

PCVSA in primary care.

1 **Assessing the feasibility and acceptability of a pre-clinic vital signs**
2 **assessment in primary care: a pilot study.**

3 John Broughan¹, Seán McMahon², Steen Gordon², Nandakumar Ravichandran³, Donal Bailey⁴,

4 Jennifer Grant^{2,5}, Geoff McCombe³, James Sheil², Walter Cullen³

5

6 ¹ Clinical Research Centre, School of Medicine, University College Dublin, Ireland.

7 ² Wavescope Ireland Ltd., Dublin, Ireland

8 ³ School of Medicine, University College Dublin, Ireland

9 ⁴ Department of Clinical Innovation, Centric Health Primary Care, Ireland

10 ⁵ Beacon HealthCheck, Beacon Hospital, Dublin, Ireland.

11

12 **Corresponding author:**

13 John Broughan

14 john.broughan@ucd.ie

15 +353 86 8928972

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

PCVSA in primary care.

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** Vital signs assessment can be crucial. However, such assessments are time-
28 consuming and so are not always prioritised. Measuring vital signs before doctor visits may
29 therefore be an effective and efficient strategy. We piloted a pre-clinic vital signs assessment
30 (PCVSA) within a primary care centre to determine its feasibility and acceptability.

31 **Methods:** A mixed methods cross-sectional design was piloted. Study participants included
32 adult patients and practice staff. Patients had vital signs assessed by a Primary Care Assistant
33 before GP visits. Data collected concerned participants' study engagement, the timings of
34 PCVSA / GP visits, and surveys / interviews investigating participants' experiences.

35 **Results:** Sixteen patients and four staff participated. The mean PCVSA was 2mins23secs (SD
36 = 38.8) and the mean GP visit was 9mins21secs (SD = 252.4). Patients said the PCVSA was a
37 'Positive experience' (87%), 'Helpful' (81%), 'Valuable' (44%), and 'Interesting' (38%). The
38 GP said the PCVSA was either 'Helpful' (n=8, 54%) or 'Extremely Helpful' (n=7, 47%) in
39 each of their consultations, and that it improved engagement with 80% of patients, allowed
40 them to spend more time gaining understanding of the conditions of 93% of patients, and
41 enhanced productivity in 73% of consultations. The GP strongly agreed that collecting PCVSA
42 data before appointments would benefit patients over time. Qualitative interviews with practice
43 staff yielded three themes: (1) Improved patient engagement and efficient consultation, (2)
44 Time-saving potential, and (3) Practicing in general practice and associated challenges.

45 **Conclusion:** The PCVSA pilot showed good feasibility and acceptability as indicated by high
46 participant engagement, short PCVSA and GP visit times (albeit GP visit times did not measure
47 non-patient facing clinical activity), and positive feedback from patients and staff. Introducing
48 PCVSA in healthcare settings may have potential in terms of improving the standard and
49 efficiency of care.

PCVSA in primary care.

50 **Keywords:** Feasibility Studies, General Practice, Pilot Projects, Primary Health Care, Vital

51 Signs.

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

PCVSA in primary care.

72 **Author summary**

73 Checking vital signs is important for patient care, as it helps doctors assess, monitor, and make
74 clinical decisions. However, it is often overlooked to save time for other tasks considered more
75 urgent. A new approach called 'pre-clinic vital signs assessment' (PCVSA), where patients'
76 vital signs are measured before their one-on-one visit with the doctor, may help address this
77 issue. This study tested the PCVSA at a primary care centre in Dublin, Ireland, to see if it could
78 improve care quality, save time, and be accepted by both staff and patients. On average, the
79 PCVSA took 2 minutes and 23 seconds, while the typical doctor visit lasted 9 minutes and 21
80 seconds. Most patients and staff saw the PCVSA as useful, highlighting its benefits for better
81 patient-doctor communication and timesaving. Some concerns were raised about the extra
82 demand it might place on clinic resources. Overall, the findings suggest that PCVSA could
83 positively impact the quality and efficiency of care in primary care settings, with future
84 research needed to explore its benefits in larger and more varied clinics.

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

PCVSA in primary care.

97 **Background**

98 Assessment of patients' vital signs is an important component of healthcare delivery,
99 particularly among acute patients. Vital signs assessment allows clinicians to investigate and
100 monitor patient health in an objective manner. Patient safety is also an inevitable concern in
101 healthcare and studies have reported that vital signs assessment acts as a tool to improve patient
102 safety in the medical unit reducing the risk of adverse events and provide better care for patients
103 [1-3]. Thus, regular vital signs assessment can be important to ensure efficient and potentially
104 critical clinical follow-up and intervention for patients as necessary [4].

105
106 However, despite vital signs assessment's well-established benefits, because of global
107 healthcare professional shortages, vital signs screening is often impractical in busy modern
108 healthcare settings [5]. Adding vital signs assessments in the manner that they are conducted
109 today to every consultation would be problematic given the well documented existing pressures
110 on staffing and clinical flow [6]. A survey of 25 GPs conducted by Wavescope Ltd. from
111 February 2023 to January 2024 (Supplementary material) found that GPs take patients' vital
112 signs in around 30% of consultations, and that they could spend approximately three minutes
113 taking vital signs in each of these. Accounting for assumptions regarding hours worked per day
114 (8 hrs) and weeks worked per year (46 weeks), our calculations indicate that full-time GPs in
115 Ireland spend approximately 110 hours per year just taking patients' vital sign measurements.

116
117 Measurement of vital signs can also result in "white coat hypertension", a phenomenon
118 characterised by elevated blood pressure measurements and other artefacts due to stress
119 experienced by patients in the presence of healthcare professionals [7]. Further, research
120 indicates that vital signs assessments are often undervalued by clinicians, not recorded
121 faithfully or frequently enough, and the findings of vital signs assessments may be disregarded

PCVSA in primary care.

122 as unimportant [2]. For instance, a retrospective analysis by Hayes et al. of patients, in
123 examinations where international guidelines recommended a vital signs assessment, revealed
124 that 98% of patients had substandard vital signs records [8].

125
126 The worst-case scenario consequence of poor adherence to optimal vital signs assessment
127 procedures is a greater probability of medical problems among patients not being detected by
128 clinicians and patient health deteriorating as a result, potentially to a severe degree among
129 patients with acute health problems [9]. To that end, this study intended to address these issues
130 by introducing a Pre-Clinic Vital Signs Assessment (PCVSA) procedure in a busy primary
131 healthcare setting. Each patient's vitals assessments were conducted by a Primary Care
132 Assistant (PCA) while they waited to see the general practitioner (GP). Their vital signs data
133 were produced in a report sent to the GP before they saw the patient, thus allowing them to
134 maximise the time they spend on clinical decision making. We hypothesised that the PCVSA
135 would be deemed feasible from the perspectives of key stakeholders in the primary care setting,
136 namely the GP, clinical support staff and patients.

137

138 **Methods**

139 *Research design*

140 A mixed methods cross-sectional design involving calculation of PCVSA times and
141 stakeholder questionnaire / qualitative interviews was piloted. The PCVSA intervention was
142 assessed in terms of its feasibility and acceptability using Bowen et al.'s feasibility study
143 framework [10]. As per this framework, the PCVSA was evaluated according to its
144 acceptability, its level of demand among stakeholders, practicality, and capacity for
145 implementation, integration, and expansion within busy primary healthcare settings.

146

PCVSA in primary care.

147 ***Setting, participants, and sampling***

148 The study was conducted within a large, busy, primary healthcare centre in an urban suburb of
149 Dublin City, Ireland during the 9am to 12.30pm shift each day from July 8th to 10th, 2024.
150 Study participants included key staff working at the practice, as well as a target of 20 adult
151 patients attending the practice for their routine GP visit appointments. Research regarding
152 calculating pilot study sample sizes indicates that this size is suitable for a pilot feasibility study
153 [11]. Inclusion and exclusion criteria for patients participating in the study were formulated
154 and communicated to the practice’s clinical staff before recruitment of patients as participants.
155 These criteria are outlined below:

156

157 Inclusion criteria:

- 158 • Patients over age 18.
- 159 • Patients able to provide written informed consent to participation (or to be supported to
160 provide informed consent as per the Assisted Decision Making (Capacity) Act 2015).
- 161 • Patients due to see the doctor with a new or ongoing physical health concern or problem.

162

163 Exclusion criteria:

- 164 • Patients whom the clinical staff (GP, PCA) determine as too unwell to wait to see a
165 clinician; instead, being “fast tracked” into assessment.

166

167 **Recruitment**

168 *Patient recruitment*

169 Patients participating in the study were recruited as they attend the practice for their pre-
170 scheduled, non-study related, GP visit appointments. On presenting to the clinic for check in,
171 the patients were informed by the practice receptionist that the clinic is running a pilot study

PCVSA in primary care.

172 which is intended to assess the feasibility and acceptability of introducing a PCVSA. The
173 patients were provided with a study information sheet which included all relevant information
174 on the study and were given the opportunity to read the material. The PCA was there to assist
175 patients with these documents and members of the study team were available onsite to provide
176 more detail and answer questions from potential participants if requested. Patients were also
177 given the opportunity to take home the study information sheet to think about potentially
178 participating in the study and then provide informed consent on their next visit if the study was
179 still in progress. Patients that wished to participate were provided with a consent form to review
180 and sign before taking part in the study.

181

182 *Staff recruitment*

183 Staff selected by the practice management team were invited to participate in the study also. If
184 they wished to take part, staff were provided by the research team with a participant information
185 leaflet explaining the study and were offered the opportunity to discuss the study with the
186 research team. Staff also had to sign a consent form to participate in the study.

187

188 *Procedure*

189 Each patient was provided with a unique Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) sticker that
190 was attached to a card [12]. A custom RFID code [13] was designed specifically for the study
191 and this automatically collected RFID data and the time when the RFID sticker was presented
192 to RFID readers [14]. The PCA called each patient for their vital signs assessment and the
193 patients scanned their RFID card at a dedicated vital signs assessment station in the PCA's
194 private office. The PCA then measured the patient's vital signs (temp, BP, Oxygen saturation,
195 heart rate and respiration rate) using a vital signs measurement machine (Welch Allyn
196 Connex® Vital Signs Monitor 6000 Series supplied by MDI Ireland ltd). Provisions were made

PCVSA in primary care.

197 to warrant up to three vital signs assessments at 5, 10 and 15 minutes if results were outside
198 the range of normal. The PCA then placed the RFID card on the RFID scanner to log the time
199 of the examination initiation and termination.

200

201 The patients returned to the waiting area, and their vital signs were digitally transmitted to the
202 doctor via practice-based management software (Socrates) for review prior to them being
203 admitted to the doctor's consultation room. The PCA requested that once in the GP's
204 consultation room, the patient scan their RFID card before the beginning of their visit to the
205 GP's office and again when the face-to-face meeting is complete. The GP and patients
206 completed brief questionnaires querying their experience of the PCVSA consultation. The GP
207 also completed an additional "Doctor Satisfaction Questionnaire" at the end of the entire pilot
208 study to gather their overall impressions of the study and any additional information. All
209 questionnaires were developed by Wavescope Ltd. in collaboration with colleagues from
210 Afortiori Development, Ulster University, and UCD. Lastly, qualitative interviews were
211 conducted with practice staff to investigate their experiences of the study in more detail. The
212 study procedure is outlined in Figure 1 below. Study questionnaires and the qualitative
213 interview schedule are included in this paper's supplementary material.


214

215 Figure 1. Study procedure

216

217

PCVSA in primary care.



218

219 **Data collection**

220 Study engagement data (no. patients invited to participate, no. that participated, no. that
221 completed the study), were collected to determine participant recruitment and retention rates.

222 The exact timings of each stage of patients' visits were recorded using the RFID technology
223 with patients scanning their RFID cards before beginning and completing the face-to-face
224 PCVSA and GP appointments. While patients' vital signs data (temp, BP, Oxygen saturation,
225 heart rate and respiration rate) were recorded, this data was retained by the clinic, was not
226 accessible to the research team, and was not used in the study.

227

228 Both patients and the GP completed brief questionnaires following each patient interaction
229 asking them questions about their experience of the PCVSA. These included a 'Doctor
230 Assessment Questionnaire' completed by the GP for each patient enrolled in the study and
231 'Patient Assessment Questionnaires' completed by patients themselves. The 'Patient
232 Assessment Questionnaire' included open and closed items querying patients' demographics
233 (age range [18 -40, 40 -65, 65+] & gender), and whether they felt the PCVSA was a positive
234 experience, one that they would be happy to take part in at every GP consultation, and one that

PCVSA in primary care.

235 was helpful, valuable, or interesting. The ‘Doctor Assessment Questionnaire’ also included
236 open and closed statements asking about how helpful it was having the PCVSA was before the
237 start of their face-to-face interaction with the patients, as well as the extent to which they agreed
238 with statements saying that the PCVSA improved their engagement with patients, allowed them
239 to spend more time understanding the patient’s condition, and offered time or productivity
240 gains during the consultation. At the end of the study, the GP also completed another brief
241 questionnaire (‘Doctor Satisfaction Questionnaire’) asking them to indicate overall, how
242 beneficial they felt the PCVSA was, which collected vital signs they found to be most useful,
243 what other pre-clinic measurements they would like to see taken in future, and if they would
244 accept vital signs data generated by patients personal wearable devices.

245

246 Lastly, key practice staff participated in in-depth semi-structured qualitative interviews once
247 their involvement in the study was complete to acquire further insight into their experiences of
248 the study. This data was collected via audio recordings of the interviews which were
249 subsequently transcribed and pseudonymised for analysis. As per Bowen et al.’s feasibility
250 study framework, the qualitative interview topic guide focused on areas pertaining to the
251 study’s acceptability, practicality, adaptability, likely efficacy, the demand for PCVSAs, and
252 the PCVSA’s capacity being implemented in, integrated within, and expanded to other
253 healthcare settings.

254

255 ***Data analysis***

256 Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages, timings of consultation stages, measures
257 of central tendency and variation) were used to analyse quantitative data including study
258 engagement, age, gender, PCA/GP face-to-face visit timing, and closed response questionnaire
259 data. Qualitative coding techniques were used to analyse open response questionnaire data and

PCVSA in primary care.

260 analysis of participants' qualitative interviews was guided by Braun and Clarke's 'Reflexive
261 Thematic Analysis' approach [15].

262

263 *Ethics*

264 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the UCD Human Research Ethics Committee
265 (LS-24-36-Broughan-Cullen). In line with open science practices, the study hypotheses and
266 planned analyses were preregistered on the AsPredicted website [16].

267

268 **Results**

269 *Study engagement and participant characteristics*

270 Thirty-six patients were scheduled for appointments with the GP during the study, 12 on each
271 day. Of these, 14 (39%) did not participate for reasons including appointment cancellations,
272 language barriers, and not meeting the eligibility criteria (i.e., being under 18 years of age).
273 Sixteen of the remaining 22 patients (72%) agreed to, consented to, participated in, and
274 completed the study. The sixteen patients comprised of 12 females (75%) and four males
275 (25%), and most patients fell within the 40–64-year age range (56%) (see Table 1). As per prior
276 agreements with site management personnel, four practice staff members (GP, PCA,
277 Receptionist, and Practice Manager) selected by the practice management team were invited to
278 take part in the study and all four staff consented to doing so. The GP in the study was male
279 and the three other staff participants were female.

280 Table 1. Patients' demographic characteristics

Demographic characteristics	n (%)	N
Gender		16

PCVSA in primary care.

Male	4 (25)	
Female	12 (75)	
Age group		16
18-39 years	4 (25)	
40-64 years	9 (56)	
≥ 65 years	3 (19)	

281

282 ***Timings of PCVSA and GP face-to-face visits***

283 The mean duration spent by the PCA on the vital signs assessment (n=16) was reported as
 284 142.6 seconds (2mins 23secs) and the mean average duration of the face-to-face GP visit
 285 (n=16) was 560.5 seconds (9mins21secs) (see Table 2).

286 Table 2. Time spent during the PCVSA and GP interactions (n=16).

Time spent	Mean (SD)	Median (P25 – P75)
<i>PCVSA</i>	2mins 23secs (38.8)	2mins 36secs (108.2 – 169.8)
<i>GP visit</i>	9mins 21secs (252.4)	8mins 59secs (364.3 – 671.7)

287

288 ***Responses to the ‘Patient Assessment Questionnaire’***

289 Most patients strongly agreed that it was a positive experience to take vital signs assessments
 290 prior to their face-to-face visit with the GP (88%) (see Table 3). All 16 patients said ‘Yes’ to a
 291 question asking if they would be happy for their GP to collect data on their vital signs during

PCVSA in primary care.

292 every consultation. Patients were asked if they found the PCVSA to be ‘Helpful’, ‘Valuable’,
 293 or ‘Interesting’. Thirteen of 16 patients (81%) said it was ‘Helpful’, seven of 16 (44%) said
 294 ‘Valuable’, and six of 16 (38%) said ‘Interesting’.

295 Table 3. Having my vital signs assessment taken prior to meeting the GP was a positive
 296 experience (n=16).

Characteristics	n (%)				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Having my vital signs assessment taken prior to meeting the GP was a positive experience.	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (12)	14 (88)

297

298 ***GP responses to the ‘Doctor Assessment Questionnaire’***

299 Fifteen of 16 possible ‘Doctor Assessment Questionnaire’ responses were collected. The
 300 responses indicated that the GP felt having the PCVSA before meeting patients was either
 301 ‘Helpful’ (n=8, 53.8%) or ‘Extremely Helpful’ (n=7, 46.7%) (see Table 4).

302 Table 4. What was the value of having the PCVSA information at the before meeting patients?
 303 (n=15)

What was the value of having the PCVSA info before meeting patients?	Unhelpful	No impact at all	Helpful	Extremely helpful
	0(0%)	0(0%)	8(53%)	7(47%)

PCVSA in primary care.

304 The GP strongly agreed that the PCVSA improved engagement with 80% of the patients. They
 305 also strongly agreed that PCVSA allowed them to spend more time gaining understanding of
 306 the conditions of most of the patients (93%), and strongly agreed that the PCVSA enhanced
 307 productivity gain in 73% of the consultations (see Table 5).

308 Table 5. Did having the vital signs assessment prior to meeting the patients... (see below)
 309 (n=15)

Characteristics	n (%)				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Improve how you engage with the patient?	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (20)	12 (80)
Allow you to spend more time gaining understanding of patient's condition?	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (7)	14 (93)
Offer any time or productivity gain in the consultation?	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (27)	11 (73)

310

311 *GP responses to the 'Doctor Satisfaction Questionnaire' (n=1)*

312 The GP indicated that the PCVSA was beneficial. On a scale of 'Strongly disagree' - 'Agree'-
 313 'Neutral' - 'Agree' - 'Strongly agree', the GP strongly agreed that collecting PCVSA data in
 314 advance of meeting patients would benefit patients over time. When asked which (if any) of

PCVSA in primary care.

315 five vital signs measurements (temperature, heart rate, respiration, blood pressure, oxygen
316 saturation (SpO2)) they found to be most useful, the GP indicated that all measurements were
317 equally useful. Additionally, the GP suggested incorporating additional measurements into pre-
318 clinic assessments such as height and weight for chronic patients, and ECGs for certain
319 patients. However, the GP was uncertain about accepting vital signs data from patients' own
320 wearable devices.

321

322 *Findings from qualitative interviews with practice staff*

323 In-depth semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with practice staff members.
324 These included the GP, PCA, Receptionist and Practice Manager. The following themes were
325 identified from the interviews: (1) *Improved patient engagement and efficient consultation*, (2)
326 *Time-saving potential*, and (3) *Practicing in general practice and associated challenges*.

327

328 *Improved quality of doctor / patient engagement*

329 All participants agreed that the PCVSA initiative improved patient engagement, allowing more
330 time to understand the patient's condition and enhancing the productivity of consultations. The
331 GP highlighted that while patient engagement and consultation productivity varied from case
332 to case, the initiative generally allowed more attention to patients, thereby improving GP-
333 patient engagement.

334 The GP commented on patient engagement:

335 *“It’s difficult to say (whether the PCVSA improved patient engagement), it differs case to*
336 *case but yeah, you get more time and more attention.”*

337

338 The practice of having both the GP and the PCA check the patient's vital signs before they met
339 the GP was seen as providing extra care, with the PCA being particularly perceived as a

PCVSA in primary care.

340 sympathetic and empathetic support for patients, leading to improved consultations. The staff
341 also highlighted that in their view, the PCVSA helped patients feel more relaxed, reducing
342 potential nervousness and anxiety (i.e., ‘White Coat Syndrome’) that could lead to improper
343 vital signs measurement. Participants reported that patients were happy with having their vitals
344 taken before they met the GP.

345 The practice manager commented:

346

347 *“...they (patients) feel they get the extra care, because there’s two health professionals*
348 *looking after them as well...”*

349

350 The participants also mentioned that knowing vital signs beforehand could hypothetically
351 allow staff to alert the GP to any alarming conditions.

352 The PCA commented:

353 *“...it was great for us and for the patient to know that their vital signs were all fine or if there*
354 *was any problems before they had even gone into the GP, where he knows if there was*
355 *anything flagging up, if they had a fast heart rate or their BP was high, that they know that*
356 *he could see that before he even called the patient in, so we kind of had an idea of what was*
357 *coming in to him...”*

358

359 *Time saving potential*

360 Having vital signs taken before the face-to-face meeting with the GP meant that the GP had all
361 necessary information readily available, saving time as they could immediately proceed with
362 patient facing consultation duties. Participants highlighted that the study process was quick and
363 easy, potentially allowing for PCVSA to be implemented across two to three GPs working in

PCVSA in primary care.

364 parallel on a single day. This efficiency enabled them to meet with more than 16 patients per
365 day easily, despite some language barriers in consenting for the study.

366 The PCA commented:

367

368 *“I would a million percent jump on board with the PCVSA study. I could have definitely*
369 *managed two GPs in one day. We saw 16 patients, but I would have liked to see more.*
370 *Unfortunately, some patients were children, some faced language barriers, and some needed*
371 *to take information home to translate. Additionally, some elderly patients could only handle*
372 *limited participation. However, many patients, particularly those in their mid-20s to 40s,*
373 *were very interested. With their enthusiasm, I think I could have managed two or three GPs*
374 *seeing patients simultaneously.”*

375

376 While time savings varied by case, there was a consensus that the initiative saved a considerable
377 amount of time.

378 The GP commented:

379

380 *“Each case is different. Some cases take more time, some cases less time, you know... but as*
381 *a general rule, if you ask me, yeah, the vitals will save time.”*

382

383 *Practicing in General Practice and Associated challenges*

384 While some participants noted that similar initiatives had not been undertaken before, others
385 mentioned implementing comparable measures during COVID-19 as an infection prevention
386 and control measure. These measures were typically applied to acute patients rather than in
387 general practice appointments. All participants agreed on the necessity of initiatives like

PCVSA in primary care.

388 PCVSA in primary care and general practice, indicating they would recommend it to
389 colleagues.

390 The PCA commented:

391

392 *“I do think it's important and I do think that if it did come into the practices, it would really*
393 *help a lot and it would catch a lot of them, of high blood pressures or fast heart rates or, you*
394 *know, and then that you're able to get them under control as well and a GP to obviously, you*
395 *know, starting it with a medication if needed or looking for the testing if needed or just to*
396 *keep an eye every so many weeks or so many days and I think it was a really, really good*
397 *idea, having a practice, especially before going into a GP.”*

398

399 One participant emphasised that in the long term, 30-40% of people might not get their vitals
400 checked as part of routine care, making it crucial to implement this initiative to avoid future
401 problems. The GP also highlighted that the PCVSA would be particularly beneficial for
402 patients with acute conditions, (e.g., exacerbation of COPD, respiratory tract infections, fever
403 of unknown origin) although it may not be as useful for those with general ailments.
404 Implementing the initiative in general practice was considered beneficial overall.

405 The GP commented:

406 *“You know, mostly it is, but in some instances, as I mentioned, you know, if you have a*
407 *trauma or anything like that, you know, the vitals are not as important as in acute cases. Just*
408 *in acute cases. I mean, it saves time, you know, in acute cases, you know, so you can be more*
409 *productive. Yeah. And even if it's not acute sort of a thing, I mean, there's no harm in doing*
410 *it, if you have something in front of you.”*

411

PCVSA in primary care.

412 One of the challenges highlighted by participants was the need for additional staff to perform
413 PCVSA alongside other nursing duties.

414 The GP commented:

415

416 *“I mean, generally, the PCVSA will help, you know, but then you need the manpower and*
417 *extra staff to do the vital signs, besides their own things, especially the nurse (PCA).”*

418

419 The study was found to be interesting, with both patients and staff expressing satisfaction in
420 participating. Some challenges were noted, particularly related to language barriers during
421 consenting process.

422 The receptionist commented:

423

424 *“Most people on board were happy, but there were some people that we found issues with,*
425 *like, language was a barrier. So, I didn't have time to sit down and explain the study fully to*
426 *them....So, they didn't want to sign-up for the study because they didn't understand (what it*
427 *involved). Yeah. So, it's hard to explain. (We) needed a little bit more time explaining them*
428 *about the study.”*

429

430 **Discussion**

431 ***Summary of key findings***

432 This study aimed to determine the feasibility of piloting a PCVSA initiative in a busy primary
433 healthcare setting in Dublin, Ireland. Good feasibility was observed as evidenced by the short
434 time durations spent by patients during their PCA assessments and subsequent face-to-face
435 meetings with GPs, as well as high levels of acceptability for the PCVSA among participating

PCVSA in primary care.

436 patients and practice staff completing post-PCVSA questionnaires and qualitative interviews.
437 While 14 (39%) of patients scheduled for appointments were not eligible to participate because
438 they cancelled GP appointments, did not meet the predefined eligibility criteria, or were
439 deemed by practice staff to not have necessary English language skills to sufficiently
440 comprehend the study's participation information sheet or consent form, there were good levels
441 of study participation and completion among eligible patients attending the practice and
442 allocated staff.

443 As for the study's acceptability, frequently observed positive impacts of the PCVSA included
444 a desire among patients and staff to see PCVSA being implemented within standard care
445 practices, perceived PCVSA related improvements in the quality and efficiency of care
446 provided, and perceived enhancements regarding staff / patient relationships and
447 communication. The most notable feasibility issues that were identified included the additional
448 workload that routine PCVSA could have on practice staff, and the necessity for strategies in
449 future studies to overcome language barriers impeding participation in the study for some
450 patients.

451 **Comparing with existing literature**

452 Research indicates that vital signs assessment can be important to ensure effective clinical
453 evaluation, providing crucial information about a patient's health status and playing a key role
454 in triage, prevention, and patient safety within healthcare settings, albeit particularly for
455 vulnerable patients and patients requiring emergency and hospital care where the bulk of
456 research has been conducted to date [17-21]. Our study points to the importance of PCVSA in
457 a general practice setting, with the findings of this study emphasising the perceived value
458 among practice staff of PCVSA in saving time and improving patient engagement and
459 consultation quality.

PCVSA in primary care.

460 The average time reported by the PCA for the conducting of PCVSA in our study (2.4 minutes)
461 is notably shorter than the 3.75 minutes reported by a similar study [95% CI 3.53 to 3.9] [22].
462 However, the study mentioned was conducted in a hospital rather than primary care setting,
463 and systematic review research mentions that meaningfully comparing timings for vital signs
464 assessments between studies is difficult or even impossible because of variations in the
465 methods of vital signs assessment between studies [3]. It is also important to note that the
466 average GP visit time reported in this study (9mins21secs) only captures the GP's patient facing
467 clinical work and should not be confused with complete consultation time which previous
468 research by Crosbie et al. (2020) and Pierse et al. (2019) calculated to range from 14.1mins to
469 14mins36secs [23, 24].

470 Our study highlights factors such as White Coat Syndrome, patient nervousness, and anxiety
471 as potential contributors to inaccuracies in vital signs measurements. This aligns with existing
472 research that identifies these factors as common sources of inaccuracy in vital signs assessment
473 [25-27]. The findings show that the GP in this study ranked temperature, heart rate, respiration
474 rate, blood pressure, and oxygen saturation as the most useful vital signs. This aligns with the
475 literature, albeit not based within primary care settings, that emphasises these parameters as
476 critical indicators of patient health [28-32]. Additionally, our study supports recommendations
477 from systematic reviews that advocate for the inclusion of pulse oximetry in vital signs
478 measurements to improve patient care and outcomes [33].

479 The study by Ullah et al. (2022) reported on the increased workload associated with vital signs
480 measurement in general practice, a very important consideration. However, our study's
481 findings demonstrate that the use of PCVSA, despite concerns about support staff workload
482 and language barriers during the consenting process, did not hinder the PCA in their efforts to
483 manage 16 patients and support other GPs working in the practice that day simultaneously.

PCVSA in primary care.

484 This led to a perceived reduction in times spent during face-to-face GP visit times and GP
485 workload among participating staff, as well as improved patient experiences and satisfaction.
486 Elliott et al. (2024) identified gaps in the rigorous assessment of vital signs, emphasising the
487 need for consistent and thorough measurement to ensure patient safety and effective
488 surveillance in acute settings [34]. Our study's findings provide support for Elliot et al.'s
489 position in a primary care context. The positive feedback from both patients and staff
490 underscored the value of PCVSA in improving patient engagement, consultation efficiency,
491 and overall satisfaction in this setting. Having said this, there remains a need for further testing
492 of PCVSA in general practice on a larger scale across diverse contexts to fully determine the
493 value of Elliot et al.'s stance.

494 *Implications for research, policy and practice*

495 This study's findings indicate that PCVSA could have several positive implications for clinical
496 practice. The findings suggest that in general practice settings, PCVSA may lead to
497 improvements regarding the quality of patient care, identification of health problems,
498 operational workflow and time management, patient and staff satisfaction, and relationships
499 and communication between patients and clinical staff. It is also possible that the benefits of
500 PCVSA may extend to other care settings such as nursing homes or hospitals, albeit evaluation
501 of PCVSA studies in these settings is required before such claims can be made with confidence.
502 A barrier to routinely conducting vital signs assessments is the extra time and workload that
503 assessments can bring [5]. A PCVSA that does not require direct clinician, or even healthcare
504 staff involvement (e.g., PCVSA from clinically validated personal wearable devices), may
505 overcome this impediment, thus increasing the likelihood that busy clinical staff are more likely
506 to comply with the vital signs assessment recommendations advised by practice and policy
507 influencers and decision makers. From a research perspective, the main implication of this
508 study's findings is an evidenced need for continued research examining the potential of

PCVSA in primary care.

509 PCVSA, in primary care as well as in other care contexts. Larger-scale feasibility studies in
510 diverse settings are advised to comprehensively show proof of concept, and randomised
511 controlled trials methods may have value in terms of comparing the effect of PCVSA to usual
512 care on key outcome measures, perhaps the timing of face-to-face GP visits, the identification
513 of health problems, or the frequency of hospital admissions.

514

515 *Methodological strengths & limitations*

516 One of the key strengths of the study is the novelty of its aim to examine the feasibility and
517 acceptance of PCVSA in general practice / primary care. Another strength of the study is its
518 mixed-methods approach, combining both quantitative data and qualitative insights from semi-
519 structured interviews with practice staff. This comprehensive evaluation provides a well-
520 rounded understanding of the PCVSA's impact on practice efficiency and patient engagement.
521 However, there are limitations to consider. Firstly, being a pilot study, the study sample was
522 small and specific to adult patients and staff in one practice. It is probable that the PCVSA
523 would be less feasible and acceptable in other practice settings, particularly those with fewer
524 support staff resources. Further testing of the study in larger and more diverse samples with
525 varying service and patient characteristics is required to attain more generalisable findings.
526 Also, although the quantitative survey captured patient satisfaction and perspectives, the study
527 did not include a qualitative component from the patients' perspective which could have
528 provided deeper insights into their experiences and perceptions. Additionally, the study faced
529 challenges with language barriers during the consenting process, which had a slight negative
530 impact on recruitment and could have affected the clarity of communication and the overall
531 participation experience for some patients with English language limitations that may have
532 taken part. Further, GP visits were timed from the moment patients entered the GP's office to
533 the moment they left. While participants in this study did not raise this as an issue, future studies

PCVSA in primary care.

534 should note that GP times may be more accurately recorded if measurements also include time
535 spent by the GP performing non-patient facing clinical duties.

536

537 **Conclusion**

538 The study demonstrated that the PCVSA could be a valuable initiative in primary care and
539 general practice. Based on the study's findings, PCVSA may have significant potential for
540 saving time, enhancing patient engagement, and facilitating more productive and efficient
541 consultations. The findings suggest that further research in these settings is recommended to
542 fully explore the benefits of integrating PCVSA into routine practice in primary care and
543 general practice.

544 **Acknowledgements**

545 We would like to thank the following for their support with this project: Enterprise Ireland,
546 Centric Health, staff and patients at Ballyowen Medical (Dublin, Ireland), Afortiori
547 Development, Xenon Health Solutions (Dublin, Ireland), Dr Louise Dubras (Ulster University,
548 Belfast, Northern Ireland), Mr Seamus McGarrell (St James's Hospital, Dublin Ireland), the
549 Health Research Board (Dublin, Ireland), Ireland East Hospital Group, University College
550 Dublin's College of Health and Agricultural Sciences and School of Medicine.

551

552

553

554

555

PCVSA in primary care.

556 **References**

- 557 1. Watkins T, Whisman L, Booker P. Nursing assessment of continuous vital sign
558 surveillance to improve patient safety on the medical/surgical unit. *J Clin Nurs*.
559 2016;25(1-2):278-81. doi: 10.1111/jocn.13102.
- 560 2. Kellett J, Sebat F. Make vital signs great again - A call for action. *Eur J Intern Med*.
561 2017;45:13-19. doi: 10.1016/j.ejim.2017.09.018.
- 562 3. Dall'Ora C, Griffiths P, Hope J, Barker H, Smith GB. What is the nursing time and
563 workload involved in taking and recording patients' vital signs? A systematic review.
564 *J Clin Nurs*. 2020;29(13-14):2053-68. doi: 10.1111/jocn.15202.
- 565 4. Castledine G. The importance of measuring and recording vital signs correctly. *Br J*
566 *Nurs*. 2006;15(5):285. doi: 10.12968/bjon.2006.15.5.20645.
- 567 5. Ullah E, Albrett J, Khan O, Matthews C, Perry I, GholamHosseini H, et al. Workload
568 involved in vital signs-based monitoring & responding to deteriorating patients: A
569 single site experience from a regional New Zealand hospital. *Heliyon*. 2022;8(10).
570 doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10955.
- 571 6. Irish College of General Practitioners. Shaping the Future: A Discussion Paper on the
572 Workforce & Workload Crisis in General Practice in Ireland. Ireland; 2022. Available
573 from:[https://www.irishcollegeofgps.ie/Portals/0/Clinical%20Hub/Publications%20and](https://www.irishcollegeofgps.ie/Portals/0/Clinical%20Hub/Publications%20and%20Journals/Current%20Publications/CH_Pub_Current_Shaping_the_Future_October_2022.pdf)
574 [%20Journals/Current%20Publications/CH_Pub_Current_Shaping_the_Future_Octobe](https://www.irishcollegeofgps.ie/Portals/0/Clinical%20Hub/Publications%20and%20Journals/Current%20Publications/CH_Pub_Current_Shaping_the_Future_October_2022.pdf)
575 [r_2022.pdf](https://www.irishcollegeofgps.ie/Portals/0/Clinical%20Hub/Publications%20and%20Journals/Current%20Publications/CH_Pub_Current_Shaping_the_Future_October_2022.pdf)
- 576 7. Pioli MR, Ritter AM, de Faria AP, Modolo R. White coat syndrome and its variations:
577 differences and clinical impact. *Integr Blood Press Control*. 2018;11:73-9. doi:
578 10.2147/IBPC.S152761.
- 579 8. Hayes E, Gannon L, Quinlan D. Sepsis and documentation of six physiological vital
580 signs in GP Out-of-Hours. *Ir Med J*. 2023;116(9):857.

PCVSA in primary care.

- 581 9. Smith AF, Wood J. Can some in-hospital cardio-respiratory arrests be prevented? A
582 prospective survey. *Resuscitation*. 1998;37(3):133-7. doi: 10.1016/s0300-
583 9572(98)00056-2.
- 584 10. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How
585 we design feasibility studies. *Am J Prev Med*. 2009;36(5):452-7. doi:
586 10.1016/j.amepre.2009.02.002.
- 587 11. Julious SA. Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharm Stat*.
588 2005;4(4):287-91. Available from:
589 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pst.185>
- 590 12. Want R. An introduction to RFID technology. *IEEE Pervasive Comput*. 2006;5(1):25-
591 33. doi: 10.1109/MPRV.2006.2.
- 592 13. McMahon S. smart.py. 2024. Available from: <https://github.com/seanjmcm/rfid>
- 593 14. Advanced Card Systems Ltd. ACR1222L VisualVantage. 2024. Available from:
594 <https://www.acr1222l.com/>
- 595 15. Braun V, Clarke V. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qual Res Sport Exerc*
596 *Health*. 2019;11(4):589-97. Available from:
597 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- 598 16. McMahon S, Gordon S, Broughan J, Grant J, Sheil J, Cullen W. Primary Healthcare
599 Pre-Clinic Vital Signs Assessment: a Pilot Study. *AsPredicted*. 2024. Available from:
600 https://aspredicted.org/see_one.php
- 601 17. Barfod C, Lauritzen MM, Danker JK, Sölétormos G, Forberg JL, Berlac PA, et al.
602 Abnormal vital signs are strong predictors for intensive care unit admission and in-
603 hospital mortality in adults triaged in the emergency department - a prospective cohort
604 study. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2012;20:28. doi: 10.1186/1757-7241-20-
605 28.

PCVSA in primary care.

- 606 18. Brekke IJ, Puntervoll LH, Pedersen PB, Kellett J, Brabrand M. The value of vital sign
607 trends in predicting and monitoring clinical deterioration: A systematic review. *PLoS*
608 *One*. 2019;14(1). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210875.
- 609 19. Convertino VA, Schauer SG, Weitzel EK, Cardin S, Stackle ME, Talley MJ, et al.
610 Wearable Sensors Incorporating Compensatory Reserve Measurement for Advancing
611 Physiological Monitoring in Critically Injured Trauma Patients. *Sensors (Basel)*.
612 2020;20(22):6413. doi: 10.3390/s20226413.
- 613 20. Cross R, Considine J, Currey J. Nursing handover of vital signs at the transition of
614 care from the emergency department to the inpatient ward: An integrative review. *J*
615 *Clin Nurs*. 2019;28(5-6):1010-21. doi: 10.1111/jocn.14679.
- 616 21. Zachariasse JM, Maconochie IK, Nijman RG, Greber-Platzer S, Smit FJ, Nieboer D,
617 et al. Improving the prioritization of children at the emergency department: Updating
618 the Manchester Triage System using vital signs. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(2). doi:
619 10.1371/journal.pone.0246324.
- 620 22. Dall'Ora C, Griffiths P, Hope J, Briggs J, Jeremy J, Gerry S, et al. How long do
621 nursing staff take to measure and record patients' vital signs observations in hospital?
622 A time-and-motion study. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2021;118:103921. doi:
623 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2021.103921.
- 624 23. Crosbie B, O'Callaghan ME, O'Flanagan S, Brennan D, Keane G, Behan W. A real-
625 time measurement of general practice workload in the Republic of Ireland: a
626 prospective study. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2020;70(696). doi: 10.3399/bjgp20X710429.
- 627 24. Pierse T, Barry L, Glynn L, Quinlan D, Murphy A, O'Neill C. A pilot study of the
628 duration of GP consultations in Ireland. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2019;5:142. doi:
629 10.1186/s40814-019-0532-4.

PCVSA in primary care.

- 630 25. Ludikhuizen J, Smorenburg SM, de Rooij SE, de Jonge E. Identification of
631 deteriorating patients on general wards; measurement of vital parameters and potential
632 effectiveness of the Modified Early Warning Score. *J Crit Care*. 2012;27(4):424.e7-
633 13. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2012.01.003.
- 634 26. Philip K, Richardson R, Cohen M. Staff perceptions of respiratory rate measurement
635 in a general hospital. *Br J Nurs*. 2013;22(10):570-4. doi:
636 10.12968/bjon.2013.22.10.570.
- 637 27. Cooper S, Cant R, Sparkes L. Respiratory rate records: the repeated rate? *J Clin Nurs*.
638 2014;23(9-10):1236-8. doi: 10.1111/jocn.12234.
- 639 28. Pickering TG, Hall JE, Appel LJ, Falkner BE, Graves J, Hill MN, et al.
640 Recommendations for blood pressure measurement in humans and experimental
641 animals: part 1: blood pressure measurement in humans: a statement for professionals
642 from the Subcommittee of Professional and Public Education of the American Heart
643 Association Council on High Blood Pressure Research. *Circulation*. 2005;111(5):697-
644 716. doi: 10.1161/01.CIR.0000154900.76284.F6.
- 645 29. Smith JJ, Bland SA, Mullett S. Temperature--the forgotten vital sign. *Accid Emerg*
646 *Nurs*. 2005;13(4):247-50. doi: 10.1016/j.aaen.2005.08.002.
- 647 30. Elliott M, Coventry A. Critical care: the eight vital signs of patient monitoring. *Br J*
648 *Nurs*. 2012;21(10):621-5. doi: 10.12968/bjon.2012.21.10.621.
- 649 31. Pretto JJ, Roebuck T, Beckert L, Hamilton G. Clinical use of pulse oximetry: official
650 guidelines from the Thoracic Society of Australia and New Zealand. *Respirology*.
651 2014;19(1):38-46. doi: 10.1111/resp.12204.
- 652 32. Rolfe S. The importance of respiratory rate monitoring. *Br J Nurs*. 2019 Apr
653 25;28(8):504-508. doi: 10.12968/bjon.2019.28.8.504. PMID: 31002547.

PCVSA in primary care.

- 654 33. Lockwood C, Conroy-Hiller T, Page T. Vital signs. *JBI Libr Syst Rev.* 2004;2(6):1-
655 38. doi: 10.11124/01938924-200402060-00001. PMID: 27820007.
- 656 34. Elliott M, Williamson R, Endacott R. Patient mortality and the neglect of vital signs'
657 assessment: An audit of a national coronial database. *Nurs Crit Care.* 2024 Feb 8. doi:
658 10.1111/nicc.13037. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 38328857.
- 659

660 **Supporting information captions**

- 661 S1. Doctor Assessment Questionnaire
- 662 S2. Doctor satisfaction questionnaire
- 663 S3. Patient assessment questionnaire
- 664 S4. Qualitative interview topic guide