden [11] (*'ischaemic heart disease'*, *'hypertension'* and *'stroke'*; *'diabetes mellitus'*; *'chronic kidney disease'*; *'lung cancer'*; *'HIV/AIDS'*; *'chronic obstructive pulmonary disease'* and *'bronchial asthma'*) and additional conditions as suggested by the WHO team (*'chronic musculoskeletal conditions'*; *'chronic*

skin disease’); and criteria: *written in English or French; publication years 2002-2021; among humans.*

Other literature and documents

Search for grey/other literature (policies, circulars, publications not available from scientific search engines) were conducted using the same keywords but including general quality of care documents and with broader year limitations (1999-2022) in the Google search engine. Additionally, contacts from the WHO, healthcare regulatory agencies, organizations with chronic disease programs/projects, and various Ministries of Health and/or connected agencies were requested to share any documents they have produced as related to quality of care, specifically for chronic conditions.

Literature sifting

Scientific publications were sifted through Rayyan (www.rayyan.ai). This was done systematically by minimum two members of the research team with any disagreements resolved amongst the two, as needed, through a third researcher. Retrieved scientific publications were initially screened through the titles. Abstracts (if available) of the chosen documents were individually reviewed. Full articles were scrutinized and selected; only documents that are relevant to this study were included in the final selection. We also looked into the bibliographic references of the included articles to check for additional literature; however, none of the snowballed papers were included in the final list. (Figure 2) Grey literature and other documents were purposively collected.

Data extraction and framework building

Data retrieval was systematically initiated by at least one of the members of the research team and verified by a different member. We critically analysed the literature and made use of deductive and inductive approaches to identify quality aims, determinants and attributes. We used our definitions for deductive and inductive analysis. We utilised the IOM quality framework to deductively extract data on aims. Analysis was done iteratively, going back to the literature as we identified additional concepts and critically analysing to expound on the meanings. We intended to group determinants following the WHO health systems building blocks [8]. However, as we also considered resources beyond the health system, we reclassified the groups to: (1) leadership and governance; (2) financing; (3) resources (including health workforce, health information, medical products, vaccines, and technologies, PwCC, their families, the community and other sectors); and (4) service delivery. We then inductively identified specific determinants, any specific actions on these determinants, and corresponding principles organising said actions. We also determined measurable attributes relative to each of the chronic care quality aims. Additionally, during data extraction, we noted that specific papers would concentrate on a particular stage in the ‘journey’ of a person in the natural history of a chronic condition (e.g. addressing risks, rehabilitation, etc). We thus went back to our selection to consciously extract additional information on particular stages of the PwCC journey. We then brought forward said concepts, as related to the aims, determinants, and attributes of good quality chronic care, and the principles that organise actions on the determinants, to build the zero version of the chronic care quality (CCQ) framework. To note, the lived experiences of the research team (as health care provider, PwCC, health economist, anthropologist, public health expert; from LIC, MIC, HIC) influenced the critical analysis of the data.

Delphi survey

We prepared a list of “mid”- to “advanced” level chronic care experts, gleaned through our own professional networks, references from colleagues or other known experts, relevant publications in peer-reviewed journals or the websites of relevant organizations, and from recommendations by different organisations (e.g. NCD Alliance, Global Alliance on Chronic Diseases), and supplemented by the WHO Team. A concern was to secure, to the extent possible, representation across genders, types of expertise, and settings of activities/experience (with focus on low- and middle- over high-income settings), covering the six WHO regions. We conducted two rounds of the Delphi survey via an online application, Mesydel (<https://mesydel.com/en>). The first step was to arrive at an agreement over our scoping review findings that build towards the chronic care quality framework, and to propose financing mechanisms to improve quality of chronic care. Based on first round results, the second round was conducted to fine-tune purchasing arrangements. For this paper, we concentrated on findings contributing to the chronic care quality framework. Findings related to financing mechanisms to improve quality of chronic care will be presented in a separate paper.

We presented scoping review findings and version zero of the chronic care quality framework to our Delphi respondents. There was consensus on the identified chronic care quality aims, the groups of determinants, and our proposed actions in the first round. The respondents gave rich suggestions on how each of the chronic care quality aims could be achieved, providing specific determinants and actions based on their own settings, to complement the chronic care quality framework. We synthesised and critically analysed the responses, reflecting on our scoping review findings and contrasting and comparing all information collected.

RESULTS

A total of 15,215 scientific articles were retrieved and 48 [12-59] were retained for the review (Figure 1). Eighteen of these are specific for certain chronic conditions (diabetes=5, cardiovascular diseases including hypertension and stroke=5, HIV/AIDS=2; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease=2, chronic kidney disease=2, osteoarthritis=1, and cancer=1) while some target specific groups (older people=5, children=1, female=1, informal caregiver=1). Forty-six (46) propose and implement or demonstrate implementations of various models of quality of care, mostly in high income countries (n=31), five in LMICs (South Africa=3, Haiti=1, not specified=1), and the rest (n=10) said to be global/international. Majority (n=46) fit and consolidate the IOM definition of quality and two or more of the IOM care quality aims. A couple[41-42] consider Donabedian’s [2] elements of quality in healthcare.

We retrieved 26 grey literature/documents from the IOM (n=3)[3-5]; WHO (n=10)[7,60-68] the EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle (n=4)[69-72]; the United States of America (USA) Agency for Health Care Research & Quality (n=2)[73-74]; and the rest coming from different agencies: two from the USA [75-76], and one document each from Australia [77], Canada [78] Ireland [79], Belgium [80], and the Philippines [81].

More detailed information extracted from the scientific and grey literature can be found in the supplementary files, available from <https://www.itg.be/en/research/research-themes/quality-of-care-for-chronic-conditions>.

The natural history of (most) chronic conditions and the PwCC journey

Our scoping review findings [5,13-14,29,33,37,52,55,59,64,68] indicate a path of a person who is at risk of and will eventually develop (and die from) a chronic condition. In the natural history of most chronic conditions, exposure of a person throughout the whole life-course (from foetal life to adulthood) to certain social, structural and commercial determinants of health and diverse risk factors predisposes a person to develop chronic conditions. Left unaddressed, continued exposure to risks and determinants will likely cause maldevelopment of and/or damage to various organ systems including the immune system and, eventually, lead to the development of chronic conditions. Using this person's path through the 'natural history' of (most) chronic conditions, we mapped the journey through healthcare of a person who is at risk of and will eventually develop (and die from) a chronic condition, and expectations from the healthcare system. We propose the stages in the journey and touchpoints in healthcare as follows (see Figure 3):

1. general population, for risk prevention
2. at (high) risk population, for risk control
3. PwCC, of which there would be different touchpoints
 - a. diagnosis and prompt treatment,
 - b. follow-up
 - i. for the condition
 - (1) regular follow-up
 - (2) during exacerbations/moments of crisis
 - ii. for co-morbid conditions
 - iii. for complications
 - iv. for other health problems
 - c. rehabilitation
 - d. palliative and end-of-life care
 - e. considerations for the primary informal caregivers of PwCC

The depicted journey and corresponding touchpoints with the healthcare system should not be viewed in a linear, streamlined fashion. People may skip stages, 'leave' without completing the whole journey (where death may be from other causes, e.g. a fatal accident), or may regress to a preceding stage. PwCC may experience more than one of the depicted stages (e.g. not in good control + complications + other health problems). Additionally, a person with multimorbidity will be in separate stages concurrently, as they will be in a certain stage for each of their chronic condition. Moreover, given an ageing population and an increase in the numbers of PwCCs (and with multimorbidity) among them, the demand for chronic care will considerably increase worldwide [82]. Care models will no longer be able to rely solely on healthcare professionals because of lack of personnel and funding. Informal care will be essential for sustainability. These informal caregivers need to have the knowledge and be trained to provide care for the PwCC; at the same time, they also need to care for their own well-being. Supporting informal caregivers by equipping them with the knowledge to care for PwCC and for their own selves eventually will reflect on chronic care quality [30].

The PwCC journey relates well to the data collected from the scoping review, where aims and/or determinants and attributes of good quality chronic care have been applied and studied in the different stages of the journey (see supplementary file). This also strongly suggests that adopting what we propose to call as ‘journey consciousness’ should be expected from all actors (providers, users, regulators, financiers, policy-makers, etc.) who are in a position to shape the delivery of chronic care services.

Aims

We identified seven aims for quality of chronic care in our scoping review: effectiveness; efficiency; safety; equity; accessibility, timeliness and affordability; person-centredness; and continuity. These are presented in our earlier paper [9].

Determinants

We identified and classified ‘determinants’ of quality chronic care into our proposed four groups, which can be distributed across the different health system levels (national health system, local health system, health facility and healthcare team) akin to the macro-, meso- and micro-levels of the WHO ICCCF [68].

1. **Leadership & governance** would, at the national (systems) level, encompass the (overarching) policies and legislative frameworks for and in support of good quality care for chronic conditions. At the local and health facility levels, these would include different management and work systems, such as:
 - a. Local or health facility governance [19,32-33,38-41,43,48,50-51,54], local or health facility policies and local legislative frameworks as applicable (depending on the level of decentralization).
 - b. Quality management systems (QMS) [32-33,46,48-51,55].
 - c. Health information management systems [12-13,17-18,22-23,25,27,29,32-36,43,50,57-59].
 - d. Learning and knowledge management systems (including guidelines, standard operating procedures and their implementing rules and regulations) [14-17,22-23,25,28,32-33,43-45,47-49,51-52,54-55,57,59].
 - e. Resource governance / management of resources, including management of human resources for health [39-41,48,51-52,56].
 - f. Multisectoral and community engagement and collaborations to (help) address risks and determinants of chronic conditions, and to support the PwCC in their journey [20-21,25,26,33,36-39,50-52].
We note that stakeholders beyond the health sector are particularly relevant for chronic conditions, for co-designing and co-implementing interventions on risks and the social, structural and commercial determinants of the development and worsening of chronic conditions [33,38,39,43,49]. Such engagements can be initiated at both the national and local levels.
 - g. Involvement/engagement of PwCC in policy- and decision-making on issues concerning chronic care in general and for their own selves [20-21,25-26,33,36-39].
2. **Financing** at both national and local levels can consider healthcare financing itself, purchasing, healthcare spending (% of GDP, other sources, out-of-pocket expenditures), etc. Only five of the included scientific literature mention financing [25,32,43,46-47]. We note that three of our included literature suggest, but do not provide details, that rewards for effective clinical processes affecting management and prevention of chronic

problems can be established[29,68,80]. This was one of the aspects explored in the second round of our Delphi survey and will be discussed in a separate paper.

3. Resources would depend on the level of (de)centralization of health care. For instance, in a (more) centralized system, most of these determinants would originate from the national level. Depending on the degree of decentralization, these would then shift towards the local health systems, and involve the health facilities, the communities, and the PwCC and their family. We identified determinants classified under resources from our scientific and grey literature, as follows:
 - a. Infrastructure – physical environment, healthcare facility buildings and lay-out of the buildings [60,65,81].
 - b. Health care staff – with skills, knowledge and expertise in caring for chronic conditions [52,56].
 - c. Health information – the information/data collected from people consulting at the health facility; what these are and how these are documented and kept, accessed, used, and shared [13-14,17-18,22-23,25,27,32-36,43,50,57-59].
 - d. Equipment, pharmaceuticals, diagnostics and consumables, based on local patterns of diseases and health problems, to support chronic care delivery from health promotion to tertiary prevention and to promote and support self-management and informal caregiver management of the PwCC [23,41,81].
 - e. Sectors and stakeholders other than health who may positively – directly or indirectly – contribute to prevention and control of risks and chronic conditions [33,38-40,43].
 - f. PwCC, their families and their social networks, and other resources in the community [15,17,22,32,43,50] noting that informal caregiver is the subject of one of the scientific literature we reviewed [30].

4. Service delivery

This determinant group is well-developed in the included scientific literature, for instance:

- a. chronic care services [5,12-81] including services for self-management education and support, and
- b. delivery systems [27-29,32,34-40,42-43,46-52,54,56-60].

Actions on the determinants

Corollary to the above, although the presence of some determinants *per se* can already be construed to (partly) achieve specific chronic care quality aims (e.g. having chronic care structures in place, i.e. availability of chronic care services), other determinants need particular actions.

As noted in the literature we reviewed, actions would include:

1. Organization of health services [12-13,15,17-20,22-25,30,32-34,36,39,43,46-47] to have a (comprehensive) offer of care for chronic conditions (i.e. the chronic care services). This includes sound determinations of what services should be offered and in what levels, which of the human resources for health are tasked to do which activity, and how these are organized, specifically (e.g. as a separate “vertical service” or integrated with other services). Organization should also include making the services available on a regular basis and considering financial, cultural and temporal accessibility. While certain services may not be available every day, the time schedule should be fixed (e.g. fixed hours and days) to facilitate access and maximally accommodate PwCCs.

2. Designing a system of delivery of chronic care that is conscious of a person's journey through the natural history of chronic conditions, so that the offer is well-coordinated, continuous and seamless. A comprehensive health systems response would encompass health services from a person's risk exposure to their end-of life. This way, PwCC do not fall from care as they traverse their journey and move from one level of care to another, and from the community to the health facilities and vice versa. We noted this journey-conscious action, describing specific steps in the journey (e.g., screening to diagnosis and follow-up; addressing complications and comorbidities and reintegration) in 15 of the scientific literature we reviewed [18,23-24,26-27,34,36-37,41,44,46,51,54,56,58].
3. Ensuring availability of appropriate equipment, laboratory tests and medicine responsive to the needs of the population and having proper inventory and stocking mechanisms to avoid stock-outs, mechanisms to avoid equipment breakdown [23,41,61,81].
4. Ensuring proper skill mix, training, professional education (i.e. updating knowledge with scientific evidence), and supportive supervision of human resources for health to deliver coordinated, collaborative, biopsychosocial, and person-centred, culture- and gender-sensitive chronic care including self-management education and support, to PwCC, as well as ensuring health care staff motivation [13,20,22,38-39,44,46-47,51,56-58].
5. Actions on health information systems so that:
 - a. Data are analysed in a timely manner to assess population needs [13,17,22,32,43,50]
 - b. Individual health records are available and up to date for individual case management [80]; and that said PwCC health record follow them from one service to another, from one level to another, and are also accessible to the PwCC (and their informal caregivers, as warranted) etc. [13-14,17-18,22-23,25,27,32-36,43,50,57-59].
6. Actions towards promoting a culture of quality such as continuous quality improvement, with a cycle of monitoring and evaluation to check for opportunities for improvement and to act on these constructively [33-34,44,47,49-52,56].
7. Actions on financing which would include, among others, proper allocation of finances; generation, mobilization, pooling and coordination of resources; incentives [25,32,38,67,75]; considerations for alternative financing mechanisms, etc. [24,26,33,35,39,47,49], considering that PwCCs are expected to utilize health services regularly throughout the duration of their condition and more often throughout their lifetime and, thus, would need and use resources more often.
8. Provision of PwCC self-management education and support (also for informal caregivers)[12-13,15-18,21-23,25,27,29-32,35,37,42-43,47,49,59].

Integration as an exemplary principle to organize actions

Integration has received considerable attention and various interpretations, including in WHO [7,61-63,66]. Care and/or service integration is explicitly indicated as an action in 14 of the scientific literature we reviewed [18,22,33-35,37-38,40,43,45,55-57,59]. In 13 other reviewed scientific literature, the actions on care collaboration and/or coordination and/or partnerships were used as a means to integrate care or services or healthcare providers (both formal and informal) [16-17,22-24,36,39,42,44,46-47,52,54]. Our analysis places integration as an exemplary organising principle that orients actions on determinants to improve quality of chronic care. Organising the coherence of various interventions to improve quality of care matters, as acting on determinants presented above will also compete for resources.

Our literature review suggests that applying integration as an organizing principle to act on various chronic care quality determinants would have at least two implications.

First, it would encourage integration of different chronic care services, encompassing health promotion, and primary, secondary and tertiary prevention including curative care and involving different sectors and disciplines, and also taking into account social services [7,38-39,53,61,62,75,79,81]. This way, the different chronic care services at different levels and carried-out by various healthcare personnel/disciplines are *integrated* to: include population actions [25,33,38,56,59]; incorporate mechanisms to connect the PwCC with community resources [15,27,31,43,49,69,74]; and assure seamless access to all levels of care and/or other healthcare services/specialties (i.e. there is management continuity) and with their health information made available (i.e. informational continuity is ensured) covering all steps of the PwCC journey.

Second, it would encourage integration of 'integrated chronic care services' with other ongoing healthcare activities. Integration of diabetes care with other ongoing primary health care activities in LMICs has been demonstrated to improve quality of diabetes care in the past [83]. Community-based healthcare workers can perform health promotion, risk prevention and control, and screening for chronic conditions at the community level together with their other ongoing community-based activities (e.g. under-5 growth monitoring, as TB-DOTS treatment partner)[14,39]. Facility-based healthcare professionals can also take advantage and screen people identified at risk, if and when they consult (even for a different health problem), and confirm the diagnosis and initiate prompt treatment and self-management education of PwCC, together with their other healthcare activities[13].

Attributes

We identified attributes relative to specific quality aims, per determinant group, from the included scientific and grey literature (Table 2). We note that these may be specific to the context of the setting/focus of the paper cited. While a considerable number of the scientific literature presented attributes of good clinical outcomes, we noted that attributes related to structure and/or process were also used.

Delphi survey results

Forty-nine of the 52 invited stakeholders (94%) consented and participated in the Delphi survey. Table 3 provides demographic and pertinent characteristics.

There was consensus on the proposed chronic care quality aims, as we described previously [9]. In the open-ended component of the survey, the respondents described determinants and actions, and related these to achievement of the aims based on their experiences, more particularly in low resource settings. The panellists agree that attributes need to be contextual, and that the structure-process-outcome framework can be used to identify specific indicators.

They indicated the need to organize chronic care and service delivery that encompasses the whole gamut from screening to clinical management (or a 'journey-conscious' approach), which could redound on efficiency, accessibility, equity, effectiveness and continuity.

"prevention must be considered"

“Different segments of the health system could provide better continuity of care, from screening through management through treatment - which would make a big difference to patients.”

“the passive and disease-focused approach of the healthcare system affects the quality of chronic care, which is often reduced to the belated attention of clinical complications in referral settings and at a high cost”

“Service delivery for chronic conditions is absent in primary care. Medicines are not continuously available or not affordable or it is not well explained how they must be taken or adhered to or people receive the inappropriate medicines for their condition.”

“Right now, we have reactive, short-term care and changing that mindset is priority. (Currently) chronic care is nobody's business which, unfortunately, means that patients have to do it (by) themselves.”

The need for resources was highlighted; specifically identifying human resources to improve accessibility and equity, having health information systems in place for care continuity, and engagement of PwCC for self-management.

“provision of health care needs resources”

“Unequal distribution of doctors with concentrations in urban areas aggravates access problems.”

“I would ensure that services of health providers were generally accessible to all and equitably distributed.”

“...the absence of good electronic MIS (health information systems) that track the patient contributes to lack of continuity of care.”

“I would put a premium on empowering patients to be able to do self-care, particularly for interventions that have been proven to be effective. This means increasing health literacy and emphasis on primary prevention.”

Regarding financing, the respondents indicated effects on accessibility, equity, continuity and person-centredness.

“The greatest current challenge is the lack of financing... the health system was under-funded...accessibility worsened following the political-economic crisis. Inequity has always been a major challenge”

“Without a single financial architecture, the data systems, continuity of care, patient-centeredness, etc. are all extremely difficult to achieve.”

The responses were varied for the determinant group leadership and governance, calling for strategic planning and priority setting, and connecting these determinants with integration, collaborative care and wider determinants of health, which would redound on chronic care quality:

“Work more on strategic planning and setting priorities, as well as improving health care in general.”

“For improved care on chronic conditions we need to achieve the following:

- a. *Delivery within integrated care pathways spanning across care sectors and being organised around the patient;*
- b. *Co-development of interventions, Care pathways and treatment plans with patients;*
- c. *Provision of the data, electronic, administrative, and governance infrastructure to enable integrated care for chronic condition;*
- d. *Focus on improving wider determinants of health (housing, social support network, community facilities, education etc) and primary prevention in the patient's community setting."*

They also mentioned strengthening the health information and referral and counter-referral systems to help ensure continuity:

"(Continuity) can be enabled by strengthening the information system and introducing digitization, where possible."

"we need to set up a good health information system to monitor patients within the district. Depending on the technical facilities available, a referral and counter-referral system needs to be set up ...between the 2 levels ... to deal with any complications."

and working on human resources for health to improve retention.

"improve the plans for health staff and develop motivational mechanisms for keeping health staff in a country."

For our proposed framework, the panel recommended viewing equity as a cross-cutting issue, which calls for broad societal transformations. Inequitable access to care for chronic conditions is evident: while the better-off and urban population can avail private facilities or outpatient care at hospital level, the poorest households will often not find accessible or affordable treatments in their surroundings. This calls for attention to vulnerable groups (e.g. migrants, ethnic minorities, marginalized population, people living with disability), the extra barriers they face (e.g. cultural barriers, stigma, etc.) and the lower quality of care they often get.

Considering the serious shortcomings in quality of care in many facilities and health systems, the panel recommended prioritization to ensure that core determinants of quality of care are fulfilled (i.e. secure the availability of medicines, diagnostics, qualified staff, appropriate digital data system, quality assurance and clinical governance, etc.).

Illustrating the chronic care quality framework

We finalised the chronic care quality framework considering the the above results.

Figure 4 illustrates that actions on determinants can fulfil quality aims and any of these can be measured through attributes, making use of structure, process and outcomes criteria and indicators. We also emphasized the view that equity should be a cross-cutting aim, as recommended by the Delphi panel. We remind that the determinants and actions should be situated in each step of the healthcare journey of PwCC, as illustrated in Figure 3.

DISCUSSION

Our results support creating a chronic care quality framework considering different individual and organizational perspectives, the whole gamut of chronicity from risks to

complications. and the need for informal carers. These views are best expressed through our proposed determinant groups and specific actions that can be applied to specific steps in the healthcare journey of PwCC. The determinants and respective actions on certain determinants can contribute to the achievement of one or more of the seven chronic care quality aims. We have established that equity is an aim by itself as well as a cross-cutting one that should also be considered when achieving other aims. For instance, care that is effective should be made accessible regardless of personal characteristics of PwCC. Measuring achievement can be done by looking into specific indicators of the structures, processes, and outcomes of care.

We recognize that the determinants and actions listed from our scoping review and validated through the Delphi survey may not be exhaustive. However, our determinant groups are all-encompassing and include actors outside of the health system, as demonstrated in both our scoping review and Delphi results. Further to this, ‘journey consciousness’ reminds these actors that there is a collective responsibility for the best system performance along the PwCC journey and that everyone has to reflect how their contribution fits in the journey, keeping in mind that the state of the PwCC in front of them is determined by the history of the disease, and by how the health system has handled the PwCC and their risk-exposures and disease(s) in the past, is handling them right now, and how they will be handled in the future. Failure to provide good quality health services in an earlier step of the journey will rebound on the succeeding steps. Journey consciousness and the (non-)achievement of good quality chronic care as related to each step can also be partly measured through cascades of care[85].

Starting the journey at the level of risk prevention brings to attention the actions that need to be done to prevent and control risks. Engagement and involvement of a wider range of actors is possible in the co-design and co-implementation of interventions on risks, and in addressing the social, structural and commercial determinants of the development and worsening of chronic conditions [34,39,40,44,60]. Such stakeholder-, community- and PwCC-engagements can be initiated at both the national and local levels. However, while actions on these ‘external’ determinants are expected to be made – or at the least, initiated – within the health system, there should be clear understanding of the responsibilities of the health system. Addressing the various risks and the social/structural/commercial determinants themselves, e.g. air pollution control, the regulation of sales of unhealthy products, food formulations, tobacco and alcohol taxations, etc. would need actions beyond the scope of the health system.

We also stress the importance of the PwCC (and their families and, where applicable, their informal caregivers), whom we identified as a determinant (a resource), in achieving good quality chronic care that starts from their own individual level. About 95-99% of care is given by the PwCC (or their families/ informal caregivers) to their own self; they are in-charge of their own health on a day-to-day basis [85]. Equipping PwCCs and their direct caregivers with self-management education and providing them support to self-manage will contribute to better chronic care. PwCCs can also be tapped as peer educators to provide self-management education and support, augmenting much-needed workforce.

Regarding monitoring of quality, achieving the aims of chronic care quality through their determinants and the actions are, to a fair extent, measurable. As illustrated in our CCCQ framework, this allows assessing whether quality of care is in place or has been acted upon. To look into specific and directly measurable variables of importance for quality of chronic

care, our results are congruent with Donabedian's structures, processes and outcomes framework [2]. Structure measures refer to the attributes of the health service or the healthcare provider, i.e. the presence or adequacy or magnitude of specific determinants, such as availability of services, health care provider to patient ratio, presence of guidelines. Process measures entail attributes relative to what the health system/service or the healthcare provider does to maintain or improve health, for instance if care delivery follows standards of care, healthcare workers follow standard operating procedures, referral/counter-referral mechanisms are used. Last, outcome measures are attributes that reflect the impact of the health service or the health care provided to the PwCC, for example improved glycemia in people with diabetes, reduced mortality rate. These attributes can have set criteria and/or indicators, e.g.: presence/availability of specific chronic care services, number of healthcare providers trained in self-management education provision (structure); number of healthcare providers following/utilising clinical practice guidelines (process); a decrease in glycosylated haemoglobin by certain percentage points (outcome), etc. Considering structures and processes expands measures of quality care beyond (clinical) outcomes. We do not give specific indicators or criteria in the CCCQ framework; rather, we indicate that attributes can be measured through structures, processes and outcomes. The measurable attributes listed in Table 2 give an idea of what indicators and criteria can be used; implementers can take inspiration from these examples and formulate their own measures based on their context and the specific interventions they implement.

LIMITATIONS

We presented concepts relative to quality of care, tailored to chronic conditions. We note that there is very minimal literature available from low resource settings; we addressed this by ensuring representativity of low- and middle-income country expertise and experience in our Delphi survey.

While we have specified chronic care quality aims, determinants, actions and attributes from a scoping review and validated these with a Delphi survey, these warrant implementation research especially to identify what specific determinants need to be acted upon, what organising principles are warranted in the context to orient specific actions, and to tailor the structure, process, and outcome attributes that will be used to measure achievement of the aims.

CONCLUSIONS

We have moved from a generic understanding of quality of care to one tailored to chronic conditions, considering various views of individuals and organizations. We have determined the scope of attention, one which values a comprehensive offer of healthcare services, addresses risks and determinants, ensures biopsychosocial well-being of PwCC, and gives importance to measurable attributes relevant to the PwCC and their families, to the community, and to the health system. With this view, we formulated a chronic care quality framework that looks into different determinants of chronic care quality and actions that could achieve the aims of good quality chronic care.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY & FURTHER RESEARCH

The CCCQ framework developed in this study could be used to identify the leverage points to be targeted by interventions aimed at improving quality of chronic care or to monitor along the causal pathway the effectiveness of such interventions. For instance, as a further round of discussion in the Delphi survey performed for this study, the framework was used as the basis for discussing healthcare purchasing arrangements and their possible effectiveness in improving quality of chronic care in low- and middle-income countries. The Delphi survey results on purchasing arrangements will be presented separately. These are all components of the larger program of work implemented by WHO, which focuses on purchasing arrangements as an instrument to improve quality of health services for chronic conditions. It is expected that member nations will take inspiration from this program of work. Actors active in chronic care may also be inspired by our specifications, in designing good quality chronic care services or working on improvement strategies thereto.

Our outputs relative to the framing of chronic care quality are conceptual. Operationalization for systematic improvements in quality of chronic care can be a next step, among others.

DRAFT

References

1. Youssra M and Bozic KJ. Brief history of quality movement in US healthcare. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2012 Dec; 5(4): 265–273.
2. Donabedian A. An introduction to quality assurance in healthcare. New York: Oxford University Press; 2003.
3. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. *To err is human: building a safer health system*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 1999.
4. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2001.
5. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Crossing the global quality chasm: Improving health care worldwide*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2018.
6. World Health Organization. *Quality of care : a process for making strategic choices in health systems*. Geneva: WHO; 2006.
7. World Health Organization, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, and The World Bank. *Delivering quality health services: A global imperative for universal health coverage*. Geneva: WHO, OECD and The World Bank; 2018.
8. Huber M, Knottnerus JA, Green L, Horst H v. d., Jadad AR, Kromhout D, Leonard B, et al. How should we define health? *BMJ*. 2011;343:d4163. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.d4163
9. Ku GM, Van De Put W, Katsuva D, Ag Ahmed MA, Rosenberg M, Meessen B. Quality of care for chronic conditions: Identifying specificities of quality aims based on scoping review and Delphi survey. *Global Health Action*, 17:1, 2381878, DOI: 10.1080/16549716.2024.2381878
10. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews. Available from: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/ScopingReviews>
11. GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020;396:1204–22.
12. Hung DY, Rundall TG, Tallia AF, Cohen DJ, Halpin HA, Crabtree BF. Rethinking Prevention in Primary Care: Applying the Chronic Care Model to Address Health Risk Behaviors. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2007;85:69-91.
13. Lewanczuk R. Innovations in primary care: Implications for hypertension detection and treatment. *Can J Cardiol*. 2006; 22(7):614-616.
14. Hung DY, Glasgow RE, Dickinson LM, Froshaug DB, Fernald DH, Balasubramanian BA, et al. The Chronic Care Model and Relationships to Patient Health Status and Health-Related Quality of Life. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2008;35.
15. Hroschikovsky MC, Solberg AI, Sperl-Hillen JM, Harper PG, McGrail MP, Crabtree BF. Challenges of Change: A Qualitative Study of Chronic Care Model Implementation. *Ann Fam Med*. 2006;4:317-326. DOI: 10.1370/afm.570.
16. Jansen DL, Heijmans M & Rijken M. Individual care plans for chronically ill patients within primary care in the Netherlands: Dissemination and associations with patient characteristics and patient-perceived quality of care. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*. 2015; 33: 100–106.

17. Kaissi AA & Parchmann M. Assessing Chronic Illness Care for Diabetes in Primary Care Clinics. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality & Patient Safety*. 2006; 32:6.
18. Lim LL, Lau ES, Kong AP, Davies MJ, Levitt NS, Eliasson B, et al. Aspects of Multicomponent Integrated Care Promote Sustained Improvement in Surrogate Clinical Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41:1312-1320. DOI: 10.2337/dc17-2010.
19. Ludt S, Van Lieshout J, Campbell SM, Rochon J, Ose D, Freund T, Wensing M, Szecsenyi J. Identifying factors associated with experiences of coronary heart disease patients receiving structured chronic care and counselling in European primary care. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12.
20. Lyon RK & Glawson JG. An organized approach to chronic disease care. *Family Practice Management* May-June 2011:27-31.
21. Vrijhoef HJM, Berbee R, Wagner EH, & Steuten LMG. Quality of integrated chronic care measured by patient survey: identification, selection and application of most appropriate instruments. *Health Expectations* 2009; 12:417–429
22. Petrelli F, Cangelosi G, Nittari G, Pantanetti P, Debernardi G, Scuri S. Chronic Care Model in Italy: a narrative review of the literature. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*. 2021; 22(e32): 1–7. DOI: 10.1017/S1463423621000268
23. Lall D, Engel N, Devadasan N, Horstman K, Criel B. Models of care for chronic conditions in low/middle-income countries: a ‘best fit’ framework synthesis. *BMJ Global Health*. 2018;3:e001077. DOI:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001077
24. Parchman N & Kaissi AA. Are Elements of the Chronic Care Model Associated with Cardiovascular Risk Factor Control in Type 2 Diabetes? *Joint Commission Journal on Quality & Patient Safety* 2009 35;3:135-38
25. Mateo-Gavira I, Carrasco-García S, Larran L, Fierro MJ, Zarallo A, Mayoral Sánchez E, et al. Specific model for the coordination of primary and hospital care for patients with diabetes mellitus. Evaluation of two-year results (2015–2017). *Endocrinología, Diabetes y Nutrición (English ed.)*. 2021;68:175-183.
26. Enderlin CA, McLeskey N, Rooker JL, Steinhauser C, D’Avolio D, Gusewelle R, Ennen KA. Review of current conceptual models and frameworks to guide transitions of care in older adults. *Geriatric Nursing*. 2013;34:47-52.
27. Sendall M, McCosker L, Crossley K, & Bonner A. A structured review of chronic care model components supporting transition between healthcare service delivery types for older people with multiple chronic diseases. *Health Information Management Journal* 2016; 1–11 DOI: 10.1177/1833358316681687
28. Hopman P, De Bruin SR, Forjaz MJ, Rodriguez-Blazquez C, Tonnara G, Lemmens LC, et al. Effectiveness of comprehensive care programs for patients with multiple chronic conditions or frailty: A systematic literature review. *Health Policy*. 2016;120:818-832.
29. Adams JS & Woods ER. Redesign of chronic illness care in children and adolescents: evidence for the chronic care model. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics* 2016; 28;4:428-33
30. Litzelmann K. Caregiver Well-being and the Quality of Cancer Care. *Semin Oncol Nurs*. 2019; 35(4): 348–353. doi:10.1016/j.soncn.2019.06.006.
31. Dugoff EH, Dy S, Giovannetti ER, Leff B, & Boyd CM. Setting Standards at the Forefront of Delivery System Reform: Aligning Care Coordination Quality Measures for Multiple Chronic Conditions. *J Healthc Qual*. 2013; 35(5): 58–69. doi:10.1111/jhq.12029.

32. Brand CA, Ackerman IN, Tropea J. Chronic disease management: Improving care for people with osteoarthritis. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Rheumatology* 2014; 28:119–142
33. Buja A, Toffanin R, Claus M, Ricciardi W, Damiani G, Baldo V, et al. Developing a new clinical governance framework for chronic diseases in primary care: an umbrella review. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e020626. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020626
34. Beland F & Hollander MJ. Integrated models of care delivery for the frail elderly: international perspectives. *Gac Sanit.* 2011; 25(S):138–146
35. Kanter MH, Lindsay G, Bellows J. Complete Care at Kaiser Permanente: Transforming Chronic and Preventive Care. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality & Patient Safety* 2013; 39(11):484-94.
36. Chiu HHL, Murphy-Burke DMM, Thomas SA, Yuriy M, Kruthaup-Harper AL, Janghu JD, et al. and the BC Renal Palliative Committee. Advancing Palliative Care in Patients With CKD: From Ideas to Practice. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2020; 77(3):420-426.
37. Morrin L, Britten J, Davachi S, Knight H. Alberta Healthy Living Programme: A Model for Successful Integration of Chronic Disease Management Services. *Can J Diabetes* 2013 37:254e259
38. Nuno R, Coleman K, Bengoa R, & Sautoa R. Integrated care for chronic conditions: The contribution of the ICC Framework. *Health Policy* 2012; 105:55–64
39. Lebina L, Oni T, Alaba OA, Kawonga M. A mixed methods approach to exploring the moderating factors of implementation fidelity of the integrated chronic disease management model in South Africa. *BMC Health Services Research* 2020; 20:617
40. Ameh S, Gómez-Olivé FX, Kahn K, Tollman SM, Klipstein-Grobusch K. Relationships between structure, process and outcome to assess quality of integrated chronic disease management in a rural South African setting: applying a structural equation model. *BMC Health Services Research* 2017; 17:229
41. Ameh S, Klipstein-Grobusch K, D’ambruoso L, Kahn K, Tollman SM, Gomez-Olive FX. Quality of integrated chronic disease care in rural South Africa: user and provider perspectives. *Health Policy and Planning* 2017; 32:257–
42. Ulbrich EM, Mattei AT, Mantovani MdF, Bittencourt Madureira A, & Puchalski Kalinke L. Care models for people with chronic diseases: integrative review. *Invest. Educ. Enferm.* 2017; 35 (1): 8-16
43. Grover A & Joshi A. An Overview of Chronic Disease Models: A Systematic Literature. *Global Journal of Health Science* 2015; (2): 210-27
44. Disler RT, Currow DC, Phillips JL, Smith T, Johnson MJ, Davidson PM. Interventions to support a palliative care approach in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies.* 2012;49:1443-1458.
45. Kari H, Aij O-Jensen N, Kortejarvi H. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a people-centred care model for community-living older people versus usual care – A randomized controlled trial. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy* 2021; 18:3004–3012.
46. Kamajian S. Utilizing medical homes to manage chronic conditions. *Osteopathic Family Physician* 2010; 2:102-107.
47. Brownson CA, Miller D, Crespo R, Neuner S, Thompson J, Wall JC. A Quality Improvement Tool to Assess Self-Management Support in Primary Care. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety.* 2007;33:408-416.

48. Harvey G, Oliver K, Humphreys J, Rothwell K & Hegarty J. Improving the identification and management of chronic kidney disease in primary care: lessons from a staged improvement collaborative. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2015; 27(1), 10–16
49. Hayashino Y, Suzuki H, Yamazaki K, Goto A, Izumi K, Noda M. A cluster randomized trial on the effect of a multifaceted intervention improved the technical quality of diabetes care by primary care physicians: The Japan Diabetes Outcome Intervention Trial-2 (J-DOIT2). *Diabetic Medicine*. 2015;33:599-608.
50. Hirschhorn LR, Landers S, McInnes DK, Malitz F, Ding L, Joyce R, et al. Reported care quality in federal Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program supported networks of HIV/AIDS care. *AIDS Care*. 2009;21:799-807. DOI:10.1080/09540120802511992
51. Joseph JP, Jeromea G, Lamberta W, Almazor P, Cupidon CE, Hirschhorn LR. Going beyond the vertical: leveraging a national HIV quality improvement programme to address other health priorities in Haiti. *AIDS* 2015; 29 (Suppl 2):S165–S173
52. Pullen R, Miravittles M, Sharma A, Singh D, Martinez F, Hurst JR, et al. CONQUEST Quality Standards: For the Collaboration on Quality Improvement Initiative for Achieving Excellence in Standards of COPD Care. *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease*. 2021; 16:2301–2322
53. Wellwood I, Wu O, Langhorne P. Developing a Tool to Assess Quality of Stroke Care Across European Populations: The EROS Quality Assessment Tool. *Stroke* 2011; 42:1207-1211
54. Hawthorne G, Hrisos S, Stamp E. Diabetes Care Provision in UK Primary Care Practices. *Plos One* 2012; 7(7): e41562.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0041562
55. Fletcher GF, Berra K, Fletcher BJ, Gilstrap L, & Wood MJ. The Integrated Team Approach to the Care of the Patient with Cardiovascular Disease. *Curr Probl Cardiol* 2012; 37:369-397.
56. Mitchell JD, Haag JD, Klavetter E, Beldo R, Shah ND, Baumbach LJ, et al. Development and Implementation of a Team-Based, Primary Care Delivery Model: Challenges and Opportunities. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2019;94:1298-1303.
57. Van Houtven CH, Hastings SN, & Colón-Emeric C. A Path To High-Quality Team-Based Care For People With Serious Illness. *Health Affairs* 2019; 38;6: 934–940
58. Washington DL, Bean-Mayberry B, Mitchell MN, Riopelle D, & Yano EM. Tailoring VA Primary Care to Women Veterans: Association with Patient-Rated Quality and Satisfaction. *Women's Health Issues* 2011; 21-4S:S112–S119
59. Campbell N, Young ER, Drouin D, Legowski B, Adams MA, Farrell J, et al. A Framework for Discussion on How to Improve Prevention, Management, and Control of Hypertension in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* 2012; 28:262–269.
60. World Health Organization. Global action plan for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases 2013-2020. Geneva: WHO; 2013. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241506236> [accessed 30 September 2021]
61. WHO PAHO. Manual for implementing quality care for chronic conditions. USA: WHO PAHO; undated.
62. World Health Organization Europe. Integrated care models: an overview. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2016.
63. World Health Organization. Primary care: Putting people first. Geneva: WHO; 2008.

64. World Health Organization. Assessing national capacity for the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
65. World Health Organization. Health System performance assessment. Geneva: WHO; 2022
66. World Health Organization. A Vision for Primary Care. Geneva: WHO; 2018.
67. World Health Organization. Better NCD outcomes: challenges and opportunities for health systems. Geneva: WHO; 2014
68. World Health Organization. Innovative care for chronic conditions. Geneva: WHO; 2002.
69. Palmer and the EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle. Multimorbidity care model: Recommendations from the consensus meeting of the joint Action on Chronic. Brussels: EC; 2016.
70. EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle. QCR Tool based on CHRODIS: Recommendations to improve prevention and quality of care for people with chronic diseases. Brussels: EC; undated.
71. EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle. CHRODIS QCR Toolguide. Brussels: EC; undated.
72. EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle. Deliverable 7.1 WP7 Pilot action design: A blueprint for action. Brussels: EC; 2019.
73. Peikes D, Taylor EF, Genevro J, Meyers D. A Guide to Real-World Evaluations of Primary Care Interventions. USA: Agency for Health Care Research & Quality; 2014.
74. McDonald KM. Care coordination atlas. USA: Agency for Health Care Research & Quality; 2014.
75. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Multiple chronic conditions - a strategic framework. USA: U.S department of Health and Human Services; 2010.
76. Thompson, L. Disease Management Programs: Improving health while reducing costs? In: The Center on an Aging Society at Georgetown University's Institute for Health Care Research and Policy. Issue Briefs on Challenges for the 21st Century: Chronic and Disabling Conditions. Washington, DC: George University Health Policy Institute; undated [cited 7 September 2022]. Available from: <https://hpi.georgetown.edu/management/>
77. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Better outcomes for people with chronic and complex conditions. Australia: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 2015.
78. Jackson J, Lahtinen M, Cooke T. Understanding patient and provider experience with relationship, management and informational continuity. Canada: Health Quality Council of Alberta; 2016.
79. Department of Health & Children. Tackling chronic disease - a policy framework for the management of chronic diseases. Ireland: Department of Health & Children; undated.
80. Belgian healthcare knowledge center. Organisation of care for chronic patients in Belgium: development of a position paper. Belgium: KCE; 2012.
81. Philippine Health Insurance Corporation. Bench book on performance improvement of health services. Philippines: PhilHealth; 2004.
82. Broese van Groenou MI & De Boer A, 2016. Providing informal care in a changing society. European Journal of Ageing, 13, 271-279.
83. Ku GMV, Kegels G, 2014. Integrating chronic care with primary care activities: enriching healthcare staff knowledge and skills and improving glycemic control of a

cohort of people with diabetes through the First Line Diabetes Care Project in the Philippines. *Glob Health Action* 2014; 7: 25286. doi: 10.3402/gha.v7.25286.

84. The World Bank. *Improving Health Services and Redesigning Health Systems: Using Care Cascade Analytics to Identify Challenges and Solutions. Volume 1: Population-level Cascade Analytics 2021.* Washington DC: World Bank. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0. pp 10-19.
85. Funnel MM. Helping patients take charge of their chronic illnesses. *Fam Pract Manag.* 2000;7(3):47-51. PMID: 10947289.

DRAFT

Acknowledgments

We thank John de Maesschalck, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium, and Rafael Nalupta and Shreyashi Paik (student interns) for their assistance with the screening of scientific literature in the scoping review. The online Delphi survey (administration) was facilitated by Lynette Dominguez, independent consultant and supported, as for the digital platform, by Martin Erpicum, Mesylab, Liege, Belgium. We are grateful to the participants of our Delphi panel for their invaluable contributions. The authors are themselves alone responsible for the views expressed in this article, which do not necessarily represent the views, decisions, or policies of the World Health Organization.

Author Contributions

GK conceptualized the full work, based on a terms of reference published by WHO, with contributions from WVDP, MGAA, and DK. The scoping review protocol was prepared by GK, with contributions from WVDP, MGAA, DK, MR and BM. The scoping review was conducted by GK, WVDP, MGAA, and DK. The Delphi survey protocol was prepared by GK and BM, with contributions from WVDP, MGAA, DK, and MR. The Delphi survey questionnaire was prepared by BM and GK, with contributions from MR. Analysis of the Delphi survey was conducted by BM, GK and MR. This manuscript was drafted by GK, with contributions from WVDP, MGAA, DK, MR and BM. All authors read and approved the final version.

Disclosure Statement

None of the authors have any financial competing interests regarding this research.

Ethics and Consent

The Delphi survey protocol and an amendment thereto were reviewed and approved by the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp Institutional Review Board (protocol number 1627/22). Briefing sessions, scheduled in two moments to accommodate time differences, were conducted to orient prospective participants to the study (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A7FLpdIB0xs&t=1s>). Full informed consent was obtained prior to participation.

Funding Information

This study, as part of a programme of work “Purchasing instruments to strengthen quality health services for chronic illnesses”, was commissioned by the WHO Kobe Centre and the WHO Department of Health Financing and Economics. The Kobe Group, which includes Hyogo Prefecture, Kobe City, the Kobe Chamber of Commerce and Kobe Steel, in Japan, contributed financially to the development and production of the research report.

Paper context

- **Main findings:** *The nature of chronic conditions, the journey through healthcare of people with chronic conditions and how different groups view care quality redound on ensuing distinct chronic care needs, warranting specifications for good quality chronic care.*

- **Added knowledge:** *The concepts proposed in our chronic care quality framework are tailored to the natural history of chronic conditions and considers the journey through healthcare of a person with chronic conditions as well as views of different stakeholders, to provide a comprehensive guide in designing/implementing/evaluating quality chronic care services throughout the continuum.*
- **Global health impact for policy and action:** *This work, developed to guide further work on designing purchasing instruments to improve quality of chronic care, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, may also be a source of inspiration for other interventions aiming at improving quality of chronic care.*

ORCID identifiers

Grace Marie V. Ku	0000-0002-4276-9104
Willem van de Put	0000-0002-3306-5287
Deogratias Katsuva	0000-0003-1366-3295
Mohamad Ali Ag Ahmed	0000-0001-9374-871X
Megumi Rosenberg	0000-0002-0226-2229
Bruno Meessen	0000-0002-0359-8621






Figure 2. Sifting of retrieved scientific literature




Figure 3. Journey through the healthcare delivery system of a person with chronic condition (PwCC Journey)

Explanatory notes: **Community-based** services include, among others, general health promotion activities; awareness-raising; risk-screening and control; early diagnosis (screening for disease); self-management support; linking with community resources; community reintegration and community-based rehabilitation. **Facility-based** services include, among others, early diagnosis (confirmatory); prompt and regular clinical case management; self-management education; targeted risk control; for complications and comorbidities/multimorbidities - early recognition (including screening), prompt and regular treatment and referral (as needed). 'Good control' refers to achievement of good clinical endpoints of the chronic condition; logically, 'not in good control' is the opposite. In a lifetime of a PwCC, it is expected that there will be moments of 'good' control and moments of 'poor' (not in good) control. The frequency of either, and the severity of 'poor control' depends on a number of factors, the quality of chronic care of which plays a vital role. **Comorbidity** is the occurrence of multiple (acute and/or chronic medical conditions which may or may not be related with the chronic condition) of the PwCC, and which contribute to their total burden of (physiologic as well as psychosocial) dysfunction. While these may either be acute or other chronic conditions, comorbidities are usually used for additional chronic conditions. The presence of comorbidities complexifies healthcare as there may be agonistic and antagonistic interactions in case management. **Complications** are conditions that arise from (worsening of) the chronic condition(s) including those that arise during the course of treatment. **Other health problems** are health issues which are unrelated to the chronic condition but are recognised as such because of effects of the chronic condition on the health and well-being of the person. These may also be classified as comorbid conditions, but we use this term to refer to other health problems not necessarily with established diagnosis and may include the need for preventive services, e.g., immunizations, prophylaxis treatments, as warranted by the chronic condition.




Figure 4. Framework for good quality care for chronic conditions

Table 1. Chronic care quality determinants and actions identified from the literature reviewed

Author(s), year of publication	Determinants identified	Actions identified
SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE		
Hung et al (2007) [12]	Leadership & governance (facility level) Healthcare services (prevention, risk control) PwCC	Good practice management Organization of health care Self-management education and support PwCC engagement
Lewanczuk et al (2006) [13]	Leadership & governance (systems level) Health information system Human resources for health (HRH, specifically family physician and specialized team) Public health official PwCC Healthcare services	Organization of health care Delivery system design Self-management education and support Decision support Use of registry data to inform health system responses
Hung et al (2008) [14]	Health information system HRH (physician, nurse, medical assistant) Healthcare services	Delivery system design
Hroschikoski et al (2006) [15]	Health information systems Community resources PwCC Healthcare services	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support Community linkages
Janssen et al (2015) [16]	PwCC HRH (primary care level) Healthcare services	Care coordination Care collaboration Self-management education and support
Kaissi et al (2006) [17]	Leadership & governance (facility level) Appointment system Clinical information systems HRH (primary care physicians, specialists, educators) PwCC and families	Organization of health care Decision support Delivery system design Self-management education and support Community linkages

	Expert peers	
Lim et al (2018) [18]	Health care providers Health information systems PwCC Expert peers	Organization of health care Self-management education and support Care integration
Ludt et al (2012) [19]	Leadership and governance (facility level) HRH	Organization of health care
Lyon et al (2011) [20]	HRH (chronic care team)	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support HRH satisfaction/motivation Engagement
Vrijhoef et al (2009) [21]	HRH PwCC Appointment system	Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support
Petrelli et al (2021) [22]	Evidence-based guidelines Health information systems Community External stakeholders (volunteer groups, self-help groups, centers for the elderly, third sector in general) HRH (general practitioner, specialist doctors, nurses)	Organization of health care Decision support Self-management education and support Resource generation / mobilization
Lall et al (2018) [23]	Medicines Diagnostics HRH Health information systems PwCC	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support Healthcare coordination Community linkages Resource generation
Mateo et al (2019) [24]	Healthcare services Referral system	Organization of health care Delivery system design
Adams & Wood (2016) [25]	Regulating agencies Financing PwCC Chronic care team	Healthcare organization Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support

	Local expert or champion Clinical information systems Community	Collaborative care Engagement Community linkages Financing mechanisms (incentives)
Enderlin et al (2013) [26]	PwCC, families and (informal) caregivers HRH (healthcare providers, nurses specializing in geriatrics)	Delivery system design Skill mix Health literacy / engagement / partnerships
Sendall et al (2016) [27]	PwCC Clinical information systems	Delivery system design Self-management education and support Community linkages
Hopman et al (2016) [28]	Healthcare services Clinical information systems	Comprehensive care / care integration (provision of care for various conditions) Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support
Parchman & Kaissi (2009) [29]	Healthcare services Clinical information systems HRH PwCC	Organization of the practice/clinic Delivery system design Care integration Community linkages Self-management education and support Decision support
Litzelmann et al (2019) [30]	Psychosocial care services PwCC (informal) caregivers	Self-management education and support (directed towards caregivers) Collaborative (integrated) care
Dugoff et al (2013) [31]	Health information systems Community resources PwCC	Self-management education and support Community linkages Care coordination
Brand et al (2014) [32]	Leadership & governance (facility level) Guidelines (Computerized) reminders (Patient) decision aids Quality management systems Financing Clinical information systems Patient registry Appointment/follow-up system	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support Collaborative care Performance (quality) improvement Financing mechanisms (incentives) Community linkages

	HRH (chronic care team)	
Buja et al (2018) [33]	Leadership & governance (systems and health service levels) Quality management systems Health Information systems HRH PwCC and families	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Care integration Partnerships with society Collaborative care Empowerment and engagement Continuous quality improvement
Belland & Hollander (2011) [34]	Leadership and governance Legislation and policies Standard operating procedures Information management Financing Health information systems HRH Care provider organizations Community	Organization of health care Delivery system design (facility & community based) Care coordination Care integration
Kanter et al (2013) [35]	Workflows, algorithms, standard operating procedures Clinical information systems	Delivery system design Decision support Care integration Self-management education and support
Chiu et al (2020) [36]	Leadership (culture change) Clinical information systems HRH PwCC	Organization of care Delivery system design Decision support Care collaboration Engagement
Morrin et al (2013) [37]	Standards of care Clinical information systems HRH (primary care), multidisciplinary teams PwCC Community	Service delivery design Care integration Self-management education and support Community partnership Engagement
Nuno et al (2012) [38]	Leadership & governance (systems and facility levels), policies Healthcare services (New) technologies HRH	Organization of health care Delivery service design (community & facility-based services) Decision support

	<p>PwCC and family External stakeholders Community</p>	<p>Care integration Collaborative care HRH satisfaction / motivation / appropriate skills and skill mix Resource utilization Multisectoral involvement</p>
Lebina et al (2020) [39]	<p>Leadership and governance (facility level) Supply chain management system Resources management system Guidelines HRH PwCC Community External stakeholders</p>	<p>Organization of health care Decision support Self-management education and support Patient satisfaction Multisectoral involvement Collaboration</p>
Ameh et al (2017) [40]	<p>Leadership Resources management system Appointment and defaulter tracing system Medicines Equipment</p>	<p>Delivery system design Care integration</p>
Ameh et al (2017) [41]	<p>Leadership Resources management system Referral system HRH (nurse) Medicine Equipment</p>	<p>Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support</p>
Ulbrich et al (2017) [42]	<p>Evidence-based care HRH (physician, nurse) PwCC Community</p>	<p>Delivery system design Self-management Care linkages (coordination)</p>
Grover & Joshi (2015) [43]	<p>Leadership & governance (system and facility levels) Policies Guidelines Resource management system Quality and safety improvement system Performance monitoring system Care innovations</p>	<p>Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Clinical information systems Self-management education and support Collaborative care Care integration</p>

	Clinical information systems HRH PwCC and family Community Stakeholders, support groups	Multisectoral involvement Community linkages
Disler et al (2012) [44]	HRH Comprehensive care services Holistic, psychosocial care services	Delivery system design Decision support Collaborative care
Kari et al (2021) [45]	HRH (nurse, pharmacist, GP) PwCC	Delivery system design Coordination Care integration
Kamajian et al (2010) [46]	Quality improvement and accountability systems Financing HRH (physician-directed care team)	Organization of health care Delivery system design Collaborative care Payment reforms
Brownson et al (2007) [47]	HRH PwCC	Organization of health care Decision support Self-management education and support Collaborative care
Harvey et al (2015) [48]	Leadership & governance (Resources / financial management)	Financing mechanisms (incentives) Decision support Continuous quality improvement
Hayashino et al (2015) [49]	HRH PwCC Behaviour-change materials	Decision support Self-management education and support Continuous quality improvement
Hirschhorn et al (2009) [50]	Leadership & Governance Clinical information systems Quality management systems Network of health facilities Comprehensive care services	Care coordination Care integration Continuous quality improvement
Joseph et al (2015) [51]	Resources management Quality management systems Medicines HRH PwCC Expert peers	Service delivery design Decision support Quality improvement Engagement Self-management education and support

Pullen et al (2021) [52]	HRH Guidelines Risk prediction and symptom assessment tools Medicines Non-pharmacological interventions (e.g. smoking cessation counselling, materials) Medical devices HRH PwCC	Delivery system design Decision support Collaborative care Skill mix PwCC engagement
Wellwood et al (2011) [53]	Leadership & governance Guidelines, algorithms, clinical pathways Clinical management protocols Healthcare services Medical and surgical services / interventions Rehabilitation services / interventions HRH	Organization of health care Delivery system design (multidisciplinary teams; community-based and facility-based) Care coordination Decision support
Hawthorne et al (2012) [54]	HRH PwCC	Self-management education and support Collaborative care
Fletcher et al (2012) [55]	HRH PwCC, family, friends	Decision support Care integration Care collaboration
Mitchell et al (2019) [56]	Quality management systems HRH	Delivery system design (multidisciplinary) Care integration Skill mix
Van Houtven et al (2019) [57]	(Clinical) information systems HRH (healthcare team) Family (informal) caregivers	Organization of health care Delivery system design Decision support Care integration Collaboration
Washington et al (2011) [58]	Leadership and governance (facility level) HRH	Service delivery design Decision support Patient satisfaction
Campbell et al (2012) [59]	Leadership and governance (systems and facility levels) Quality management systems Health information system/Clinical information systems HRH (interdisciplinary primary healthcare team)	Delivery system design Decision support Care integration Quality improvement

	PwCC Community External stakeholders	Self-management education and support Community engagement Stakeholder involvement
GREY LITERATURE		
Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America (1999)[3]	Leadership and governance HRH Health technologies	Performance improvement
Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America (2001)[4]	Leadership and governance Evidence-based medicine HRH Health information system Health technologies	Care collaboration Performance improvement
National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018)[5]	Leadership and governance Evidence-based medicine Equipment HRH Health information system Health technologies	Care collaboration Performance improvement
World Health Organization (2018)[7]	Evidence-based medicine Health information system	Care integration Patient engagement
World Health Organization (2013)[60]	Leadership and governance HRH Health information systems (registries) Healthcare services Delivery system	Organisation of healthcare services Delivery system design Decision support Care integration Patient and community engagement
WHO PAHO (undated)[61]	Leadership and governance including community policies Clinical practice guidelines Health information system Community resources	Delivery system design Quality improvement Decision support Self-management education and support
World Health Organization Europe (2016)[62]	Leadership and governance Health care services	Delivery system design Decision support

World Health Organization (2008)[63]	Health information system Health care services	Delivery system design Decision support Care integration (care coordination)
World Health Organization (2019)[64]	Leadership and governance Financing Resources, Equipment	Organization of healthcare services Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support Community linkages
World Health Organization (2022)[65]	Leadership and governance Financing HRH	Organization of healthcare services Delivery system design
World Health Organization (2018)[66]	Leadership and governance HRH Health care services Delivery system	Delivery system design Care integration (care coordination)
World Health Organization (2014)[67]	Leadership and governance Evidence-based medicine Financing HRH Health information systems Medicine Service delivery	Financing mechanisms (incentives) Care integration (care coordination) Quality assurance
World Health Organization (2002)[68]	Leadership and governance Evidence-based medicine, clinical practice guidelines Financing HRH Healthcare services Delivery system	Organization of healthcare services Delivery system design Care integration, care coordination Quality assurance
Palmer et al. (2016) [69]	HRH Community resources Healthcare services Delivery system	Delivery system design Multidisciplinary care teams Self-management education and support (including families and informal carers)

EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle (undated) [70]	Governance Healthcare services Delivery system	Delivery system design Decision support Performance improvement Ethics Engagement of population
EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle (undated) [71]	Governance Healthcare services Delivery system	Delivery system design Decision support Performance improvement Ethics Engagement of population
EU Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Healthy Ageing Across the Life Cycle (2019)[72]	Leadership and governance Financing Equipment HRH Healthcare services	Delivery system design Decision support Self-management education and support Engagement Performance improvement
Peikes et al. (2014)[73]	Governance Delivery system	Delivery system design
McDonald (2014)[74]	Leadership & governance Knowledge management HRH Community resources Information technology Health technologies	Integration Care collaboration and coordination Community linkages Self-management education and support
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2010)[75]	Financing Health information technology and systems	Financing mechanisms (incentives) Continuous quality improvement Care collaboration
Thompson (undated)[76]	Governance Clinical practice guidelines, evidence-based medicine Financing HRH	Delivery system design Self-management education and support Performance improvement
Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2015)[77]	Health information systems Quality management systems PwCC, families and informal carers Healthcare services Delivery system	Decision support Delivery system design Care collaboration Quality and performance improvement Self-management education and support

Jackson et al. (2016)[78]	Health information systems HRH	Care coordination, collaboration Patient engagement
Department of Health & Children (undated)[79]	Leadership and governance Clinical practice guidelines Quality management systems HRH Health information systems	Delivery system design Decision support Task distribution Care integration (Care coordination, collaboration) Quality assurance Multisectoral engagement
Belgian Healthcare Knowledge Centre (2012)[80]	Quality management HRH	Decision support Care coordination Self-management education and support
Philippine Health Insurance Corporation (2004)[81]	Leadership and governance Guidelines, clinical pathways, standard operating procedures Health information systems Quality management systems Waste management systems HRH Physical structures Healthcare services	Organization of health services Delivery system design Continuous quality improvement Ethics

Table 2. (Some) attributes of the chronic care quality dimensions, per determinant group and considering the PwCC journey through healthcare, as determined from the scoping review and Delphi survey

Quality Aim	Leadership & Governance	Financing	Resources	Service Delivery
Effectiveness	Relevant policies and monitoring and evaluation of implementation [38,43]. Availability and usage of clinical practice guidelines and standard operating procedures.	Proper resource allocation to prioritize certain health services, to ensure delivery of effective services and to ensure adequate population coverage [68].	Temperature, air quality, lighting and noise conditions are within acceptable levels to maintain staff well-being and enhance effective work outcomes[5]. HCPs are trained regarding risks and determinants of chronic conditions	Services offered respond to the needs of the population and PwCCs. Services offered follow guidelines and SoPs [17,29,32,39,52].

	<p>Continuous quality improvement is in place. Supportive supervision is practiced.</p> <p>Financial management is in place to ensure availability of sufficient resources to meet healthcare needs [65].</p> <p>Health management information systems are in place and data analysed in a timely manner to determine the needs of the population and PwCCs [33,55] and used in the management planning of health services and resources[13].</p> <p>Human resources management is in place to ensure availability of health care staff with skills, knowledge and expertise in caring for chronic conditions and the proper “skill mix”[56].</p> <p>M&E of effectiveness of care delivered (e.g., clinical audits, mortality conferences)[43,71].</p>		<p>(health promotion & prevention); to deliver chronic care (early diagnosis, follow-up, transition / reintegration); and to provide (self) management education and support to PwCC and informal caregiver[13,15,22].</p> <p>Health information are recorded effectively[75].</p>	<p>Care delivered is congruent to people’s (diverse) beliefs and values (cultural effectiveness)[71].</p> <p>Care for chronic conditions effectively decreases the numbers of chronic conditions and complications and prevents and relieves suffering, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of those at risk and limiting said risks for developing chronic conditions[12,65]. • Early diagnosis and effective, prompt and regular treatment [52] of the chronic condition, both pharmacologically & non-pharmacologically (technical effectiveness [49]. • Counseling (psychological support, dietary, healthy lifestyle)[19]. • Co-management of comorbidities / multimorbidities [69] (both acute and chronic) and other health problems. • Prevention of emergence of complications to the extent possible[18,25]. • Provision of appropriate palliative and end-of-life care[36,44] • Proper care coordination and linking to care[50], including
--	--	--	--	--

				self- and informal caregiver management[27].
Efficiency	No evidences of poor management, fraud, corruption, and abusive practices[5].	Cost-efficiency of health services[32].	Members of the healthcare team are familiar with one another and work well together to provide the highest level of care in the most efficient manner[74]. Staff and PwCC have proper forum to express ideas on healthcare and its delivery[33].	Acute and chronic care services are integrated to provide efficiency of healthcare service delivery[27].
Safety	Building and physical environment management is in place[81]. Clinical risk management to prevent and control adverse care incidents [33] and effectively and efficiently address adverse effects [18] is in place.	Proper resource allocation to maintain building and physical environment management, clinical risk management, and care coordination and communications [65,68]	Air quality and noise conditions are within acceptable limits[33]. Building infrastructure is friendly to people with physical disabilities. Infrastructure is well-equipped to prevent falls. Proper sanitation, hygiene and (hazardous) waste management are maintained[81]. Essential equipment needed to provide safe essential health services are available and functioning [65]. Prevention of breakdowns in communication and care coordination across settings and healthcare providers[19].	Care delivered in different levels of healthcare and related services including in the community is consistent[26].
Equity	Resource pooling and purchasing functions of financial management are in place to assure equitable access and get resources to them who need it most[65]. Linked to access: improved, equitable access to care for those with chronic conditions is most likely to occur with multiple linked strategies that target different levels of the health system, and	Out-of-pocket expenditures are reasonable and that no one is left behind / no one is pushed behind. Availability of alternative financing mechanisms in cases of limitations in regular financing[23].	Healthcare staff have legitimacy [40] and are sensitive to beliefs, values, culture [43,74], ethnicity, disabilities, gender [58], etc of PwCC	Care delivered to all PwCCs is consistent[47].

	availability[53] and affordability of services[23,40].			
Accessibility, timeliness and affordability	Mechanisms are in place to ensure that resources are made available in a timely manner[65].	Health financing strategies increase access to healthcare (make health services financially accessible / affordable to all)[40].	Design of the physical structure ensures ease of access for all PwCCs. Health care workers are accessible, e.g. culturally congruent, approachable[40] Health information is recorded and shared in a timely manner to healthcare providers across disciplines and levels[42].	Minimum basic services for chronic conditions providing a continuum of care [34] that include diagnosis, pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment including counselling, self-management education and support, psychosocial support, targeted risk control and higher level of care (through an established referral system), etc. that are acceptable to the population served are available [43]. Services are temporally accessible (opening hours are accessible to people who utilise the services) and are available regularly with set schedules [23,41].
Person-centredness	PwCCs work collaboratively with policy makers / health professionals / health managers in promoting and improving chronic care including palliative / end-of-life care[36,43].	Finances are available to empower and engage PwCCs and to provide self-management education and support.	HCWs have skills and expertise on motivational interviewing, stages of change theory, goal setting, action plan development, patient self-management support [20] and in the delivery of holistic care taking into consideration not only the clinical aspects of the chronic condition but also the psychosocial aspects[7] of the PwCC.	The PwCC is involved in collaborative decision-making[25], and health empowerment / engagement is provided. Care delivered also includes collaboration with informal caregivers[30]. Care delivered is congruent with the (diverse) beliefs, values and contexts of PwCC[32].
Continuity	There is a systematic approach to planning and coordinating care	Funds are allocated for care planning, coordination, referral and	There is trust [41,45] and (good) rapport [19] between the PwCC (and/or the	The delivery of health promotion and all levels of prevention

	[32] from controlling risks to end-of-life and including self-management (PwCC and informal caregiver).	counter-referral in all levels (community and facilities) and disciplines and including support to PwCC and informal caregivers for care continuum at home.	informal caregiver) and their healthcare providers (relational continuity). Communication and care coordination across settings and healthcare providers is established.[19] Community resources are identified / mapped-out.	(primary, secondary, tertiary; community-based, primary healthcare facility-based, hospital-based) is well-coordinated and as seamless as possible, from the home, to the community to healthcare facilities, and transitioning from healthcare facilities to the community and the home[26,27], with special attention to comorbidities / multimorbidities and the elderly [26,41] with chronic conditions. For instance, clinical care pathways / case management plans[31], referral and counter-referral mechanisms across care disciplines and levels [53] (community, primary, secondary, tertiary levels) are in place and are implemented.
--	---	---	---	--

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of Delphi respondents (n=49)

Age	Average	49.1 years
	Range	33-65 years
Sex	Female	15
	Male	34
Continent of origin	Africa	10
	Asia	12
	Europe	11
	North America	7
	Oceania	2
	South America	3

	Chose not to disclose	3
	No answer	1
Socio-economic classification of country/ies of 'expertise' / having knowledge of	Low-income (LIC)	10
	Middle-income (MIC)	10
	High-income (HIC)	3
	All	7
	Both LIC and MIC	13
	Both MIC and HIC	3
	Not applicable	3
Stakeholder characteristics (multiple answers possible)	Clinician / health care provision	15
	Health financing	29
	Policy implementation	19
	Policy formulation	21
	Government adviser	33
	Teacher or researcher in chronic conditions	17
	Teacher or researcher in quality of care	24
	Teacher or researcher in health financing	20
	Informal caregiver of PwCC	5
	PwCC	4
	Civil society representative	2
	Healthcare organization representative	8
	Patient group representative	4