

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047025
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Nov-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Pohontsch, Nadine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Schulze, Josefine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Hoeflich, Charlotte; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Glassen, Katharina; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Breckner, Amanda; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Szecsenyi, Joachim; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Lühmann, Dagmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Scherer, Martin; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives
4
5

6 Pohontsch NJ*, Schulze J, Höflich C, Glassen K, Breckner A, Szecsenyi J, Lühmann D, Scherer M.
7
8

9 Corresponding author:
10
11

12 Nadine Janis Pohontsch, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical
13

14 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistr. 52, 20246 Hamburg, Germany; n.pohontsch@uke.de, 0049
15

16 40 7410 55537, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0966-4087
17
18

19
20 Co-authors:
21
22

23 Josefine Schulze, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
24

25 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5727-9343
26
27

28 Charlotte Höflich, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
29

30 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
31
32

33 Katharina Glassen, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
34

35 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8892-8625
36
37

38 Amanda Breckner, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
39

40 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0777-5223
41
42

43 Joachim Szecsenyi, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
44

45 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4483-0028
46
47

48 Dagmar Lühmann, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
49

50 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7965-5007
51
52

53 Martin Scherer, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
54

55 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
56
57

58 Word count: 3952
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Prevalence of people with multimorbidity (PM) rises. Multimorbidity constitutes a challenge to the health care system, and treatment of PM is prone to high quality variations. Currently, no set of quality indicators (QI) exists to assess quality of care, let alone incorporating the patient perspective. We therefore aim to validate and amend a literature-based set of QI from the patients' perspective.

Methods

We conducted eight focus groups (FG) with PM and three FG with patients' relatives using a semi-structured guide. Data was analysed using Kuckartz's qualitative content analysis. We derived deductive categories from the literature, added inductive categories (new quality aspects) and translated them into QI.

Results

We created four new QI. Two QI (patient education/self-management, regular updates of medication plans) were consented by an expert panel, while two others were not (periodic check-ups, general practitioner coordinated care). Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not covered in the FG.

Conclusion

We show that FG with patients and relatives add relevant aspects in QI development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a reasonable addition to traditional QI development. Our QI set constitutes a framework for assessing the quality of care in the German health care system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment standards and increase

1
2
3 the use of existing guidelines, hereby helping to reduce overuse, underuse, and misuse in the
4
5 treatment of PM.
6
7

8
9 **German Clinical Trials Register: DRKS00015718, registration date: 15th of October 2018**
10

11 12 13 14 15 **Strengths and limitations of this study** 16

- 17
18 • affected patients and their relatives (who often function as informal caregiver) were
19
20 questioned in the focus groups
21
22
- 23 • FG participants from two differently structured regions in Germany representing a wide
24
25 spectrum of combinations of different diseases were queried
26
27
- 28 • FG with patients and their relatives (asking about positive and negative experiences with
29
30 care) seem to be an effective tool to identify quality aspects relevant for QI development
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **INTRODUCTION** 38

39
40 Our society is aging and higher life expectancy is associated with higher rates of chronic diseases. Care
41
42 for patients with multimorbidity (PM) will evolve into one of our most prominent challenges in the
43
44 future [1,2]. Multimorbidity is strongly linked to functional limitations, lower quality of life and increase
45
46 in health care utilization, costs and higher mortality [3,4]. Care for PM is very complex [5] and therefore
47
48 prone to deficits in quality and major (unintended) interindividual differences regarding the impact of
49
50 illness and carer performance [6–9]. Generic standards for high quality of care are hard to define due
51
52 to the infinite number of possible (combinations of) medical problems in PM. Evidence-based
53
54 standards relevant to PM are urgently needed. As long as the current state of health care cannot be
55
56 mapped systematically, for example by using a set of quality indicators (QI) specific for multimorbidity,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 it remains impossible to compare the effects of interventions and health care models to optimize
4 quality or to identify sectors, regions or health care providers needing improvement.
5
6

7
8 Considering the patients' perspective is even more relevant when dealing with PM. Every decision
9 made concerning risks and benefits of treatments and interventions has to be weighed against
10 individual impairments, comorbidities and gain in subjective quality of life [10]. Prioritization must take
11 the whole range of bio-psycho-social complexities into account and follow principles of patient-
12 centred clinical management and decision making. Views on high quality health care often differ
13 between patients and their health care providers [11] and therefore patients can [12] and must be
14 involved in guideline and QI development [13–16]. Studies show that this is not often the case [14]
15 even though approaches to patient involvement in QI development, e.g. focus groups (FGs), exist and
16 are considered to be of high value [13].
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The MULTIqual project aims at the development of a quality indicator set which can be used to
30 evaluate the current state of health care provided for PM and to promote the implementation of
31 treatment standards for future care. We conducted FGs with PM and their relatives to validate and
32 amend a literature- and expert consensus-based set of QI by qualitatively surveying their views on
33 health care quality.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 METHODS

42
43
44
45 The MULTIqual project is a multi-centre mixed-methods project comprising a systematic literature
46 review, FGs, a two-stage expert consensus process and a quantitative survey with PM and general
47 practitioners (GPs). Following the COREQ [17] this paper presents the results of FGs with PM and their
48 relatives conducted in Hamburg and Heidelberg and of the expert consensus on the QI set.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Participant selection and recruitment

56
57
58 We randomly selected and invited GPs to take part in our study. Participating GPs were asked to recruit
59 patients aged 65 and above with three or more chronic conditions that attended the practice at least
60

1
2
3 once in the last three months. PM willing to participate were asked to invite close relatives to take part
4
5 in the study. Exclusion criteria were insufficient knowledge of German and inability to give informed
6
7 consent. Patients received an invitation containing study information, a response sheet and a reply
8
9 envelope. Participants received an allowance of 30€ plus a reimbursement of travel expenses.
10
11
12 Participants gave written informed consent for the FGs to be recorded, transcribed and the data being
13
14 published anonymously.
15

16 17 Focus group guide

18
19
20
21 Guide development was based on the literature review (e.g., [18]) and the research questions outlined
22
23 above. As lay persons mostly relate to implicit experiential knowledge when defining quality criteria,
24
25 we chose to question our FG participants about their own positive and negative experiences with
26
27 primary health care, changes in their health care needs and experiences due to multimorbidity and
28
29 their vision of ideal primary care for people like them (see suppl. file 1 for 'patients' focus group guide').
30
31
32 With patients' relatives, the same topics were discussed in respect to the associated PM (see suppl.
33
34 file 2 for 'relatives' focus group guide').
35

36 37 Data collection

38
39
40
41 Either JS, CH, AB or KG had spoken to the participants on the phone, but had no other relationship with
42
43 them. In 12/2018 and 01/2019 we conducted eight FGs with PM (city A =3, city B= 5) and three FGs
44
45 with patients' relatives (A=1, B=2) using the semi-structured guides described above. Two moderators
46
47 facilitated the FGs (NJP, JS, KG, AB, CH and TKI respectively) which lasted about two hours. Discussions
48
49 were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim by a trained research assistant following designated
50
51 transcription rules. Accuracy of the transcripts was checked by the respective moderators. In order to
52
53 protect the FGs participants' identity, names and other identifying details were changed during
54
55 transcription.
56
57
58
59

60 Expert panel meeting

1
2
3 The expert consensus process consisted of two stages: an online rating of draft quality indicators by
4 an expert panel (EP) and an in-person meeting. The EP consisted of representatives of primary care,
5 nursing, practice management, quality research methodology, social work, physical therapy, geriatrics,
6
7 clinical pharmacology, social medicine and patient representatives. The in-person meeting took place
8
9 on 1st February 2019. Prior to the meeting the experts had rated the literature-based QI set concerning
10
11 significance, clarity of definition, possibility to influence the indicator manifestation, strength of
12
13 evidence and potential risks/undesirable effects using an online platform. The EP discussed and
14
15 selected a preliminary QI set to be used and validated in the quantitative survey. The EP judged
16
17 indicators (described below) based on initial analyses of FG material ad hoc during the meeting after a
18
19 presentation by NJP.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Data analysis

27
28
29 Data were analysed using the qualitative content analysis approach described by Kuckartz [19],
30
31 following a realistic paradigm [20]. Coders (NJP, CH and JS) read all transcripts to familiarize with the
32
33 data. Transcripts were broken down into fragments adopting different sizes ranging from part of a
34
35 sentence to one or more paragraphs in relation to the segment length needed to understand the
36
37 content and context of the relevant accounts. We created deductive codes representing the aspects
38
39 of quality described in the literature-based QI set and selected by the EP and inductive codes when
40
41 new aspects of quality emerged from the data (see below). We then subjected all transcripts to a
42
43 second round of coding by a different coder. Coding was carried out with constant discussions between
44
45 the three coders about the coded text passages and assigned codes. To ensure intersubjective
46
47 reproducibility and comprehensibility [21], the results were presented to and discussed with the
48
49 interdisciplinary workgroup 'qualitative methods' and the co-authors DL (postdoctorate, MD) and MS
50
51 (professor, MD). Data was managed using MAXQDA 11 (Verbi GmbH).
52
53
54
55
56

57 Identification of additional patient relevant quality aspects

58
59
60

1
2
3 We aimed to supplement the preliminary QI set extracted from a systematic literature review by QI
4 quality based on patient-relevant quality aspects derived from the FG data. A multidisciplinary
5 research team (NJP, CH, KG, AB and JS) allocated subjectively important quality aspects from patients'
6 and their relatives' views to the preliminary set of QI based on the literature review and identified
7 important additional quality aspects where needed. Afterwards the research team transformed the
8 new quality aspects into QI.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Patient and public involvement statement

18
19 Patients were involved in the recruitment of focus group participants (viz. their relatives). Patient
20 representatives and representatives of relevant fields (see above) were involved in the rating and
21 selection of quality indicators. Apart from that there was no patient or public involvement in the study.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Researcher characteristics

30
31
32 Researchers' characteristics, beliefs and assumption influence qualitative research and data
33 interpretation. NJP (♀): post-doc psychologist, experienced qualitative researcher (patient
34 involvement in QI development, health care research focusing on general practice). JS (♀):
35 psychologist/junior scientist. CH (♀): medical student. AB (♀): junior scientist, M.A. Health Information
36 Management. DL (♀), KG (♀), JSz (♂), MS (♂): medical professionals, experienced post-doc researchers
37 in the field of general practice and QI development.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 RESULTS

49 Participants characteristics

50
51
52 29 female and 18 male patients aged 65-84 years as well as three female and six male relatives (five
53 spouses/four children) aged 49-78 years took part in five patient groups and three relatives groups
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respectively. Nine registered volunteers did not take part, with n = 3 due to acute health problems and
4
5 n = 6 due to organizational difficulties.
6
7

8
9 Focus group-based additional quality aspects included into the QI set after the EP rating
10

11
12 Two focus-group based quality aspects were finally supported by the EP and included in the QI set.
13
14

15 *Patient education / self-management*

16

17
18 Patients consider it very helpful to be informed about their diseases and possible (self-) treatment and
19
20 management strategies (for example, nutrition counselling). Daily disease management can be
21
22 supported by specific information on self-management strategies, training in disease-related
23
24 competencies (for example, measuring the INR value), addressing coping strategies and provision of
25
26 knowledge for the patient.
27
28
29
30

31
32 *"I took part in a course in [city] and have been monitoring my 'Quick' [prothrombin time] myself for*
33
34 *over 20 years and I have a book and also keep a record. And I always took it with me to the*
35
36 *hospitals and the doctors were amazed that they could see exactly how I did it and how I tested*
37
38 *my 'Quick'. [...] And I always write it down and then I dose the medication myself. No, I am still*
39
40 *grateful to the doctor for giving me the tip that I can do the course how to measure my 'Quick'*
41
42 *on my own [...]."*
43

44
45 *(city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 162-166)*
46
47

48 *Regular updates of medication plan*

49

50
51 Patients report to have been provided with medication plans and consider it very important for them
52
53 to be up-to-date especially when taking a high number of different medications or when medication is
54
55 prescribed by specialists. Some patients always have copies of their medication plan at hand in case of
56
57 an emergency and it would be considered helpful if this plan was accessible electronically on the health
58
59 insurance card.
60

1
2
3 *"This is also from the GP, right? It's a medication plan. So you know when to take it and so on. One*
4 *should know that. But also that you can show it, if someone asks: 'What are you taking?' Oh*
5 *god, yes, what am I taking? What's it called again? It just changed again, hasn't it? Well, I*
6 *know it, but it's also good for the other doctors if they have something printed and to be able*
7 *to see exactly what she needs, what she takes, how often and when [...]. So, it is very pleasant*
8 *when GPs do something like that. Gives you a certain amount of security."*
9
10 *(city A, patient focus group B, paragraph 251-253)*

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Focus group-based additional quality aspects not included into the QI set after the EP rating

21
22
23 Two other indicators were not supported by the EP and not included in the final QI set.

24 25 26 *Regular check-ups*

27
28
29
30 Patients with chronic diseases see a need for regular check-ups as it would allow for early detection of
31 health deterioration and they know these procedures from the disease management programmes, e.g.
32 for diabetes or COPD. They value the regular contact with the GP at fixed appointments.
33
34
35

36
37
38 *"[...] if you take these medications regularly and then say: "We'll have a general check-up once*
39 *every two years" – I think that's not enough. I think it should be every year. The status should*
40 *be checked once in a while, if I'm taking these pills regularly."*
41
42
43
44
45 *(city A, patient focus group C, paragraph 97)*

46 47 48 *General practitioner coordinated care*

49
50
51 Patients appreciate the GPs to coordinate their care which involves for example writing referral letters
52 for specialist visits (and the GP receiving medical reports), having a network of specialists at hand,
53 planning preventive measures and keeping track of medications and their interactions and side effects.
54
55
56
57
58 Patients who describe their relationship with their GP as trusting, want all information on their health
59 care to converge at their GPs' practice.
60

1
2
3 *"[...] when the diagnoses are made and the GPs know what's going on, then they should actually act*
4 *as a control center and have the possibility to coordinate everything."*
5

6
7 *(city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 264)*
8
9

10
11 *"That's a given in our practice. He always wants to give you referrals because he wants to have*
12 *doctor's letters. Otherwise he says he doesn't have an overview. And I think that's very, very*
13 *good."*
14
15

16
17 *(city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 66)*
18
19

20
21 Literature-based quality aspects supported by focus groups
22

23
24 Table 1 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by both
25
26 FGs and expert consensus and shows supporting quotes from the FGs. Descriptions of categories
27
28 shown table 1 follow below.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Quality aspects identified in the literature and supported by focus groups and expert panel ratings

Patient-related factors	Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs	<p>“So for me, I would like to see myself not only as a body, or only as organs, but as a complex human being. That’s very important for me, [...] this union of body, mind and soul.” (<i>city B</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 70)</p> <p>“This is certainly an aspect that the doctors should [...] actually take a closer look at again: What is the situation at home? Does the person need support? Do we have to organize something?” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 91)</p>
	Involving partners, family and caregivers	<p>“Perhaps this could be discussed in a phone call with relatives, so that I am informed about the current situation, what is pending or how the medication maybe, yes, what I have to pay attention to as a caring relative and, as I said, if this is okay for my mother, as I know that she is not informed at all.” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 174)</p>
Physician-patient- interaction	Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals	<p>“A doctor's sole decision: (.) "Do this or that" - if the patient doesn't agree, it is pointless (...). He won't do it anyway. (...) And that's why I think that those issues really need to be discussed together. And determined together what is possible for the patient. Not everything is possible.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 468)</p> <p>“[...] we discussed it [...] at eye level in a VERY thorough conversation, so that we decided on the therapy regimen together, which I follow, and use take control of the disease.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 21)</p>

<p>Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment</p>	<p>Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment</p>	<p>“It's important to me [...] that I get information in an [...] understandable way about what is going on with me and how this could be treated.” (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)</p> <p>“And then that in some cases he may explain the disease. Not the disease, but the measures, that's the way I wanted to put it. But then we come back to the time factor again. But in some cases, as I said, it is done this way. So that you get a little more time and get information about what is actually going on and what you can do about it. Or against it.” (city B, relatives' focus group B, paragraph 98)</p> <p>“But it's just that when I get pills and it says this and that and you don't even know what it's for. [...]” (city B, patient focus group C, paragraph 43)</p>
<p>Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions</p>	<p>Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions</p>	<p>“Especially in the case of multiple chronic diseases, I find it extremely important that the general practitioner explains to me that the drugs are compatible, that there is no interaction or that it is possible that they will cancel each other out or even worsen the condition, as in the case of my mother [...]” (city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 69)</p> <p>“I also consider close monitoring of drug effects and side effects important. Because there are side effects that one does not even register, which develop so insidiously. So it's a good thing that experts with their backgrounds check for possible side effects and say: “Watch this, something is happening to you, that doesn't fit in or it's a side effect”.</p>

bmjopen-2020-04-2025 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on 07 April 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

		<p>Because I only read the package insert when I really have something and suspect a side effect. I do not read them in advance. Because then you don't take the drug." (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)</p>
	<p>Written treatment plan</p>	<p>"I packed a little something from my management. I don't know if you know anything like that, here is a blood sugar diary for people on insulin. This is from the diabetes clinic. It contains all my data, every record, both blood sugar levels and blood pressure and then the insulin dose. And I also check my weight and write it down here, so I always keep everything together. And I take this to my general practitioner as well as to the other doctors, for example to the eye specialist. And I think that's good." (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 167-168)</p>
<p>Context and Organizational Structures</p>	<p>Comprehensive care documentation</p>	<p>"I think [...] to keep an overview of the attending specialists is actually very important. Because [...] when I go to the eye specialist or ear, nose and throat specialist, and the GP doesn't even know this, and usually doesn't get a medical report from them either, then he is actually missing out [...] on important information. I could have glaucoma, or whatever. And he doesn't even know about it and he doesn't even know what kind of medication you might have to take. [...]" (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 466)</p>
	<p>Training programmes addressing</p>	<p>"Whereby I have to say with my GP's joint practice, you can't complain. So there are two [employees], I think, they are still trained nurses. That's how long they've been at it. They are REALLY competent. And I'd say they already</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

	<p>management of patients with multimorbidity</p>	<p>have a certain diagnostic instinct. They can tell when someone comes in with swollen eyes, whether it's just a flu-like infection or a real flu, that he should perhaps be isolated.” (city A, relative focus group A, paragraph 108)</p> <p>“Well, of course we have the problem that we have more and more elderly people who are sick, and have multiple diseases. And we have fewer and fewer GPs. So, I think it would be a very good care model if we had, for example, registered physicians who specialize in geriatrics. I think it would be a good care model if we had general medical training, with additional specialization, for example in mental health. I would prefer geriatrics and that these doctors with such training, who also have many, many or mostly older patients, are given more time. That perhaps, there are also these reference numbers, what they can charge. Because, we have to get there, because there are more and more elderly people, that they would get the possibility, the aspect of time and if it is only five minutes. Five minutes is a lot per patient. But that is of course an idle wish [...]” (city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 85)</p>
--	---	---

For peer review only

Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs

Patients expressed a need for the GP to have a holistic view on the patient's health problems and needs. They underlined the importance of not only seeing and treating physical symptoms, but also the overall picture of medical and psychosocial aspects of the patient's situation. They consider it important for the GP to have at least basic information on the patient's background and personal history. Sometimes house calls can be necessary for a realistic judgement on biopsychosocial support needs for example for elderly people with beginning dementia.

Involving partners, family and caregivers

Relatives of people with multimorbidity often appreciate the GPs' willingness to communicate with them and support them in the process of giving care. Support and advice are often desperately needed by informal caregivers of persons with multimorbidity, especially if dementia is an issue. GP's awareness of informal caregivers' problems and concerns is important and could for example be addressed by offering consultation hours for relatives and other informal caregivers.

Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals

Shared decision-making to find a customized treatment approach for individual patients is highly appreciated by the FG participants. Communicating, informing and deciding on treatment regimens and goals on a par with the patient are seen as essential for increasing adherence and patient satisfaction. Patients value the freedom to set their own priorities and make decisions based on their values and preferences concerning their health and health care behaviour. They appreciate their GPs supporting them in this approach and the autonomy this respect gives them.

Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment

Our FG participants did not differentiate clearly between information and advice on their diagnosis, disease or condition and risks, medications (for example indication, dosage and interactions) or non-

1
2
3 pharmacological treatments and their benefits and potential side effects. They emphasize the
4 importance of detailed and comprehensible information on all these aspects. Either way, some stated
5 not be interested in very detailed descriptions of potential risks and side effects. The amount of
6 information given must be tailored to the patient's needs even though these consultations might need
7 more time than usually budgeted.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 *Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions*

16
17
18 Medication reviews are highly acclaimed by the FG participants. Patients and their relatives wish for
19 the GP to check for interactions regularly especially with medication prescribed by others and over-
20 the-counter (OTC) drugs. They expressed criticism of the high numbers of prescribed drugs and low
21 engagement of health professionals to actively inquire about drug-related problems and to search for
22 highly tolerable medications. Patients focus less on the thorough documentation of adverse drugs
23 reactions than on their monitoring and handling. They wish for the GP to detect signs of adverse effects
24 and monitor them for example through regular follow-ups.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 *Written treatment plan*

37
38
39 FG participants' recognize the value of written treatment schedules that include overviews on
40 scheduled health care appointments plus instructions, e.g., whether they have to appear with an
41 empty stomach for bloodwork. They emphasized the advantages of automated recalls systems.
42
43
44 Another focus was on recorded treatment protocols, e.g. keeping a blood pressure journal or a
45 diabetes log book containing measured values and other relevant parameters. Patients proposed using
46 digital solutions for facilitating care coordination between different providers.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 54 *Comprehensive care documentation*

55
56
57 The vast majority of the FG participants consider comprehensive care documentation as a vital part of
58 high quality care, emphasizing importance of the exchange of information on diagnostic testing or
59
60

1
2
3 examination results and prescribed medication, giving the GP the opportunity to coordinate care and
4
5 consult the specialist about the patient's treatments. Patients report that the responsibility for this
6
7 exchange is often in the patients' hand, being the ones to take care of specialists' letters being issued
8
9 to the GP. Under the premise of data security, patients would support a digital exchange of doctor's
10
11 letters, but sometimes doubt the 'digital competencies' especially of the older generation of
12
13 physicians.
14
15

16 17 *Training programmes addressing management of patients with multimorbidity*

18
19
20
21 Patients put emphasis on the competencies of the practice team. For medical assistants this means for
22
23 example being experienced in taking blood samples or giving shots. Another aspect is the ability to
24
25 triage patients according to the severity and urgency of their treatment needs. GPs should engage in
26
27 continuous medical education, be up-to-date on actual research results and technological advances.
28
29 Participants valued additional training in the field of geriatrics or psychology and proposed regular
30
31 supervision and peer consultation for complex problems in multimorbid patients.
32
33

34 35 *Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups*

36
37
38
39 Table 2 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by the EP
40
41 but not accounted for in FGs. As this paper focuses on the FG result, these quality aspects are described
42
43 extensively elsewhere (manuscript in preparation).
44
45

46
47 **Table 2: Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups**

49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	49 50 Patient-related factors	Screening for depression
	51 52	Proactive pain assessment
	53 54	Monitoring of pain management
	55 56	Addressing financial support needs
	57 58 59 60	Quality of life assessment

	Assessment of symptom burden
	Establishing patient preferences
Physician-patient-interaction	Identification of patients with multimorbidity
	Assessment of treatment burden
	Monitoring adherence to treatment
Context and Organizational Structures	Assigning responsibility for coordination of care

DISCUSSION

Main results

By asking PM and their relatives in FGs about their experiences with primary health care we derived four new patient-relevant QI to date not represented in guidelines or the literature on quality of care in multimorbidity. Out of these, two QI concerning regular updates of written medication plans and patient education and fostering self-management were supported by the EP. On the other hand, regular check-ups and GP-coordinated care were not supported by the EP. Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, establishing patient preferences and shared decision-making, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not covered in the FGs.

Strength and limitations

To obtain a comprehensive picture of aspects of quality of care from the affected persons' point of view we asked not only patients with multimorbidity, but also their relatives (often informal caregiver) in separate groups. FG participants were recruited in two very differently structured regions of northern and southern Germany and represent a wide spectrum of combinations of

1
2
3 different diseases. We therefore assume that our results might be cautiously generalizable to PM in
4
5 primary care all over Germany.
6
7

8
9 Reflecting and evaluating own experiences is dependent on representation of different perspectives,
10
11 lived experiences and group interaction, and must be fragmentary, as participants were lay persons
12
13 regarding health care (quality). Therefore, it did not seem feasible to ask the participants to propose
14
15 QI. Instead, we focussed on positive and negative experiences with primary care and derived patient-
16
17 relevant QI indirectly. As many accounts can be matched to QI derived from the literature and half of
18
19 the newly developed QI were supported by expert consensus this methodology seems to be plausible
20
21 and practicable.
22
23

24
25 Although the questions focussed on experiences regarding the related PM, the results from FGs with
26
27 relatives show that for some participants it was difficult to focus on their role as (caregiving) relative.
28
29 Many participants referred to their own health care experiences being affected by multiple
30
31 conditions themselves, which reflects the spectrum of issues and challenges in the field as the
32
33 prevalence of multimorbidity increases in older age [22].
34
35

36
37
38 Discussion of results and comparison with existing literature
39
40

41
42 Since 2016, patients enrolled in statutory health insurance in Germany have a right to be provided
43
44 with a recorded medication plan if they are prescribed at least three different long-term medications,
45
46 which is very much appreciated by persons with multimorbidity in our study and elsewhere [23].
47

48
49 There are plans to incorporate these data into the electronic health card to allow for a standardized
50
51 digital exchange of this information of these data between providers [24,25]. Despite preferring a
52
53 written medication plan and stating the problem of insufficient communication between prescribing
54
55 physicians, participants of our FGs judged this incorporation ambivalently as they saw problems
56
57 concerning data safety and confidentiality [26] as well as (older) GPs digital literacy.
58
59
60

1
2
3 PMs wish for patient education, fostering of self-management and periodic check-ups might arise from
4
5 their experiences with patient education and regular control of, e.g., blood values, respiratory function
6
7 and blood pressure during the structured disease management programmes (DMP, e.g., [27]) that
8
9 many patients with diabetes, COPD or heart failure take part in. DMP for single diseases and lone-
10
11 standing self-management interventions for patients with multimorbidity have shown to be helpful
12
13 (e.g., [28,29]), which supports the patient-education QI (see also [12]). While a recent systematic
14
15 review supports the importance of monitoring treatment effects and clinical parameters [30], this is
16
17 no plea for generalised periodic check-ups without a definite indication.
18
19

20
21 The proposition of a GP-coordinated care was not supported by the expert panel as this care model is
22
23 not yet sufficiently embedded within routine care in Germany [31], although §73 SGB V [32] makes
24
25 way for general practitioner-centred primary care (coordination) since 2003, which is also highlighted
26
27 in the policy paper of the German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians from 2012
28
29 [33].
30
31

32
33 Literature-based QI validated by the FGs focus mostly on aspects that address interpersonal
34
35 communication, holistic treatment approaches and processes that allow patients to make their own
36
37 choices based on comprehensive information. This aligns our findings with the wide scientific
38
39 consensus that the treatment of patients with multimorbidity should be informed by a patient-centred
40
41 approach [12,34–36]. The majority of the quality statements proposed by NICE [37] align with the
42
43 indicators resulting from our study (e.g., “assessing values, priorities and goals”, “care coordination”
44
45 and “reviewing medicines and other treatments”). All measurement frameworks seem to have one
46
47 thing in common: taking shared-decision making into account as central aspect of patient-centred
48
49 care [38].
50
51
52
53

54
55 An explanation for the lack of support for the QI dealing with screening and assessment issues might
56
57 be due to the participants’ perspective as individuals and end users of care structures and processes.
58
59 Qualitative methods are mostly able to elicit patients’ personal experiences with and views on health
60

1
2
3 care (processes) and laypersons are seldom confronted with meta-level issues directed at groups of
4
5 patients and not individual patients.
6
7

8
9 Other projects aiming at the development of quality frameworks in multimorbidity predominantly
10
11 focussed on outcome measurement [39–41]. Scientific evidence on generic health outcome measures
12
13 to assess quality of care for PM is still lacking. In the light of PM's individual goals and priorities it proves
14
15 difficult to define outcome indicators suitable for all. Keeping that in mind, our QI set addressing mainly
16
17 care processes and covering a broad range of care domains is evidence-based and seems to be very
18
19 adequate for the evaluation of quality of care for PM.
20
21

22 23 Future research

24
25
26 Primary care patients (≥ 65 years) and their GPs will be questioned using standardized patient reported
27
28 outcome measures (related to the identified QI) and other instruments (measuring indicator
29
30 manifestation) will be used to study validity and applicability of the developed set of QI. The definite
31
32 set of QI will be determined based on the study results.
33
34
35

36 37 Practical implications

38
39
40 Our QI set can be used as a framework for assessing the quality of care in the German health care
41
42 system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment standards, increase the use of existing guidelines
43
44 [10,42] and help to reduce over-, under- and misuse of healthcare resources. The QI set will serve as a
45
46 reference framework for future evaluations of complex interventions and care models for PM.
47
48
49

50 51 CONCLUSION

52
53
54 Our study has proven that FGs with patients and their relatives add important aspects in QI
55
56 development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a
57
58 reasonable addition to traditional QI development [12,13]. Future challenges lie in the adoption of
59
60

1
2
3 these quality criteria as practical and valid standardized measures and their implementation in primary
4
5 care.
6
7
8
9
10

11 **Author contributions**

12 MS, DL, JSz: Acquisition of funding for and conception, design and supervision of the study. AB, KG, NP,
13
14 JSc: moderation of focus groups. AB, KG, CH, NP and JSc: data analysis and interpretation. NP: drafting
15
16 of the manuscript. AB, KG, CH, DL, JSc, JSz, MS: critical revision of former versions and final approval
17
18 of the manuscript.
19
20
21
22

23 **Acknowledgements**

24 We would like to thank all patients and their relatives for their time and effort invested in participating
25
26 in the focus groups, the experts for participating in the expert panel, Tabea Eissing for her contributions
27
28 in the development of the focus group guides and Thomas Kloppe for co-moderating one of the focus
29
30 groups.
31
32
33

34 **Data availability statement**

35 The data generated and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due study's
36
37 assurances to participants that the full raw focus group data would not be shared publicly, and that all
38
39 attempts would be made to maintain confidentiality. We named the people who are responsible for
40
41 data analysis to the focus group participants in the written consent and they did not agree to the
42
43 sharing of the full raw data.
44
45
46
47

48 **Funding**

49 This work was supported by the Innovation Fund of the Federal Joint Committee (G-BA; grant no.
50
51 01VSF16058). The funding body had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
52
53 publish or preparation of the manuscript.
54
55
56

57 **Competing Interests**

58 None declared.
59
60

Ethics Approval

Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Hamburg Medical Association, (10th September 2018, PV5846), from the Clinical Ethics Committee Heidelberg (19th December 2018, S-665/2018), and the Medical Association of Baden-Wuerttemberg (13th November, B-F-2018-096).

Consent to participate

Participants gave written informed consent to participate in the study and for the FGs to be recorded, transcribed and the data being published anonymously.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

References

- 1 Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Entwicklung im Gesundheitswesen. Sondergutachten 2009. Koordination und Integration - Gesundheitsversorgung in einer Gesellschaft des längeren Lebens. http://www.svr-gesundheit.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Gutachten/2009/Kurzfassung-2009.pdf (accessed 27 Jul 2020).
- 2 Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing Res Rev* 2011;10:430–9. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2011.03.003
- 3 France EF, Wyke S, Gunn JM, et al. Multimorbidity in primary care: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:e297-307. doi:10.3399/bjgp12X636146
- 4 Gijzen R, Hoeymans N, Schellevis FG, et al. Causes and consequences of comorbidity: a review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001;54:661–74. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00363-2
- 5 Clyne B, Cooper JA, Hughes CM, et al. “Potentially inappropriate or specifically appropriate?” Qualitative evaluation of general practitioners views on prescribing, polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate prescribing in older people. *BMC Fam Pract* 2016;17:109. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0507-y

- 1
2
3 6 Koller D, Schön G, Schäfer I, et al. Multimorbidity and long-term care dependency - a five-year
4 follow-up. *BMC Geriatr* 2014;14:70. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-14-70
5
6
7
8 7 van den Bussche H, Kaduskiewicz H, Schäfer I, et al. Overutilization of ambulatory medical care
9 in the elderly German population?--An empirical study based on national insurance claims data
10 and a review of foreign studies. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:129. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-
11 1357-y
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 8 Jin H, Tang C, Wei Q, et al. Age-related differences in factors associated with the underuse of
19 recommended medications in acute coronary syndrome patients at least one year after hospital
20 discharge. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2014;14:127. doi:10.1186/1471-2261-14-127
21
22
23
24
25
26 9 Sönnichsen A, Trampisch US, Rieckert A, et al. Polypharmacy in chronic diseases-Reduction of
27 Inappropriate Medication and Adverse drug events in older populations by electronic Decision
28 Support (PRIMA-eDS): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2016;17:57.
29 doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1177-8
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 10 DEGAM. Leitlinie Multimorbidität. <http://www.degam.de/degam-leitlinien-379.html>.
37
38
39 11 Herzberg H, Bernateck K, Welti F, et al. Patientenbeteiligung bei der Entwicklung von
40 Qualitätsindikatoren am Beispiel der Nationalen VersorgungsLeitlinie Chronische Herzinsuffizienz
41 – Eine qualitative Analyse kollektiver Sichtweisen. *Gesundheitswesen* 2016;78:373–7.
42 doi:10.1055/s-0035-1548880
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 12 Pohontsch NJ, Herzberg H, Joos S, et al. The professional perspective on patient involvement in
50 the development of quality indicators: a qualitative analysis using the example of chronic heart
51 failure in the German health care setting. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2015;9:151–9.
52 doi:10.2147/PPA.S74064
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 13 Kötter T, Schaefer FA, Scherer M, et al. Involving patients in quality indicator development - a
4 systematic review. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2013;7:259–68. doi:10.2147/PPA.S39803
5
6
7
8
9 14 Kötter T, Blozik E, Scherer M. Methods for the guideline-based development of quality
10 indicators--a systematic review. *Implement Sci IS* 2012;7:21. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-21
11
12
13
14 15 Campbell SM, Shield T, Rogers A, et al. How do stakeholder groups vary in a Delphi technique
15 about primary mental health care and what factors influence their ratings? *Qual Saf Health Care*
16 2004;13:428–34. doi:10.1136/qhc.13.6.428
17
18
19
20
21 22 Baudendistel I, Noest S, Peters-Klimm F, et al. Bridging the gap between patient needs and
23 quality indicators: a qualitative study with chronic heart failure patients. *Patient Prefer*
24 *Adherence* 2015;9:1397–405. doi:10.2147/PPA.S83850
25
26
27
28
29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60
- 17 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a
32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007;19:349–57.
doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
- 18 Sofaer S, Firminger K. Patient perceptions of the quality of health services. *Annu Rev Public*
Health 2005;26:513–59. doi:10.1146/annurev.publhealth.25.050503.153958
- 19 Kuckartz U. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Methoden, Praxis, Computerunterstützung*. 1st ed. Beltz
Juventa 2012.
- 20 Potter J, Wetherell M. *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*.
London: Sage 1987.
- 21 Steinke I. Quality Criteria in Qualitative Research. In: Flick U, von Kardorff E, Steinke I, eds. *A*
Companion to Qualitative Research. London: Sage 2004. 184–90.

- 1
2
3 22 Polenick CA, Leggett AN, Webster NJ, et al. Multiple chronic conditions in spousal caregivers of
4
5 older adults with functional disability: associations with caregiving difficulties and gains. *J*
6
7 *Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2020;75:160–72. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbx118
8
9
10
11 23 Botermann L, Krueger K, Eickhoff C, et al. Patients' handling of a standardized medication plan: a
12
13 pilot study and method development. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2016;10:621–30.
14
15 doi:10.2147/PPA.S96431
16
17
18 24 Klein S, Schellhammer S. Medication infrastructure development in Germany. In: Aanestad M,
19
20 Grisot M, Hanseth O, et al., eds. *Information Infrastructures within European Health Care*. Cham:
21
22 Springer 2017.
23
24
25
26 25 BMG. Allgemeine Informationen eGK.
27
28 <https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/themen/krankenversicherung/egk.html>
29
30 (accessed 27 Jul 2020).
31
32
33
34 26 Ärzteblatt DÄG Redaktion Deutsches. Von eEurope 2002 zur elektronischen Gesundheitskarte:
35
36 Chancen für das Gesundheitswesen. <http://www.aerzteblatt.de/archiv/31696> (accessed 27 Jul
37
38 2020).
39
40
41 27 Fuchs S, Henschke C, Blümel M, et al. Disease management programs for type 2 diabetes in
42
43 Germany: a systematic literature review evaluating effectiveness. *Dtsch Ärztebl Int*
44
45 2014;111:453–63. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2014.0453
46
47
48
49 28 Mehring M, Donnachie E, Fexer J, et al. Disease management programs for patients with COPD in
50
51 Germany: a longitudinal evaluation of routinely collected patient records. *Respir Care*
52
53 2014;59:1123–32. doi:10.4187/respcare.02748
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29 Contant É, Loignon C, Bouhali T, et al. A multidisciplinary self-management intervention among
4 patients with multimorbidity and the impact of socioeconomic factors on results. *BMC Fam Pract*
5 2019;20:53. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0943-6
6
7
8
9
10
11 30 Muth C, Blom JW, Smith SM, et al. Evidence supporting the best clinical management of patients
12 with multimorbidity and polypharmacy: a systematic guideline review and expert consensus. *J*
13 *Intern Med* 2019;285:272–88. doi:10.1111/joim.12842
14
15
16
17
18 31 Lübeck R, Beyer M, Gerlach F. [Rationale and dissemination of “GP centered health care” (“HzV”)
19 in Germany]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz* 2015;58:360–6.
20 doi:10.1007/s00103-015-2118-5
21
22
23
24
25
26 32 SGB V Gesetzliche Krankenversicherung - SGB V Sozialgesetzbuch.
27 <https://www.sozialgesetzbuch-sgb.de/sgbv/1.html> (accessed 27 Jul 2020).
28
29
30
31
32 33 DEGAM. General Practice — Focused on the whole person. Positions on the future of general
33 practice and family medicine 2012. <http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam->
34 [Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf](http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf). 29. (accessed
35 27 Jul 2020).
36
37
38
39
40
41 34 Boyd CM, Lucas GM. Patient-centered care for people living with multimorbidity. *Curr Opin HIV*
42 *AIDS* 2014;9:419–27. doi:10.1097/COH.000000000000073
43
44
45
46
47 35 Schattner A, Bronstein A, Jellin N. Information and shared decision-making are top patients’
48 priorities. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:21. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-6-21
49
50
51
52 36 Kvåle K, Bondevik M. What is important for patient centred care? A qualitative study about the
53 perceptions of patients with cancer. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2008;22:582–9. doi:10.1111/j.1471-
54 6712.2007.00579.x
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 37 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Multimorbidity quality standard. 2017.
4
5 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs153>. (accessed 27 Jul 2020).
6
7
8
9 38 Godolphin W. Shared decision-making. *Healthc Q Tor Ont* 2009;12:e186-190.
10
11 doi:10.12927/hcq.2009.20947
12
13
14 39 Working Group on Health Outcomes for Older Persons with Multiple Chronic Conditions.
15
16 Universal health outcome measures for older persons with multiple chronic conditions. *J Am*
17
18 *Geriatr Soc* 2012;60:2333–41. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04240.x
19
20
21
22 40 National Quality Forum (NQF). Multiple chronic conditions measurement framework. 2012.
23
24 [https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Re](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx)
25
26 [port.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx). (accessed 27 Jul 2020).
27
28
29
30 41 Akpan A, Roberts C, Bandeen-Roche K, et al. Standard set of health outcome measures for older
31
32 persons. *BMC Geriatr* 2018;18:36. doi:10.1186/s12877-017-0701-3
33
34
35 42 Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, et al. Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline
36
37 dissemination and implementation strategies. *Health Technol Assess* 2004;8:iii–iv, 1-72.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their
4
5 relatives
6
7

8
9 The Patient – Patient-Centered Outcomes Research
10

11
12 Pohontsch NJ¹, Schulze J¹, Höflich C¹, Glassen K², Breckner A², Szecsenyi J², Lühmann D¹,
13
14 Scherer M¹.
15
16

17
18 Corresponding author: n.pohontsch@uke.de
19

20
21 ¹ Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Ep-
22
23 pendorf, Hamburg, Germany
24
25

26
27 ² Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg University Hospi-
28
29 tal, Heidelberg, Germany
30
31

Guideline for Focus Groups with Patients

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care“

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we discuss your experiences, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and your chronic diseases.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: What has changed for you in your primary care compared to the past, since you no longer have only one, but three or more chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experience with primary care

I would like to ask you to tell us about your positive experiences with primary care.

2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far with your GP where you felt particularly well taken care of? Please think of your experiences as a patient with multiple chronic diseases at the same time.

2.1.2 What expectations do you have for your GP and his team?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

2.2.1 What experiences with your family doctor have you had so far where you felt that you were not well taken care of? What happened? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.

2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision for primary care

3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?

3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases looks like or should like.

3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like for someone like you?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects which you have given 4 points are so important to you.

For peer review only

1
2
3 Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their
4
5 relatives
6
7

8
9 The Patient – Patient-Centered Outcomes Research
10

11
12 Pohontsch NJ¹, Schulze J¹, Höflich C¹, Glassen K², Breckner A², Szecsenyi J², Lühmann D¹,
13
14 Scherer M¹.
15
16

17
18 Corresponding author: n.pohontsch@uke.de
19
20

21
22 ¹ Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Ep-
23
24 pendorf, Hamburg, Germany
25
26

27
28 ² Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg University Hospi-
29
30 tal, Heidelberg, Germany
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Guideline for Focus Groups with Relatives

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care “

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we talk about your experience, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

- 1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and the chronic illnesses that affect your relative.
- 1.2 Please also briefly describe your relationship with your relative, who has multiple chronic conditions, and the extent to which you are involved in their care.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: In your opinion and your experience, what has changed in primary care compared to the past since your relative no longer has not only one but multiple chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experiences with family doctor care

Now I would like to ask you to tell us about your good experiences with the family medical care of your relative, who is affected by several chronic diseases.

- 2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far where you would say that the GP was taking particularly good care of your relative?
- 2.1.2 What expectations/wishes do you have for the medical care of your relative who is affected by multiple chronic diseases?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

- 2.2.1 What experiences with medical care have you had where you would say that you and your relative was not well taken care of? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.
- 2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision of optimal primary care

- 3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?
- 3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases and their relatives looks like or should like.
- 3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like? What would you wish for as a family member?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects you have given 4 points are so important to you.

COREQ

1 “Quality of care for people with multimorbidity – A focus group study with patients and their relatives”

2 Topic	3 Item No.	4 Guide Questions/Description	5 Reported on Page No. (Comment)
6 Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
7 <i>Personal characteristics</i>			
8 Interviewer/facilitator	9 1	10 Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	11 p. 5
12 Credentials	13 2	14 What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	15 p. 7
16 Occupation	17 3	18 What was their occupation at the time of the study?	19 p. 7
20 Gender	21 4	22 Was the researcher male or female?	23 p. 7
24 Experience and training	25 5	26 What experience or training did the researcher have?	27 p. 7
28 <i>Relationship with participants</i>			
29 Relationship established	30 6	31 Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	32 p. 5
33 Participant knowledge of the interviewer	34 7	35 What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	36 Researchers introduced themselves and the study at the beginning of the focus group meetings.
37 Interviewer characteristics	38 8	39 What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	40 p. 7
41 Domain 2: Study design			
42 <i>Theoretical framework</i>			
43 Methodological orientation and Theory	44 9	45 What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	46 p. 6
47 <i>Participant selection</i>			
48 Sampling	49 10	50 How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	51 p. 4/5
52 Method of approach	53 11	54 How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	55 p. 5
56 Sample size	57 12	58 How many participants were in the study?	59 p. 8
60 Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	p. 8
61 <i>Setting</i>			
62 Setting of data collection	63 14	64 Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	65 in the department’s meeting room
66 Presence of non-participants	67 15	68 Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	69 Trained research assistant taking notes
70 Description of sample	71 16	72 What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	73 p. 5/8
74 <i>Data collection</i>			
75 Interview guide	76 17	77 Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	78 See suppl. files 1+2

Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No, not applicable
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	p. 5
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	No, not applicable
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Approx. 120-135 minutes
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	No, because theoretical saturation is a concept originally developed within Grounded Theory. Later, it was termed data/thematic saturation for other qualitative methods. While the concept of saturation has helpfully been translated for other qualitative approaches it is not appropriate to impose it on all instances, for example conversation analysis and qualitative content analysis (using purposive, not theoretical sampling).
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. We did not return the transcripts to the focus group participants as this does not seem to be the usual procedure in studies using focus groups and qualitative content analysis and would have meant an unduly demand from the patients.
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	p. 6
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	p. 8-18
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	p. 6
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	p. 7
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No. In health services research, where the data collection is an one-off exercise, participant checking might be more trouble than it is worth, especially in respect to the expenditure of the participants time. We therefore choose to ensure intersubjective reproducibility and comprehensibility by discussing the results with an interdisciplinary workgroup for qualitative methods.
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	p. 8-18 and table 1
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, we think that data and findings presented are consistent, but also think that it is the readers'/reviewers' right/duty to judge about that.
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	p. 8-18
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	p. 8-18

BMJ Open

Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047025.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Apr-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Pohontsch, Nadine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Schulze, Josefine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Hoeflich, Charlotte; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Glassen, Katharina; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Breckner, Amanda; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Szecsenyi, Joachim; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Lühmann, Dagmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Scherer, Martin; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care
Primary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives
4
5

6 Pohontsch NJ*, Schulze J, Höflich C, Glassen K, Breckner A, Szecsenyi J, Lühmann D, Scherer M.
7
8

9 Corresponding author:
10
11

12 Nadine Janis Pohontsch, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical
13 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistr. 52, 20246 Hamburg, Germany; n.pohontsch@uke.de, 0049
14
15 40 7410 55537, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0966-4087
16
17
18

19
20 Co-authors:
21
22

23 Josefina Schulze, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
24 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5727-9343
25
26

27 Charlotte Höflich, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
28 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
29
30

31
32 Katharina Glassen, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
33 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8892-8625
34
35

36
37 Amanda Breckner, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
38 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0777-5223
39
40

41 Joachim Szecsenyi, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
42 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4483-0028
43
44

45
46 Dagmar Lühmann, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
47 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7965-5007
48
49

50 Martin Scherer, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
51 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
52
53

54
55
56
57
58 Word count: 4.581
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Prevalence of people with multimorbidity rises. Multimorbidity constitutes a challenge to the health care system, and treatment of patients with multimorbidity is prone to high quality variations.

Currently, no set of quality indicators (QI) exists to assess quality of care, let alone incorporating the patient perspective. We therefore aim to identify aspects of quality of care relevant from the patients' perspective and match them to a literature-based set of QI.

Methods

We conducted eight focus groups with patients with multimorbidity and three focus groups with patients' relatives using a semi-structured guide. Data was analysed using Kuckartz's qualitative content analysis. We derived deductive categories from the literature, added inductive categories (new quality aspects) and translated them into QI.

Results

We created four new QI based on the quality aspects relevant to patients' relatives). Two QI (patient education/self-management, regular updates of medication plans) were consented by an expert panel, while two others were not (periodic check-ups, general practitioner coordinated care). Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not addressed in the focus groups.

Conclusion

We show that focus groups with patients and relatives add relevant aspects in QI development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a reasonable addition

1
2
3 to traditional QI development. Our QI set constitutes a framework for assessing the quality of care in
4
5 the German health care system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment standards and increase
6
7 the use of existing guidelines, hereby helping to reduce overuse, underuse, and misuse in the
8
9 treatment of patients with multimorbidity.
10
11
12

13 **German Clinical Trials Register: DRKS00015718, registration date: 15th of October 2018**
14
15
16

17 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 18 • affected patients and their relatives (who often function as informal caregiver) were
19 interviewed in the focus groups
- 20 • focus group participants from two differently structured regions in Germany representing a
21 wide spectrum of combinations of different diseases were queried
- 22 • focus groups with patients and their relatives (asking about positive and negative
23 experiences with care) seem to be an effective tool to identify quality aspects relevant for QI
24 development
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **INTRODUCTION**

45
46
47 Our society is aging and higher life expectancy is associated with higher rates of chronic diseases. Care
48 for patients with multimorbidity is likely to evolve into one of our most prominent challenges in the
49 future [1,2]. Multimorbidity is strongly linked to functional limitations, lower quality of life and increase
50 in health care utilization, costs and higher mortality [3,4]. Care for patients with multimorbidity is very
51 complex [5] and therefore prone to deficits in quality and major (unintended) interindividual
52 differences regarding the impact of illness and carer performance [6–9]. Multimorbidity creates many
53 challenges to general practitioners (GPs) and affected patients alike, e.g. (too) short consultation times,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 polypharmacy, increased health care utilization, high treatment burden and self-management
4 requirements as well as psychological distress [10,11]. Several decades of research and discussion have
5 provided us with suggestions for management approaches in primary care to better address the needs
6 of this patient group, inter alia, the Chronic Care Model [12,13] and the meta-algorithm [14] for
7 treating patients with multimorbidity.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Generic standards for high quality of care are hard to define due to the infinite number of possible
16 (combinations of) medical problems in patients with multimorbidity. Evidence-based standards
17 relevant to patients with multimorbidity are urgently needed, because single disease clinical guidelines
18 are for several reasons often inadequate for this patient population [10]. As long as the current state
19 of health care cannot be mapped systematically, for example by using a set of quality indicators (QI)
20 specific for multimorbidity, it remains impossible to compare the effects of interventions and health
21 care models to optimize quality or to identify sectors, regions or health care providers needing
22 improvement.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 In Germany, the first point of contact in the health care system for people who fall ill is usually a general
35 practitioner. GPs are usually licensed to provide care on the basis of contracts with the statutory health
36 insurance (SHI) and are member of the corresponding association of SHI doctors. The statutory health
37 insurance covers about 90% of Germany's residents and is complemented by a private health insurance
38 system. German GPs have usually completed five years of further training to be allowed to call
39 themselves specialists in general practice/primary care. Patients are free to consult any GP unless they
40 choose to enrol themselves in a GP contract ("Hausarztzentrierte Versorgung"). The contractually
41 defined GP-coordinated care further strengthens the role of the GPs as guides and coordinators for
42 the health care of their patients [15]. GPs refer patients to outpatient specialists or hospitals when
43 further or specialized care is needed. There are more than 100 different types of patient record
44 management software [16] and usually the patient records of different doctors are not linked, which
45 means that their communication and coordination often relies on (referral/discharge) letters and
46 patients' reports.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Taking the patients' perspective into consideration is even more relevant when dealing with patients
4 with multimorbidity. Every decision made concerning risks and benefits of treatments and
5 interventions has to be weighed against individual impairments, comorbidities and gain in subjective
6 quality of life [14]. Prioritization must take the whole range of biopsychosocial complexities into
7 account and follow principles of patient-centred clinical management and decision making. Views on
8 high quality health care often differ between patients and their health care providers [17,18]. For
9 example, quality of care seems to be higher when process or intermediate outcome indicators are
10 measured and lower when patient-reported experiences of care are reviewed [18]. Therefore patients
11 can [19] and must be involved in guideline and QI development [20–23]. Studies show that this is not
12 often the case [21] even though approaches to patient involvement in QI development, e.g. focus
13 groups, exist and are considered to be of high value [20].

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The MULTIqual project aims at the development of a quality indicator set which can be used to
evaluate the current state of health care provided for patients with multimorbidity and to promote
the implementation of treatment standards for future care. We conducted focus groups with patients
with multimorbidity and their relatives to validate and amend a literature- and expert consensus-based
set of QI by qualitatively surveying their views on health care quality.

METHODS

The MULTIqual project is a multi-centre mixed-methods project comprising a systematic literature
review, focus groups, a two-stage expert consensus process and a quantitative survey with patients
with multimorbidity and general practitioners. Following the COREQ [24] this paper presents the
results of focus groups with patients with multimorbidity and their relatives conducted in Hamburg
and Heidelberg and of the expert consensus on the qualitatively derived QIs. Further details on the
systematic literature review, expert panel, consensus process and quality indicator development
process that are not directly relevant for the work presented here will be described extensively
elsewhere (manuscript in preparation).

Participant selection and recruitment

We randomly selected the GPs from the register of SHI-accredited doctors of the city districts or within a radius of 25 km around the two study centers respectively. We invited the selected GPs to participate in our study and informed them in detail about the project if they were interested. Participating GPs were asked to recruit patients aged 65 and above with three or more chronic conditions that attended the practice at least once in the last three months. Patients with multimorbidity willing to participate were asked to invite close relatives to take part in the study as well. Exclusion criteria were insufficient knowledge of the German language and inability to give informed consent. Patients received an invitation containing study information, a response sheet and a reply envelope. Participants received an allowance of 30€ plus a reimbursement of travel expenses. Participants gave written informed consent for the focus groups to be recorded, transcribed and the data being published anonymously.

Focus group guide

Guide development was based on the literature review (e.g., [25]) and the research questions outlined above. As lay persons mostly relate to implicit experiential knowledge when defining quality criteria (e.g., [26,27]), we chose to question our focus group participants about their own positive and negative experiences with primary health care, changes in their health care needs and experiences due to multimorbidity and their vision of ideal primary care for people like them (see suppl. file 1 for 'patients' focus group guide'). With patients' relatives, the same topics were discussed in respect to the associated patient with multimorbidity (see suppl. file 2 for 'relatives' focus group guide').

Data collection

Either JS, CH, AB or KG had spoken to the participants on the phone, but had no other relationship with them. In 12/2018 and 01/2019 we conducted eight focus groups with patients with multimorbidity

1
2
3 (city A =3, city B= 5) and three focus groups with patients' relatives (A=1, B=2) using the semi-
4 structured guides described above. Two moderators facilitated the focus groups (NJP, JS, KG, AB, CH
5 and TKI respectively) which lasted about two hours. Discussions were digitally recorded and
6 transcribed verbatim by a trained research assistant following designated transcription rules. Accuracy
7 of the transcripts was checked by the respective moderators. In order to protect the focus groups
8 participants' identity, names and other identifying details were changed during transcription.
9

17 Data analysis

20 Data were analysed using the qualitative content analysis approach described by Kuckartz [28],
21 following a realistic paradigm [29]. Coders (NJP, CH and JS) read all transcripts to familiarize with the
22 data. Transcripts were broken down into fragments adopting different sizes ranging from part of a
23 sentence to one or more paragraphs in relation to the segment length needed to understand the
24 content and context of the relevant accounts. We created deductive codes representing the aspects
25 of quality described in the literature-based QI set and selected by the expert panel and inductive codes
26 when new aspects of quality emerged from the data (see below). We then subjected all transcripts to
27 a second round of coding by a different coder. Coding was carried out with constant discussions
28 between the three coders about the coded text passages and assigned codes. To ensure intersubjective
29 reproducibility and comprehensibility [30], the results were presented to and discussed with the
30 interdisciplinary workgroup 'qualitative methods' and the co-authors DL (postdoctorate, MD) and MS
31 (professor, MD). Data was managed using MAXQDA 11 (Verbi GmbH).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Identification of additional patient relevant quality aspects and expert rating of deduced QI

51 We aimed to supplement the preliminary QI set extracted from a systematic literature review by QI
52 based on patient-relevant quality aspects derived from the focus group data. A multidisciplinary
53 research team (NJP, CH, KG, AB and JS) allocated subjectively important quality aspects from patients'
54 and their relatives' views to the preliminary set of QI based on the literature review and identified
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important additional quality aspects where needed. Afterwards the research team transformed the
4 additionally identified quality aspects into QI (including description, numerator, denominator,
5 exclusion criteria etc.). These QI were presented by NP to an expert panel during an in-person meeting.
6
7
8
9
10 The expert panel consisted of representatives of primary care, nursing, practice management, quality
11 research methodology, social work, physical therapy, geriatrics, clinical pharmacology, social medicine
12 and patient representatives. The in-person meeting took place on 1st February 2019. During the
13 meeting NJP presented the focus group-material-based new QI to the expert panel. After a rating of
14 relevance, strength of evidence and their potential for undesirable effects, the expert panel voted for
15 keeping or rejecting the QI deduced from the focus group material via nominal group technique.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Patient and public involvement statement

25
26
27 Patients were involved in the recruitment of focus group participants (viz. their relatives). Patient
28 representatives and representatives of relevant fields (see above) were involved in the rating and
29 selection of QI. Apart from that there was no patient or public involvement in the study.
30
31
32
33
34

35 Researcher characteristics

36
37
38
39 Researchers' characteristics, beliefs and assumption influence qualitative research and data
40 interpretation. NJP (♀): post-doc psychologist, experienced qualitative researcher (patient
41 involvement in QI development, health care research focusing on general practice). JS (♀):
42 psychologist/junior scientist. CH (♀): medical student. AB (♀): junior scientist, M.A. Health Information
43 Management. DL (♀), KG (♀), JSz (♂), MS (♂): medical professionals, experienced post-doc researchers
44 in the field of general practice and QI development.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 RESULTS

55 56 57 58 Participants characteristics

1
2
3 We included 29 female and 18 male patients aged 65-84 years as well as three female and six male
4 relatives (five spouses/four children) aged 49-78 years in five patient groups, and three relatives
5 groups, respectively. Nine registered volunteers did not take part, with n = 3 due to acute health
6 problems and n = 6 due to organizational difficulties.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Focus group-based additional quality aspects included into the QI set after the expert panel rating
14

15
16 Two focus-group based quality aspects were finally supported by the expert panel and included in the
17 QI set.
18
19

20 21 22 *Patient education / self-management* 23

24
25 Patients consider it very helpful to be informed about their diseases and possible (self-) treatment and
26 management strategies (for example, nutrition counselling). Daily disease management can be
27 supported by specific information on self-management strategies, training in disease-related
28 competencies (for example, measuring the INR value), addressing coping strategies and provision of
29 knowledge for the patient.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37
38 *"I took part in a course in [city] and have been monitoring my 'Quick' [prothrombin time] myself for*
39 *over 20 years and I have a book and also keep a record. And I always took it with me to the*
40 *hospitals and the doctors were amazed that they could see exactly how I did it and how I tested*
41 *my 'Quick'. [...] And I always write it down and then I dose the medication myself. No, I am still*
42 *grateful to the doctor for giving me the tip that I can do the course how to measure my 'Quick'*
43 *on my own [...]."*
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *(city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 162-166)*
52

53 54 55 *Regular updates of medication plan* 56

57
58 Patients report to have been provided with medication plans and consider it very important for them
59 to be up-to-date especially when taking a high number of different medications or when medication is
60

1
2
3 prescribed by specialists. Some patients always have copies of their medication plan at hand in case of
4
5 an emergency and it would be considered helpful if this plan was accessible electronically on the health
6
7 insurance card.
8
9

10
11 *"This is also from the GP, right? It's a medication plan. So you know when to take it and so on. One*
12
13 *should know that. But also that you can show it, if someone asks: 'What are you taking?' Oh*
14
15 *god, yes, what am I taking? What's it called again? It just changed again, hasn't it? Well, I*
16
17 *know it, but it's also good for the other doctors if they have something printed and to be able*
18
19 *to see exactly what she needs, what she takes, how often and when [...]. So, it is very pleasant*
20
21 *when GPs do something like that. Gives you a certain amount of security."*
22
23

24 *(city A, patient focus group B, paragraph 251-253)*
25
26
27

28 Focus group-based additional quality aspects not included into the QI set after the expert panel rating
29

30
31 Two other indicators were not supported by the expert panel and not included in the final QI set.
32
33

34 *Regular check-ups*

35
36
37

38 Patients with chronic diseases see a need for regular check-ups as it would allow for early detection of
39
40 health deterioration and they know these procedures from the disease management programmes, e.g.
41
42 for diabetes or COPD. They value the regular contact with the GP at fixed appointments.
43
44

45
46 *"[...] if you take these medications regularly and then say: "We'll have a general check-up once*
47
48 *every two years" – I think that's not enough. I think it should be every year. The status should*
49
50 *be checked once in a while, if I'm taking these pills regularly."*
51
52

53 *(city A, patient focus group C, paragraph 97)*
54
55

56 *General practitioner coordinated care*

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Patients appreciate the GPs to coordinate their care which involves for example writing referral letters
4
5 for specialist visits (and the GP receiving medical reports), having a network of specialists at hand,
6
7 planning preventive measures and keeping track of medications and their interactions and side effects.
8
9 Patients who describe their relationship with their GP as trusting, want all information on their health
10
11 care to converge at their GPs' practice.
12
13

14
15 *"[...] when the diagnoses are made and the GPs know what's going on, then they should actually act*
16
17 *as a control center and have the possibility to coordinate everything."*

18
19 *(city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 264)*

20
21
22
23 *"That's a given in our practice. He always wants to give you referrals because he wants to have*
24
25 *doctor's letters. Otherwise he says he doesn't have an overview. And I think that's very, very*
26
27 *good."*

28
29
30 *(city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 66)*
31
32

33 Literature-based quality aspects supported by focus groups

34
35
36
37 Table 1 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by both
38
39 focus groups and expert consensus and shows supporting quotes from the focus groups. Descriptions
40
41 of categories shown table 1 follow below.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Quality aspects identified in the literature and supported by focus groups and expert panel ratings

Patient-related factors	Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs	<p>“So for me, I would like to see myself not only as a body, or only as organs, but as a complex human being. That’s very important for me, [...] this union of body, mind and soul.” (<i>city B</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 70)</p> <p>“This is certainly an aspect that the doctors should [...] actually take a closer look at again: What is the situation at home? Does the person need support? Do we have to organize something?” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 91)</p>
	Involving partners, family and caregivers	<p>“Perhaps this could be discussed in a phone call with relatives, so that I am informed about the current situation, what is pending or how the medication maybe, yes, what I have to pay attention to as a caring relative and, as I said, if this is okay for my mother, as I know that she is not informed at all.” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 174)</p>
Physician-patient- interaction	Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals	<p>“A doctor's sole decision: (.) "Do this or that" - if the patient doesn't agree, it is pointless (...). He won't do it anyway. (...) And that's why I think that those issues really need to be discussed together. And determined together what is possible for the patient. Not everything is possible.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 468)</p> <p>“[...] we discussed it [...] at eye level in a VERY thorough conversation, so that we decided on the therapy regimen together, which I follow, and use take control of the disease.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 21)</p>

bmjopen-2020-047925 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 17, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

<p>Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment</p>	<p>Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment</p>	<p>“It's important to me [...] that I get information in an [...] understandable way about what is going on with me and how this could be treated.” (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)</p> <p>“And then that in some cases he may explain the disease. Not the disease, but the measures, that's the way I wanted to put it. But then we come back to the time factor again. But in some cases, as I said, it is done this way. So that you get a little more time and get information about what is actually going on and what you can do about it. Or against it.” (city B, relatives' focus group B, paragraph 98)</p> <p>“But it's just that when I get pills and it says this and that and you don't even know what it's for. [...]” (city B, patient focus group C, paragraph 43)</p>
<p>Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions</p>	<p>Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions</p>	<p>“Especially in the case of multiple chronic diseases, I find it extremely important that the general practitioner explains to me that the drugs are compatible, that there is no interaction or that it is possible that they will cancel each other out or even worsen the condition, as in the case of my mother [...]” (city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 69)</p> <p>“I also consider close monitoring of drug effects and side effects important. Because there are side effects that one does not even register, which develop so insidiously. So it's a good thing that experts with their backgrounds check for possible side effects and say: “Watch this, something is happening to you, that doesn't fit in or it's a side effect”.</p>

bmjopen-2020-04-2025 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on 07 April 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

		<p>Because I only read the package insert when I really have something and suspect a side effect. I do not read them in advance. Because then you don't take the drug." (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)</p>
	<p>Written treatment plan</p>	<p>"I packed a little something from my management. I don't know if you know anything like that, here is a blood sugar diary for people on insulin. This is from the diabetes clinic. It contains all my data, every record, both blood sugar levels and blood pressure and then the insulin dose. And I also check my weight and write it down here, so I always keep everything together. And I take this to my general practitioner as well as to the other doctors, for example to the eye specialist. And I think that's good." (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 167-168)</p>
<p>Context and Organizational Structures</p>	<p>Comprehensive care documentation</p>	<p>"I think [...] to keep an overview of the attending specialists is actually very important. Because [...] when I go to the eye specialist or ear, nose and throat specialist, and the GP doesn't even know this, and usually doesn't get a medical report from them either, then he is actually missing out [...] on important information. I could have glaucoma, or whatever. And he doesn't even know about it and he doesn't even know what kind of medication you might have to take. [...]" (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 466)</p>
	<p>Training programmes addressing</p>	<p>"Whereby I have to say with my GP's joint practice, you can't complain. So there are two [employees], I think, they are still trained nurses. That's how long they've been at it. They are REALLY competent. And I'd say they already</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

bmjopen-2020-047025 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 17, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

<p>management of patients with multimorbidity</p>	<p>of with</p>	<p>have a certain diagnostic instinct. They can tell when someone comes in with swollen eyes, whether it's just a flu-like infection or a real flu, that he should perhaps be isolated.” (city A, relative focus group A, paragraph 108)</p> <p>“Well, of course we have the problem that we have more and more elderly people who are sick, and have multiple diseases. And we have fewer and fewer GPs. So, I think it would be a very good care model if we had, for example, registered physicians who specialize in geriatrics. I think it would be a good care model if we had general medical training, with additional specialization, for example in mental health. I would prefer geriatrics and that these doctors with such training, who also have many, many or mostly older patients, are given more time. That perhaps, there are also these reference numbers, what they can charge. Because, we have to get there, because there are more and more elderly people, that they would get the possibility, the aspect of time and if it is only five minutes. Five minutes is a lot per patient. But that is of course an idle wish [...]” (city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 85)</p>
---	--------------------	---

Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs

Patients expressed a need for the GP to have a holistic view on the patient's health problems and needs. They underlined the importance of not only seeing and treating physical symptoms, but also the overall picture of medical and psychosocial aspects of the patient's situation. They consider it important for the GP to have at least basic information on the patient's background and personal history. Sometimes house calls can be necessary for a realistic judgement on biopsychosocial support needs for example for elderly people with beginning dementia.

Involving partners, family and caregivers

Relatives of people with multimorbidity often appreciate the GPs' willingness to communicate with them and support them in the process of giving care. Support and advice are often desperately needed by informal caregivers of persons with multimorbidity, especially if dementia is an issue. GP's awareness of informal caregivers' problems and concerns is important and could for example be addressed by offering consultation hours for relatives and other informal caregivers.

Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals

Shared decision-making to find a customized treatment approach for individual patients is highly appreciated by the focus group participants. Communicating, informing and deciding on treatment regimens and goals on a par with the patient are seen as essential for increasing adherence and patient satisfaction. Patients value the freedom to set their own priorities and make decisions based on their values and preferences concerning their health and health care behaviour. They appreciate their GPs supporting them in this approach and the autonomy this respect gives them.

Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment

Our focus group participants did not differentiate clearly between information and advice on their diagnosis, disease or condition and risks, medications (for example indication, dosage and interactions)

1
2
3 or non-pharmacological treatments and their benefits and potential side effects. They emphasize the
4 importance of detailed and comprehensible information on all these aspects. Either way, some stated
5 not to be interested in very detailed descriptions of potential risks and side effects. The amount of
6 information given must be tailored to the patient's needs even though these consultations might need
7 more time than usually budgeted.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 *Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions*

16
17
18 Medication reviews are highly acclaimed by the focus group participants. Patients and their relatives
19 wish for the GP to check for interactions regularly especially with medication prescribed by others and
20 over-the-counter (OTC) drugs. They expressed criticism of the high numbers of prescribed drugs and
21 low engagement of health professionals to actively inquire about drug-related problems and to search
22 for highly tolerable medications. Patients focus less on the thorough documentation of adverse drugs
23 reactions than on their monitoring and handling. They wish for the GP to detect signs of adverse effects
24 and monitor them for example through regular follow-ups.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 *Written treatment plan*

37
38
39 Focus group participants' recognize the value of written treatment schedules that include overviews
40 on scheduled health care appointments plus instructions, e.g., whether they have to appear with an
41 empty stomach for bloodwork. They emphasized the advantages of automated recalls systems.
42
43
44 Another focus was on recorded treatment protocols, e.g. keeping a blood pressure journal or a
45 diabetes log book containing measured values and other relevant parameters. Patients proposed using
46 digital solutions for facilitating care coordination between different providers.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 54 *Comprehensive care documentation*

55
56
57 The vast majority of the focus group participants consider comprehensive care documentation as a
58 vital part of high quality care, emphasizing importance of the exchange of information on diagnostic
59
60

1
2
3 testing or examination results and prescribed medication, giving the GP the opportunity to coordinate
4
5 care and consult the specialist about the patient's treatments. Patients report that the responsibility
6
7 for this exchange is often in the patients' hand, being the ones to take care of specialists' letters being
8
9 issued to the GP. Under the premise of data security, patients would support a digital exchange of
10
11 doctor's letters, but sometimes doubt the 'digital competencies' especially of the older generation of
12
13 physicians.
14
15

16 17 *Training programmes addressing management of patients with multimorbidity*

18
19
20
21 Patients put emphasis on the competencies of the practice team. For medical assistants this means for
22
23 example being experienced in taking blood samples or administering vaccinations or injectable
24
25 medications. Another aspect is the ability to triage patients according to the severity and urgency of
26
27 their treatment needs. GPs should engage in continuous medical education, be up-to-date on actual
28
29 research results and technological advances. Participants valued additional training in the field of
30
31 geriatrics or psychology and proposed regular supervision and peer consultation for complex problems
32
33 in multimorbid patients.
34
35

36 37 38 Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups

39
40
41 Table 2 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by the
42
43 expert panel but not accounted for in focus groups. As this paper focuses on the focus group result,
44
45 these quality aspects are described extensively elsewhere (manuscript in preparation).
46
47
48

49 **Table 2: Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups**

Patient-related factors	Screening for depression
	Proactive pain assessment
	Monitoring of pain management
	Addressing financial support needs
	Quality of life assessment

	Assessment of symptom burden
	Establishing patient preferences
Physician-patient-interaction	Identification of patients with multimorbidity
	Assessment of treatment burden
	Monitoring adherence to treatment
Context and Organizational Structures	Assigning responsibility for coordination of care

DISCUSSION

Main results

By asking patients with multimorbidity and their relatives in focus groups about their experiences with primary health care we were able to identify important quality aspects from their point of view and derived four new patient-relevant QI to date not represented in guidelines or the literature on quality of care in multimorbidity. Out of these, two QI concerning regular updates of written medication plans and patient education and fostering self-management were supported by the expert panel. On the other hand, regular check-ups and GP-coordinated care were not supported by the expert panel. Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, establishing patient preferences and shared decision-making, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not covered in the focus groups.

Strength and limitations

To obtain a comprehensive picture of aspects of quality of care from the affected persons' point of view we asked not only patients with multimorbidity, but also their relatives (often informal caregivers)

1
2
3 in separate groups. Focus group participants were recruited in two very differently structured regions
4
5 of northern and southern Germany and represent a wide spectrum of combinations of different
6
7 diseases. We therefore assume that our results might be cautiously generalizable to patients with
8
9 multimorbidity in primary care all over Germany. However, the experiences reported by patients with
10
11 multimorbidity and their relatives in the focus groups may to some extent be specific to the German
12
13 healthcare system. In other countries, such as the UK, for example, medication reviews and the
14
15 provision of medication information are the responsibility of pharmacists. Our results should not be
16
17 transferred to other countries without cautious reflection, as the organisation of health care systems
18
19 and the implementation of (primary) care differ between Germany and other countries.
20
21
22

23
24 Reflecting and evaluating own experiences is dependent on representation of different perspectives,
25
26 lived experiences and group interaction, and must be fragmentary, as participants were lay persons
27
28 regarding health care (quality). Therefore, it did not seem feasible to ask the participants to propose
29
30 QI. Instead, we focussed on positive and negative experiences with primary care and derived patient-
31
32 relevant QI indirectly. As many accounts can be matched to QI derived from the literature and half of
33
34 the newly developed QI were supported by expert consensus this methodology seems to be plausible
35
36 and practicable.
37
38
39

40
41 Although the questions focussed on experiences regarding the related patients with multimorbidity,
42
43 the results from focus groups with relatives show that for some participants it was difficult to focus on
44
45 their role as (caregiving) relative. Many participants referred to their own health care experiences
46
47 being affected by multiple conditions themselves, which reflects the spectrum of issues and challenges
48
49 in the field as the prevalence of multimorbidity increases in older age [31].
50
51
52

53 Discussion of results and comparison with existing literature
54
55

56
57 The complexities of managing multimorbidity are widely known [10] and there is a growing amount of
58
59 literature on interventions for improving outcomes in patients with multimorbidity [11,32]. Different
60

1
2
3 approaches to tackle the challenges of caring for patients with multimorbidity were discussed, from
4 the Chronic Care Model [13], a systematic collection and review of interventions [32] and quality
5 standards [33] to a German meta-algorithm [14], but a quality indicator set involving the perspective
6 of affected patients and their (potential) informal caregivers is still missing.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Since 2016, patients enrolled in statutory health insurance in Germany have a right to be provided with
14 a recorded medication plan if they are prescribed at least three different long-term medications, which
15 is very much appreciated by persons with multimorbidity in our study and elsewhere [34]. If patients
16 consent, these data can be saved to the electronic health card or record to allow for a standardized
17 digital exchange of this information of these data between providers [35,36]. Despite preferring a
18 written medication plan and stating the problem of insufficient communication between prescribing
19 physicians, participants of our focus groups judged this incorporation ambivalently as they saw
20 problems concerning data safety and confidentiality [37] as well as (older) GPs digital literacy.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Patients' with multimorbidity wish for patient education, fostering of self-management and periodic
33 check-ups might arise from their experiences with patient education and regular control of, e.g., blood
34 values, respiratory function and blood pressure during the structured disease management
35 programmes (DMP, e.g., [38]) that many patients with diabetes, COPD or heart failure take part in.
36 DMP for single diseases and lone-standing self-management interventions for patients with
37 multimorbidity have shown to be helpful (e.g., [39,40]), which supports the patient-education QI (see
38 also [19]). While a recent systematic review supports the importance of monitoring treatment effects
39 and clinical parameters [11], this is no plea for generalised periodic check-ups without a definite
40 indication.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The proposition of a GP-coordinated care was not supported by the expert panel as this care model is
53 not yet sufficiently embedded within routine care in Germany [41], although §73 SGB V [42] makes
54 way for general practitioner-centred primary care (coordination) since 2003, which is also highlighted
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the policy paper of the German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians from 2012
4
5 [43].
6
7

8
9 Literature-based QI validated by the focus group focus mostly on aspects that address interpersonal
10
11 communication, holistic treatment approaches and processes that allow patients to make their own
12
13 choices based on comprehensive information. This aligns our findings with the wide scientific
14
15 consensus that the treatment of patients with multimorbidity should be informed by a patient-centred
16
17 approach [19,44–46]. The majority of the quality statements proposed by National Institute for Health
18
19 and Care Excellence (NICE [33]) align with the indicators resulting from our study (e.g., “assessing
20
21 values, priorities and goals”, “care coordination” and “reviewing medicines and other treatments”). All
22
23 measurement frameworks seem to have one thing in common: taking shared-decision making into
24
25 account as central aspect of patient-centred care [47].
26
27
28

29
30 An explanation for the lack of support for the QI dealing with screening and assessment issues in the
31
32 focus groups might be due to the participants’ perspective as individuals and end users of care
33
34 structures and processes. Qualitative methods are mostly able to elicit patients’ personal experiences
35
36 with and views on health care (processes) and laypersons are seldom confronted with meta-level
37
38 issues directed at groups of patients and not individual patients.
39
40
41

42
43 Other projects aiming at the development of quality frameworks in multimorbidity predominantly
44
45 focussed on outcome measurement [48–50]. Scientific evidence on generic health outcome measures
46
47 to assess quality of care for patients with multimorbidity is still lacking. In the light of patients’ with
48
49 multimorbidity individual goals and priorities it proves difficult to define outcome indicators suitable
50
51 for all. Keeping that in mind, our QI set addressing mainly care processes and covering a broad range
52
53 of care domains is evidence-based and seems to be very adequate for the evaluation of quality of care
54
55 for patients with multimorbidity.
56
57

58
59 Future research
60

1
2
3 Primary care patients (≥ 65 years) and their GPs will be questioned using standardized patient reported
4 outcome measures (related to the identified QI) and other instruments (measuring behaviour
5 described in the identified QI) to study validity and applicability of the developed set of QI. The definite
6 set of QI will be determined based on the study results.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Practical implications

14
15
16 The QI set finally developed in the MULTiqual-study can be used as a framework for assessing the
17 quality of care in the German health care system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment
18 standards, increase the use of existing guidelines [14,51] and help to reduce over-, under- and misuse
19 of healthcare resources. The QI set will serve as a reference framework for future evaluations of
20 complex interventions and care models for patients with multimorbidity.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 CONCLUSION

30
31
32 Our study has demonstrated that focus groups with patients and their relatives add important aspects
33 in QI development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a
34 reasonable addition to traditional QI development [19,20]. Future challenges lie in the adoption of
35 these quality criteria as practical and valid standardized measures and their implementation in primary
36 care.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Author contributions

49 MS, DL, JSz: Acquisition of funding for and conception, design and supervision of the study. AB, KG, NP,
50 JSc: moderation of focus groups. AB, KG, CH, NP and JSc: data analysis and interpretation. NP: drafting
51 of the manuscript. AB, KG, CH, DL, JSc, JSz, MS: critical revision of former versions and final approval
52 of the manuscript.
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 Acknowledgements

1
2
3 We would like to thank all patients and their relatives for their time and effort invested in participating
4
5 in the focus groups, the experts for participating in the expert panel, Tabea Eissing for her contributions
6
7 in the development of the focus group guides and Thomas Kloppe for co-moderating one of the focus
8
9 groups.
10

11 **Data availability statement**

12
13
14 The data generated and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due study's
15
16 assurances to participants that the full raw focus group data would not be shared publicly, and that all
17
18 attempts would be made to maintain confidentiality. We named the people who are responsible for
19
20 data analysis to the focus group participants in the written consent and they did not agree to the
21
22 sharing of the full raw data.
23
24

25 **Funding**

26
27 This work was supported by the Innovation Fund of the Federal Joint Committee (G-BA; grant no.
28
29 01VSF16058). The funding body had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
30
31 publish or preparation of the manuscript.
32
33

34 **Competing Interests**

35
36 None declared.
37
38

39 **Ethics Approval**

40
41 Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Hamburg Medical Association, (10th
42
43 September 2018, PV5846), from the Clinical Ethics Committee Heidelberg (19th December 2018, S-
44
45 665/2018), and the Medical Association of Baden-Wuerttemberg (13th November, B-F-2018-096).
46
47

48 **Consent to participate**

49
50 Participants gave written informed consent to participate in the study and for the focus groups to be
51
52 recorded, transcribed and the data being published anonymously.
53
54

55 **Consent for publication**

56
57 Not applicable.
58
59

60 **References**

- 1 Advisory Council on the Assessment of Developments in the Health Care System [Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Entwicklung im Gesundheitswesen]. Special Report 2009. Coordination and Integration - Health Care in an Aging Society. [Sondergutachten 2009. Koordination und Integration - Gesundheitsversorgung in einer Gesellschaft des längeren Lebens.] https://www.svr-gesundheit.de/fileadmin/Gutachten/Sondergutachten_2009/Kurzfassung_engl_2009.pdf (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
- 2 Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing Res Rev* 2011;10:430–9. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2011.03.003
- 3 France EF, Wyke S, Gunn JM, et al. Multimorbidity in primary care: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:e297-307. doi:10.3399/bjgp12X636146
- 4 Gijzen R, Hoeymans N, Schellevis FG, et al. Causes and consequences of comorbidity: a review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001;54:661–74. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00363-2
- 5 Clyne B, Cooper JA, Hughes CM, et al. “Potentially inappropriate or specifically appropriate?” Qualitative evaluation of general practitioners views on prescribing, polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate prescribing in older people. *BMC Fam Pract* 2016;17:109. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0507-y
- 6 Koller D, Schön G, Schäfer I, et al. Multimorbidity and long-term care dependency--a five-year follow-up. *BMC Geriatr* 2014;14:70. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-14-70
- 7 van den Bussche H, Kaduszkiewicz H, Schäfer I, et al. Overutilization of ambulatory medical care in the elderly German population?--An empirical study based on national insurance claims data and a review of foreign studies. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:129. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1357-y
- 8 Jin H, Tang C, Wei Q, et al. Age-related differences in factors associated with the underuse of recommended medications in acute coronary syndrome patients at least one year after hospital discharge. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2014;14:127. doi:10.1186/1471-2261-14-127
- 9 Sönnichsen A, Trampisch US, Rieckert A, et al. Polypharmacy in chronic diseases-Reduction of Inappropriate Medication and Adverse drug events in older populations by electronic Decision Support (PRIMA-eDS): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2016;17:57. doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1177-8
- 10 Wallace E, Salisbury C, Guthrie B, et al. Managing patients with multimorbidity in primary care. *BMJ* 2015;350:h176. doi:10.1136/bmj.h176
- 11 Muth C, Blom JW, Smith SM, et al. Evidence supporting the best clinical management of patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy: a systematic guideline review and expert consensus. *J Intern Med* 2019;285:272–88. doi:10.1111/joim.12842
- 12 Bodenheimer T. Improving Primary Care for Patients With Chronic Illness. *JAMA* 2002;288:1775. doi:10.1001/jama.288.14.1775
- 13 Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH, Grumbach K. Improving Primary Care for Patients With Chronic Illness: The Chronic Care Model, Part 2. *JAMA* 2002;288:1909. doi:10.1001/jama.288.15.1909

- 1
2
3 14 German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians [DEGAM]. Guideline
4 Multimorbidity [Leitlinie Multimorbidität]. <http://www.degam.de/degam-leitlinien-379.html>.
5 (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
6
- 7 15 Federal Ministry of Health [Bundesministerium für Gesundheit].
8 [https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf)
9 [/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf) (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
10
11
- 12 16 National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians [Kassenärztliche
13 Bundesvereinigung]. https://www.kbv.de/media/sp/Gesamt_Systeme_Installationen.pdf
14 (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
15
- 16 17 Herzberg H, Bernateck K, Welti F, et al. Patient Participation in Development of Quality Indicators
17 using the Example of National Disease Management Guidelines for Chronic Heart Failure – A
18 Qualitative Analysis of Collective Perspectives [Patientenbeteiligung bei der Entwicklung von
19 Qualitätsindikatoren am Beispiel der Nationalen VersorgungsLeitlinie Chronische Herzinsuffizienz
20 – Eine qualitative Analyse kollektiver Sichtweisen]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2016;78:373–7.
21 doi:10.1055/s-0035-1548880
22
- 23 18 Valderas JM, Gangannagari J, Nolte E, et al. Quality of care assessment for people with
24 multimorbidity. *J Intern Med* 2019; 285: 289-300. doi:10.1111/joim.12881
25
- 26 19 Pohontsch NJ, Herzberg H, Joos S, et al. The professional perspective on patient involvement in
27 the development of quality indicators: a qualitative analysis using the example of chronic heart
28 failure in the German health care setting. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2015;9:151–9.
29 doi:10.2147/PPA.S74064
30
31
- 32 20 Kötter T, Schaefer FA, Scherer M, et al. Involving patients in quality indicator development - a
33 systematic review. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2013;7:259–68. doi:10.2147/PPA.S39803
34
- 35 21 Kötter T, Blozik E, Scherer M. Methods for the guideline-based development of quality
36 indicators--a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:21. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-21
37
38
- 39 22 Campbell SM, Shield T, Rogers A, et al. How do stakeholder groups vary in a Delphi technique
40 about primary mental health care and what factors influence their ratings? *Qual Saf Health Care*
41 2004;13:428–34. doi:10.1136/qhc.13.6.428
42
- 43 23 Baudendistel I, Noest S, Peters-Klimm F, et al. Bridging the gap between patient needs and
44 quality indicators: a qualitative study with chronic heart failure patients. *Patient Prefer*
45 *Adherence* 2015;9:1397–405. doi:10.2147/PPA.S83850
46
- 47 24 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a
48 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007;19:349–57.
49 doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
50
- 51 25 Sofaer S, Firminger K. Patient perceptions of the quality of health services. *Annu Rev Public*
52 *Health* 2005;26:513–59. doi:10.1146/annurev.publhealth.25.050503.153958
53
- 54 26 Bahadori M, Yaghoubi M, Haghgoshye E, et al. Patients' and physicians' perspectives and
55 experiences on the quality of medical consultations: a qualitative study. *JBIM Evid Implement*
56 2020;18:247–255. doi:10.1097/XEB.0000000000000210
57
- 58 27 Pohl H. Evaluating quality in endoscopy. *Endoscopy* 2017; 49:581-587. doi:10.1055/s-0043-
59 104380
60

- 1
2
3 28 Kuckartz U. Qualitative Content Analysis [Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse]. 1st ed. Beltz Juventa 2012.
4
5 29 Potter J, Wetherell M. Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.
6 London: Sage 1987.
7
8 30 Steinke I. Quality Criteria in Qualitative Research. In: Flick U, von Kardorff E, Steinke I, eds. A
9 Companion to Qualitative Research. London: Sage 2004. 184–90.
10
11 31 Polenick CA, Leggett AN, Webster NJ, et al. Multiple Chronic Conditions in Spousal Caregivers of
12 Older Adults With Functional Disability: Associations With Caregiving Difficulties and Gains. *J*
13 *Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2020;75:160–72. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbx118
14
15 32 Smith SM, Wallace E, O’Dowd T, et al. Interventions for improving outcomes in patients with
16 multimorbidity in primary care and community settings. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;2016.
17 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006560.pub3
18
19 33 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Multimorbidity quality standard.
20 2017. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs153>. (accessed 13 Apr 2021).
21
22 34 Botermann L, Krueger K, Eickhoff C, et al. Patients’ handling of a standardized medication plan: a
23 pilot study and method development. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2016;10:621–30.
24 doi:10.2147/PPA.S96431
25
26 35 Klein S, Schellhammer S. Medication Infrastructure Development in Germany. In: Aanstad M,
27 Grisot M, Hanseth O, et al., eds. Information Infrastructures within European Health Care. Cham:
28 Springer 2017.
29
30 36 National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians [Kassenärztliche
31 Bundesvereinigung]. Medication plan [Medikationsplan].
32 <https://www.kbv.de/html/medikationsplan.php> (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
33
34 37 Dietzel GTW. From eEurope 2002 to the electronic health card: Chances for the Health Care
35 System [Von eEurope 2002 zur elektronischen Gesundheitskarte: Chancen für das
36 Gesundheitswesen]. *Dtsch Arztebl* 2002; 99: A 1417–1419
37
38 38 Fuchs S, Henschke C, Blümel M, et al. Disease Management Programs for Type 2 Diabetes in
39 Germany: A Systematic Literature Review Evaluating Effectiveness. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*
40 2014;111:453–63. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2014.0453
41
42 39 Mehring M, Donnachie E, Fexer J, et al. Disease Management Programs for Patients With COPD
43 in Germany: A Longitudinal Evaluation of Routinely Collected Patient Records. *Respir Care*
44 2014;59:1123–32. doi:10.4187/respcare.02748
45
46 40 Contant É, Loignon C, Bouhali T, et al. A multidisciplinary self-management intervention among
47 patients with multimorbidity and the impact of socioeconomic factors on results. *BMC Fam Pract*
48 2019;20:53. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0943-6
49
50 41 Lübeck R, Beyer M, Gerlach F. Rationale und Stand der hausarztzentrierten Versorgung in
51 Deutschland [Rationale and dissemination of “GP centered health care” (“HzV”) in Germany].
52 *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz* 2015;58:360–6.
53 doi:10.1007/s00103-015-2118-5
54
55 42 SGB V Gesetzliche Krankenversicherung - SGB V Sozialgesetzbuch.
56 <https://www.sozialgesetzbuch-sgb.de/sgbv/1.html> (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 43 German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians [DEGAM]. General Practice —
4 Focused on the Whole Person [Allgemeinmedizin —spezialisiert auf den ganzen Menschen].
5 2012 .[http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/ Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-](http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf)
6 [Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf](http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf). (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
7
8
9 44 Boyd CM, Lucas GM. Patient-centered care for people living with multimorbidity. *Curr Opin HIV*
10 *AIDS* 2014;9:419–27. doi:10.1097/COH.000000000000073
11
12 45 Schattner A, Bronstein A, Jellin N. Information and shared decision-making are top patients'
13 priorities. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:21. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-6-21
14
15 46 Kvåle K, Bondevik M. What is important for patient centred care? A qualitative study about the
16 perceptions of patients with cancer. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2008;22:582–9. doi:10.1111/j.1471-
17 6712.2007.00579.x
18
19 47 Godolphin W. Shared decision-making. *Healthc Q Tor Ont* 2009;12 Spec No Patient:e186-190.
20 doi:10.12927/hcq.2009.20947
21
22 48 Working Group on Health Outcomes for Older Persons with Multiple Chronic Conditions.
23 Universal health outcome measures for older persons with multiple chronic conditions. *J Am*
24 *Geriatr Soc* 2012;60:2333–41. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04240.x
25
26 49 National Quality Forum (NQF). Multiple chronic conditions measurement framework.
27 [https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Re](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx)
28 [port.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx). (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
29
30 50 Akpan A, Roberts C, Bandeen-Roche K, et al. Standard set of health outcome measures for older
31 persons. *BMC Geriatr* 2018;18:36. doi:10.1186/s12877-017-0701-3
32
33 51 Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, et al. Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline
34 dissemination and implementation strategies. *Health Technol Assess Winch Engl* 2004;8:iii–iv, 1-
35 72.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Guideline for Focus Groups with Patients

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care“

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we discuss your experiences, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and your chronic diseases.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: What has changed for you in your primary care compared to the past, since you no longer have only one, but three or more chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experience with primary care

I would like to ask you to tell us about your positive experiences with primary care.

2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far with your GP where you felt particularly well taken care of? Please think of your experiences as a patient with multiple chronic diseases at the same time.

2.1.2 What expectations do you have for your GP and his team?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

2.2.1 What experiences with your family doctor have you had so far where you felt that you were not well taken care of? What happened? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.

2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision for primary care

3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?

3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases looks like or should like.

3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like for someone like you?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects which you have given 4 points are so important to you.

For peer review only

Guideline for Focus Groups with Relatives

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care “

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we talk about your experience, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and the chronic illnesses that affect your relative.

1.2 Please also briefly describe your relationship with your relative, who has multiple chronic conditions, and the extent to which you are involved in their care.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: In your opinion and your experience, what has changed in primary care compared to the past since your relative no longer has not only one but multiple chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experiences with family doctor care

Now I would like to ask you to tell us about your good experiences with the family medical care of your relative, who is affected by several chronic diseases.

2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far where you would say that the GP was taking particularly good care of your relative?

2.1.2 What expectations/wishes do you have for the medical care of your relative who is affected by multiple chronic diseases?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

2.2.1 What experiences with medical care have you had where you would say that you and your relative was not well taken care of? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.

2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision of optimal primary care

3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?

3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases and their relatives looks like or should like.

3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like? What would you wish for as a family member?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects you have given 4 points are so important to you.

COREQ

1 “Quality of care for people with multimorbidity – A focus group study with patients and their relatives”

2 Topic	3 Item No.	4 Guide Questions/Description	5 Reported on Page No. (Comment)
6 Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
7 <i>Personal characteristics</i>			
8 Interviewer/facilitator	9 1	10 Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	11 p. 7
12 Credentials	13 2	14 What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	15 p. 8
16 Occupation	17 3	18 What was their occupation at the time of the study?	19 p. 8
20 Gender	21 4	22 Was the researcher male or female?	23 p. 8
24 Experience and training	25 5	26 What experience or training did the researcher have?	27 p. 8
28 <i>Relationship with participants</i>			
29 Relationship established	30 6	31 Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	32 p. 6
33 Participant knowledge of the interviewer	34 7	35 What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	36 Researchers introduced themselves and the study at the beginning of the focus group meetings.
37 Interviewer characteristics	38 8	39 What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	40 p. 8
41 Domain 2: Study design			
42 <i>Theoretical framework</i>			
43 Methodological orientation and Theory	44 9	45 What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	46 p. 7
47 <i>Participant selection</i>			
48 Sampling	49 10	50 How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	51 p. 6
52 Method of approach	53 11	54 How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	55 p. 6
56 Sample size	57 12	58 How many participants were in the study?	59 p. 9
60 Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	p. 9
61 <i>Setting</i>			
62 Setting of data collection	63 14	64 Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	65 in the department’s meeting room
66 Presence of non-participants	67 15	68 Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	69 Trained research assistant taking notes
70 Description of sample	71 16	72 What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	73 p. 6/9
74 <i>Data collection</i>			
75 Interview guide	76 17	77 Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	78 See suppl. files 1+2

Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No, not applicable
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	p. 7
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	No, not applicable
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Approx. 120-135 minutes
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	No, because theoretical saturation is a concept originally developed within Grounded Theory. Later, it was termed data/thematic saturation for other qualitative methods. While the concept of saturation has helpfully been translated for other qualitative approaches it is not appropriate to impose it on all instances, for example conversation analysis and qualitative content analysis (using purposive, not theoretical sampling).
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. We did not return the transcripts to the focus group participants as this does not seem to be the usual procedure in studies using focus groups and qualitative content analysis and would have meant an unduly demand from the patients.
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	p. 7
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	p. 9-19
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	p. 7
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	p. 7
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No. In health services research, where the data collection is an one-off exercise, participant checking might be more trouble than it is worth, especially in respect to the expenditure of the participants time. We therefore choose to ensure intersubjective reproducibility and comprehensibility by discussing the results with an interdisciplinary workgroup for qualitative methods.
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	p. 9-19 and table 1
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, we think that data and findings presented are consistent, but also think that it is the readers'/reviewers' right/duty to judge about that.
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	p. 9-19
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	p. 9-19

BMJ Open

Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-047025.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-May-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Pohontsch, Nadine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Schulze, Josefine; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Hoeflich, Charlotte; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Glassen, Katharina; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Breckner, Amanda; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Szecsenyi, Joachim; University Hospital Heidelberg, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research Lühmann, Dagmar; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care Scherer, Martin; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Department of General Practice and Primary Care
Primary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Keywords:	Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PRIMARY CARE, PUBLIC HEALTH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study with patients and their relatives
4
5

6 Pohontsch NJ*, Schulze J, Hoeflich C, Glassen K, Breckner A, Szecsenyi J, Lühmann D, Scherer M.
7
8

9 Corresponding author:
10
11

12 Nadine Janis Pohontsch, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical
13

14 Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistr. 52, 20246 Hamburg, Germany; n.pohontsch@uke.de, 0049
15

16 40 7410 55537, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0966-4087
17
18
19

20 Co-authors:
21
22

23 Josefine Schulze, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
24

25 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5727-9343
26
27

28 Charlotte Hoeflich, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
29

30 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
31
32

33 Katharina Glassen, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
34

35 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8892-8625
36
37

38 Amanda Breckner, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
39

40 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0777-5223
41
42

43 Joachim Szecsenyi, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg
44

45 University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4483-0028
46
47

48 Dagmar Lühmann, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
49

50 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7965-5007
51
52

53 Martin Scherer, Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center
54

55 Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany
56
57

58 Word count: 4.581
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Prevalence of people with multimorbidity rises. Multimorbidity constitutes a challenge to the health care system, and treatment of patients with multimorbidity is prone to high quality variations.

Currently, no set of quality indicators (QI) exists to assess quality of care, let alone incorporating the patient perspective. We therefore aim to identify aspects of quality of care relevant from the patients' perspective and match them to a literature-based set of QI.

Methods

We conducted eight focus groups with patients with multimorbidity and three focus groups with patients' relatives using a semi-structured guide. Data was analysed using Kuckartz's qualitative content analysis. We derived deductive categories from the literature, added inductive categories (new quality aspects) and translated them into QI.

Results

We created four new QI based on the quality aspects relevant to patients' relatives). Two QI (patient education/self-management, regular updates of medication plans) were consented by an expert panel, while two others were not (periodic check-ups, general practitioner coordinated care). Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not addressed in the focus groups.

Conclusion

We show that focus groups with patients and relatives add relevant aspects in QI development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a reasonable addition

1
2
3 to traditional QI development. Our QI set constitutes a framework for assessing the quality of care in
4
5 the German health care system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment standards and increase
6
7 the use of existing guidelines, hereby helping to reduce overuse, underuse, and misuse in the
8
9 treatment of patients with multimorbidity.
10
11
12

13 **German Clinical Trials Register: DRKS00015718, registration date: 15th of October 2018**
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

21
22

- 23 • affected patients and their relatives (who often function as informal caregiver) were
24 interviewed in the focus groups
- 25 • focus group participants from two differently structured regions in Germany representing a
26 wide spectrum of combinations of different diseases were queried
- 27 • focus groups with patients and their relatives (asking about positive and negative
28 experiences with care) seem to be an effective tool to identify quality aspects relevant for QI
29 development
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **INTRODUCTION**

45
46

47 Our society is aging and higher life expectancy is associated with higher rates of chronic diseases. Care
48 for patients with multimorbidity is likely to evolve into one of our most prominent challenges in the
49 future [1,2]. Multimorbidity is strongly linked to functional limitations, lower quality of life and increase
50 in health care utilization, costs and higher mortality [3,4]. Care for patients with multimorbidity is very
51 complex [5] and therefore prone to deficits in quality and major (unintended) interindividual
52 differences regarding the impact of illness and carer performance [6–9]. Multimorbidity creates many
53 challenges to general practitioners (GPs) and affected patients alike, e.g. (too) short consultation times,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 polypharmacy, increased health care utilization, high treatment burden and self-management
4 requirements as well as psychological distress [10,11]. Several decades of research and discussion have
5 provided us with suggestions for management approaches in primary care to better address the needs
6 of this patient group, inter alia, the Chronic Care Model [12,13] and the meta-algorithm [14] for
7 treating patients with multimorbidity.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Generic standards for high quality of care are hard to define due to the infinite number of possible
16 (combinations of) medical problems in patients with multimorbidity. Evidence-based standards
17 relevant to patients with multimorbidity are urgently needed, because single disease clinical guidelines
18 are for several reasons often inadequate for this patient population [10]. As long as the current state
19 of health care cannot be mapped systematically, for example by using a set of quality indicators (QI)
20 specific for multimorbidity, it remains impossible to compare the effects of interventions and health
21 care models to optimize quality or to identify sectors, regions or health care providers needing
22 improvement.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 In Germany, the first point of contact in the health care system for people who fall ill is usually a general
35 practitioner. GPs are usually licensed to provide care on the basis of contracts with the statutory health
36 insurance (SHI) and are member of the corresponding association of SHI doctors. The statutory health
37 insurance covers about 90% of Germany's residents and is complemented by a private health insurance
38 system. German GPs have usually completed five years of further training to be allowed to call
39 themselves specialists in general practice/primary care. Patients are free to consult any GP unless they
40 choose to enrol themselves in a GP contract ("Hausarztzentrierte Versorgung"). The contractually
41 defined GP-coordinated care further strengthens the role of the GPs as guides and coordinators for
42 the health care of their patients [15]. GPs refer patients to outpatient specialists or hospitals when
43 further or specialized care is needed. There are more than 100 different types of patient record
44 management software [16] and usually the patient records of different doctors are not linked, which
45 means that their communication and coordination often relies on (referral/discharge) letters and
46 patients' reports.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Taking the patients' perspective into consideration is even more relevant when dealing with patients
4 with multimorbidity. Every decision made concerning risks and benefits of treatments and
5 interventions has to be weighed against individual impairments, comorbidities and gain in subjective
6 quality of life [14]. Prioritization must take the whole range of biopsychosocial complexities into
7 account and follow principles of patient-centred clinical management and decision making. Views on
8 high quality health care often differ between patients and their health care providers [17,18]. For
9 example, quality of care seems to be higher when process or intermediate outcome indicators are
10 measured and lower when patient-reported experiences of care are reviewed [18]. Therefore patients
11 can [19] and must be involved in guideline and QI development [20–23]. Studies show that this is not
12 often the case [21] even though approaches to patient involvement in QI development, e.g. focus
13 groups, exist and are considered to be of high value [20].

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 The MULTIqual project aims at the development of a quality indicator set which can be used to
30 evaluate the current state of health care provided for patients with multimorbidity and to promote
31 the implementation of treatment standards for future care. We conducted focus groups with patients
32 with multimorbidity and their relatives to validate and amend a literature- and expert consensus-based
33 set of QI by qualitatively surveying their views on health care quality.

34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 METHODS

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The MULTIqual project is a multi-centre mixed-methods project comprising a systematic literature
review, focus groups, a two-stage expert consensus process and a quantitative survey with patients
with multimorbidity and general practitioners. Following the COREQ [24] this paper presents the
results of focus groups with patients with multimorbidity and their relatives conducted in Hamburg
and Heidelberg and of the expert consensus on the qualitatively derived QIs. The details of the
systematic literature review, expert panel, consensus process and quality indicator development
process are not directly relevant for the work presented here, but can support the understanding of

1
2
3 the whole project. A summary of the process can be found in suppl. File 1. An extensive description
4 will be presented elsewhere (manuscript in preparation).
5
6
7

8 9 Participant selection and recruitment

10
11 We randomly selected the GPs from the register of SHI-accredited doctors of the city districts or within
12 a radius of 25 km around the two study centers respectively. We invited the selected GPs to participate
13 in our study and informed them in detail about the project if they were interested. Participating GPs
14 were asked to recruit patients aged 65 and above with three or more chronic conditions that attended
15 the practice at least once in the last three months. Patients with multimorbidity willing to participate
16 were asked to invite close relatives to take part in the study as well. Exclusion criteria were insufficient
17 knowledge of the German language and inability to give informed consent. Patients received an
18 invitation containing study information, a response sheet and a reply envelope. Participants received
19 an allowance of 30€ plus a reimbursement of travel expenses. Participants gave written informed
20 consent for the focus groups to be recorded, transcribed and the data being published anonymously.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 Focus group guide

37
38
39 Guide development was based on the literature review (e.g., [25]) and the research questions outlined
40 above. As lay persons mostly relate to implicit experiential knowledge when defining quality criteria
41 (e.g., [26,27]), we chose to question our focus group participants about their own positive and negative
42 experiences with primary health care, changes in their health care needs and experiences due to
43 multimorbidity and their vision of ideal primary care for people like them (see suppl. file 2 for 'patients'
44 focus group guide'). With patients' relatives, the same topics were discussed in respect to the
45 associated patient with multimorbidity (see suppl. File 3 for 'relatives' focus group guide').
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 Data collection

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Either JS, CH, AB or KG had spoken to the participants on the phone, but had no other relationship with
4
5 them. In 12/2018 and 01/2019 we conducted eight focus groups with patients with multimorbidity
6
7 (city A =3, city B= 5) and three focus groups with patients' relatives (A=1, B=2) using the semi-
8
9 structured guides described above. Two moderators facilitated the focus groups (NJP, JS, KG, AB, CH
10
11 and TKI respectively) which lasted about two hours. Discussions were digitally recorded and
12
13 transcribed verbatim by a trained research assistant following designated transcription rules. Accuracy
14
15 of the transcripts was checked by the respective moderators. In order to protect the focus groups
16
17 participants' identity, names and other identifying details were changed during transcription.
18
19

20 21 22 Data analysis

23
24
25 Data were analysed using the qualitative content analysis approach described by Kuckartz [28],
26
27 following a realistic paradigm [29]. Coders (NJP, CH and JS) read all transcripts to familiarize with the
28
29 data. Transcripts were broken down into fragments adopting different sizes ranging from part of a
30
31 sentence to one or more paragraphs in relation to the segment length needed to understand the
32
33 content and context of the relevant accounts. We created deductive codes representing the aspects
34
35 of quality described in the literature-based QI set and selected by the expert panel and inductive codes
36
37 when new aspects of quality emerged from the data (see below). We then subjected all transcripts to
38
39 a second round of coding by a different coder. Coding was carried out with constant discussions
40
41 between the three coders about the coded text passages and assigned codes. To ensure intersubjective
42
43 reproducibility and comprehensibility [30], the results were presented to and discussed with the
44
45 interdisciplinary workgroup 'qualitative methods' and the co-authors DL (postdoctorate, MD) and MS
46
47 (professor, MD). Data was managed using MAXQDA 11 (Verbi GmbH).
48
49
50
51

52 53 Identification of additional patient relevant quality aspects and expert rating of deduced QI

54
55
56 We aimed to supplement the preliminary QI set extracted from a systematic literature review by QI
57
58 based on patient-relevant quality aspects derived from the focus group data. A multidisciplinary
59
60

1
2
3 research team (NJP, CH, KG, AB and JS) allocated subjectively important quality aspects from patients'
4 and their relatives' views to the preliminary set of QI based on the literature review and identified
5 important additional quality aspects where needed. Afterwards the research team transformed the
6 additionally identified quality aspects into QI (including description, numerator, denominator,
7 exclusion criteria etc.). These QI were presented by NP to an expert panel during an in-person meeting.
8
9 The expert panel consisted of representatives of primary care, nursing, practice management, quality
10 research methodology, social work, physical therapy, geriatrics, clinical pharmacology, social medicine
11 and patient representatives. The in-person meeting took place on 1st February 2019. During the
12 meeting NJP presented the focus group-material-based new QI to the expert panel. After a rating of
13 relevance, strength of evidence and their potential for undesirable effects, the expert panel voted for
14 keeping or rejecting the QI deduced from the focus group material via nominal group technique.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Patient and public involvement statement

30
31
32 Patients were involved in the recruitment of focus group participants (viz. their relatives). Patient
33 representatives and representatives of relevant fields (see above) were involved in the rating and
34 selection of QI. Apart from that there was no patient or public involvement in the study.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Researcher characteristics

41
42
43 Researchers' characteristics, beliefs and assumption influence qualitative research and data
44 interpretation. NJP (♀): post-doc psychologist, experienced qualitative researcher (patient
45 involvement in QI development, health care research focusing on general practice). JS (♀):
46 psychologist/junior scientist. CH (♀): medical student. AB (♀): junior scientist, M.A. Health Information
47 Management. DL (♀), KG (♀), JSz (♂), MS (♂): medical professionals, experienced post-doc researchers
48 in the field of general practice and QI development.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 RESULTS

Participants characteristics

We included 29 female and 18 male patients aged 65-84 years as well as three female and six male relatives (five spouses/four children) aged 49-78 years in five patient groups, and three relatives groups, respectively. Nine registered volunteers did not take part, with n = 3 due to acute health problems and n = 6 due to organizational difficulties.

Focus group-based additional quality aspects included into the QI set after the expert panel rating

Two focus-group based quality aspects were finally supported by the expert panel and included in the QI set.

Patient education / self-management

Patients consider it very helpful to be informed about their diseases and possible (self-) treatment and management strategies (for example, nutrition counselling). Daily disease management can be supported by specific information on self-management strategies, training in disease-related competencies (for example, measuring the INR value), addressing coping strategies and provision of knowledge for the patient.

"I took part in a course in [city] and have been monitoring my 'Quick' [prothrombin time] myself for over 20 years and I have a book and also keep a record. And I always took it with me to the hospitals and the doctors were amazed that they could see exactly how I did it and how I tested my 'Quick'. [...] And I always write it down and then I dose the medication myself. No, I am still grateful to the doctor for giving me the tip that I can do the course how to measure my 'Quick' on my own [...]."

(city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 162-166)

Regular updates of medication plan

1
2
3 Patients report to have been provided with medication plans and consider it very important for them
4
5 to be up-to-date especially when taking a high number of different medications or when medication is
6
7 prescribed by specialists. Some patients always have copies of their medication plan at hand in case of
8
9 an emergency and it would be considered helpful if this plan was accessible electronically on the health
10
11 insurance card.
12
13

14
15 *"This is also from the GP, right? It's a medication plan. So you know when to take it and so on. One*
16
17 *should know that. But also that you can show it, if someone asks: 'What are you taking?' Oh*
18
19 *god, yes, what am I taking? What's it called again? It just changed again, hasn't it? Well, I*
20
21 *know it, but it's also good for the other doctors if they have something printed and to be able*
22
23 *to see exactly what she needs, what she takes, how often and when [...]. So, it is very pleasant*
24
25 *when GPs do something like that. Gives you a certain amount of security."*
26
27

28
29 *(city A, patient focus group B, paragraph 251-253)*
30
31

32 Focus group-based additional quality aspects not included into the QI set after the expert panel rating
33

34
35 Two other indicators were not supported by the expert panel and not included in the final QI set.
36
37

38 39 *Regular check-ups*

40
41
42 Patients with chronic diseases see a need for regular check-ups as it would allow for early detection of
43
44 health deterioration and they know these procedures from the disease management programmes, e.g.
45
46 for diabetes or COPD. They value the regular contact with the GP at fixed appointments.
47
48
49

50
51 *"[...] if you take these medications regularly and then say: "We'll have a general check-up once*
52
53 *every two years" – I think that's not enough. I think it should be every year. The status should*
54
55 *be checked once in a while, if I'm taking these pills regularly."*
56

57 *(city A, patient focus group C, paragraph 97)*
58
59
60

General practitioner coordinated care

1
2
3 Patients appreciate the GPs to coordinate their care which involves for example writing referral letters
4
5 for specialist visits (and the GP receiving medical reports), having a network of specialists at hand,
6
7 planning preventive measures and keeping track of medications and their interactions and side effects.
8
9
10 Patients who describe their relationship with their GP as trusting, want all information on their health
11
12 care to converge at their GPs' practice.
13
14

15 *"[...] when the diagnoses are made and the GPs know what's going on, then they should actually act*
16
17 *as a control center and have the possibility to coordinate everything."*

18
19
20 *(city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 264)*
21
22

23 *"That's a given in our practice. He always wants to give you referrals because he wants to have*
24
25 *doctor's letters. Otherwise he says he doesn't have an overview. And I think that's very, very*
26
27 *good."*

28
29
30 *(city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 66)*
31
32

33 Literature-based quality aspects supported by focus groups

34
35
36
37 Table 1 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by both
38
39 focus groups and expert consensus and shows supporting quotes from the focus groups. Descriptions
40
41 of categories shown table 1 follow below.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Quality aspects identified in the literature and supported by focus groups and expert panel ratings

Patient-related factors	Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs	<p>“So for me, I would like to see myself not only as a body, or only as organs, but as a complex human being. That’s very important for me, [...] this union of body, mind and soul.” (<i>city B</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 70)</p> <p>“This is certainly an aspect that the doctors should [...] actually take a closer look at again: What is the situation at home? Does the person need support? Do we have to organize something?” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 91)</p>
	Involving partners, family and caregivers	<p>“Perhaps this could be discussed in a phone call with relatives, so that I am informed about the current situation, what is pending or how the medication maybe, yes, what I have to pay attention to as a caring relative and, as I said, if this is okay for my mother, as I know that she is not informed at all.” (<i>city B</i>, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 174)</p>
Physician-patient- interaction	Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals	<p>“A doctor's sole decision: (.) "Do this or that" - if the patient doesn't agree, it is pointless (...). He won't do it anyway. (...) And that's why I think that those issues really need to be discussed together. And determined together what is possible for the patient. Not everything is possible.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 468)</p> <p>“[...] we discussed it [...] at eye level in a VERY thorough conversation, so that we decided on the therapy regimen together, which I follow, and use take control of the disease.” (<i>city A</i>, patient focus group A, paragraph 21)</p>

bmjopen-2020-047925 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 17, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22</p>	<p>Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment</p>	<p>“It's important to me [...] that I get information in an [...] understandable way about what is going on with me and how this could be treated.” (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)</p> <p>“And then that in some cases he may explain the disease. Not the disease, but the measures, that's the way I wanted to put it. But then we come back to the time factor again. But in some cases, as I said, it is done this way. So that you get a little more time and get information about what is actually going on and what you can do about it. Or against it.” (city B, relatives' focus group B, paragraph 98)</p> <p>“But it's just that when I get pills and it says this and that and you don't even know what it's for. [...]” (city B, patient focus group C, paragraph 43)</p>
<p>23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40</p>	<p>Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions</p>	<p>“Especially in the case of multiple chronic diseases, I find it extremely important that the general practitioner explains to me that the drugs are compatible, that there is no interaction or that it is possible that they will cancel each other out or even worsen the condition, as in the case of my mother [...]” (city B, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 69)</p> <p>“I also consider close monitoring of drug effects and side effects important. Because there are side effects that one does not even register, which develop so insidiously. So it's a good thing that experts with their backgrounds check for possible side effects and say: “Watch this, something is happening to you, that doesn't fit in or it's a side effect”.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

		Because I only read the package insert when I really have something and suspect a side effect. I do not read them in advance. Because then you don't take the drug." (city A, relatives' focus group A, paragraph 357)
	Written treatment plan	"I packed a little something from my management. I don't know if you know anything like that, here is a blood sugar diary for people on insulin. This is from the diabetes clinic. It contains all my data, every record, both blood sugar levels and blood pressure and then the insulin dose. And I also check my weight and write it down here, so I always keep everything together. And I take this to my general practitioner as well as to the other doctors, for example to the eye specialist. And I think that's good." (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 167-168)
Context and Organizational Structures	Comprehensive care documentation	"I think [...] to keep an overview of the attending specialists is actually very important. Because [...] when I go to the eye specialist or ear, nose and throat specialist, and the GP doesn't even know this, and usually doesn't get a medical report from them either, then he is actually missing out [...] on important information. I could have glaucoma, or whatever. And he doesn't even know about it and he doesn't even know what kind of medication you might have to take. [...]" (city A, patient focus group A, paragraph 466)
	Training programmes addressing	"Whereby I have to say with my GP's joint practice, you can't complain. So there are two [employees], I think, they are still trained nurses. That's how long they've been at it. They are REALLY competent. And I'd say they already

bmjopen-2020-047025 on 15 June 2021. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on April 17, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

<p>management of patients with multimorbidity</p>	<p>of with</p>	<p>have a certain diagnostic instinct. They can tell when someone comes in with swollen eyes, whether it's just a flu-like infection or a real flu, that he should perhaps be isolated.” (city A, relative focus group A, paragraph 108)</p> <p>“Well, of course we have the problem that we have more and more elderly people who are sick, and have multiple diseases. And we have fewer and fewer GPs. So, I think it would be a very good care model if we had, for example, registered physicians who specialize in geriatrics. I think it would be a good care model if we had general medical training, with additional specialization, for example in mental health. I would prefer geriatrics and that these doctors with such training, who also have many, many or mostly older patients, are given more time. That perhaps, there are also these reference numbers, what they can charge. Because, we have to get there, because there are more and more elderly people, that they would get the possibility, the aspect of time and if it is only five minutes. Five minutes is a lot per patient. But that is of course an idle wish [...]” (city B, patient focus group A, paragraph 85)</p>
---	--------------------	---

Assessment of biopsychosocial support needs

Patients expressed a need for the GP to have a holistic view on the patient's health problems and needs. They underlined the importance of not only seeing and treating physical symptoms, but also the overall picture of medical and psychosocial aspects of the patient's situation. They consider it important for the GP to have at least basic information on the patient's background and personal history. Sometimes house calls can be necessary for a realistic judgement on biopsychosocial support needs for example for elderly people with beginning dementia.

Involving partners, family and caregivers

Relatives of people with multimorbidity often appreciate the GPs' willingness to communicate with them and support them in the process of giving care. Support and advice are often desperately needed by informal caregivers of persons with multimorbidity, especially if dementia is an issue. GP's awareness of informal caregivers' problems and concerns is important and could for example be addressed by offering consultation hours for relatives and other informal caregivers.

Shared decision-making and mutual agreement on treatment goals

Shared decision-making to find a customized treatment approach for individual patients is highly appreciated by the focus group participants. Communicating, informing and deciding on treatment regimens and goals on a par with the patient are seen as essential for increasing adherence and patient satisfaction. Patients value the freedom to set their own priorities and make decisions based on their values and preferences concerning their health and health care behaviour. They appreciate their GPs supporting them in this approach and the autonomy this respect gives them.

Information about medication and potential benefits and harms of treatment

Our focus group participants did not differentiate clearly between information and advice on their diagnosis, disease or condition and risks, medications (for example indication, dosage and interactions)

1
2
3 or non-pharmacological treatments and their benefits and potential side effects. They emphasize the
4 importance of detailed and comprehensible information on all these aspects. Either way, some stated
5 not to be interested in very detailed descriptions of potential risks and side effects. The amount of
6 information given must be tailored to the patient's needs even though these consultations might need
7 more time than usually budgeted.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 *Medication review and documentation of adverse drug reactions*

16
17
18 Medication reviews are highly acclaimed by the focus group participants. Patients and their relatives
19 wish for the GP to check for interactions regularly especially with medication prescribed by others and
20 over-the-counter (OTC) drugs. They expressed criticism of the high numbers of prescribed drugs and
21 low engagement of health professionals to actively inquire about drug-related problems and to search
22 for highly tolerable medications. Patients focus less on the thorough documentation of adverse drugs
23 reactions than on their monitoring and handling. They wish for the GP to detect signs of adverse effects
24 and monitor them for example through regular follow-ups.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 *Written treatment plan*

37
38
39 Focus group participants' recognize the value of written treatment schedules that include overviews
40 on scheduled health care appointments plus instructions, e.g., whether they have to appear with an
41 empty stomach for bloodwork. They emphasized the advantages of automated recalls systems.
42
43
44 Another focus was on recorded treatment protocols, e.g. keeping a blood pressure journal or a
45 diabetes log book containing measured values and other relevant parameters. Patients proposed using
46 digital solutions for facilitating care coordination between different providers.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 54 *Comprehensive care documentation*

55
56
57 The vast majority of the focus group participants consider comprehensive care documentation as a
58 vital part of high quality care, emphasizing importance of the exchange of information on diagnostic
59
60

1
2
3 testing or examination results and prescribed medication, giving the GP the opportunity to coordinate
4
5 care and consult the specialist about the patient's treatments. Patients report that the responsibility
6
7 for this exchange is often in the patients' hand, being the ones to take care of specialists' letters being
8
9 issued to the GP. Under the premise of data security, patients would support a digital exchange of
10
11 doctor's letters, but sometimes doubt the 'digital competencies' especially of the older generation of
12
13 physicians.
14
15

16 17 *Training programmes addressing management of patients with multimorbidity*

18
19
20
21 Patients put emphasis on the competencies of the practice team. For medical assistants this means for
22
23 example being experienced in taking blood samples or administering vaccinations or injectable
24
25 medications. Another aspect is the ability to triage patients according to the severity and urgency of
26
27 their treatment needs. GPs should engage in continuous medical education, be up-to-date on actual
28
29 research results and technological advances. Participants valued additional training in the field of
30
31 geriatrics or psychology and proposed regular supervision and peer consultation for complex problems
32
33 in multimorbid patients.
34
35

36 37 38 Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups

39
40
41 Table 2 gives an overview of quality aspects identified in the literature review and supported by the
42
43 expert panel but not accounted for in focus groups. As this paper focuses on the focus group result,
44
45 these quality aspects are described extensively elsewhere (manuscript in preparation).
46
47
48

49 **Table 2: Literature-based quality aspects not supported by focus groups**

50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	51 Patient-related factors	Screening for depression
	52	Proactive pain assessment
	53	Monitoring of pain management
	54	Addressing financial support needs
	55	Quality of life assessment

	Assessment of symptom burden
	Establishing patient preferences
Physician-patient-interaction	Identification of patients with multimorbidity
	Assessment of treatment burden
	Monitoring adherence to treatment
Context and Organizational Structures	Assigning responsibility for coordination of care

DISCUSSION

Main results

By asking patients with multimorbidity and their relatives in focus groups about their experiences with primary health care we were able to identify important quality aspects from their point of view and derived four new patient-relevant QI to date not represented in guidelines or the literature on quality of care in multimorbidity. Out of these, two QI concerning regular updates of written medication plans and patient education and fostering self-management were supported by the expert panel. On the other hand, regular check-ups and GP-coordinated care were not supported by the expert panel. Half of the literature-based QI, for example assessment of biopsychosocial support needs, establishing patient preferences and shared decision-making, were supported by participants' accounts, while more technical domains regarding assessment and treatment regimens were not covered in the focus groups.

Strength and limitations

To obtain a comprehensive picture of aspects of quality of care from the affected persons' point of view we asked not only patients with multimorbidity, but also their relatives (often informal caregivers)

1
2
3 in separate groups. Focus group participants were recruited in two very differently structured regions
4
5 of northern and southern Germany and represent a wide spectrum of combinations of different
6
7 diseases. We therefore assume that our results might be cautiously generalizable to patients with
8
9 multimorbidity in primary care all over Germany. However, the experiences reported by patients with
10
11 multimorbidity and their relatives in the focus groups may to some extent be specific to the German
12
13 healthcare system. In other countries, such as the UK, for example, medication reviews and the
14
15 provision of medication information are the responsibility of pharmacists. Our results should not be
16
17 transferred to other countries without cautious reflection, as the organisation of health care systems
18
19 and the implementation of (primary) care differ between Germany and other countries.
20
21
22

23
24 Reflecting and evaluating own experiences is dependent on representation of different perspectives,
25
26 lived experiences and group interaction, and must be fragmentary, as participants were lay persons
27
28 regarding health care (quality). Therefore, it did not seem feasible to ask the participants to propose
29
30 QI. Instead, we focussed on positive and negative experiences with primary care and derived patient-
31
32 relevant QI indirectly. As many accounts can be matched to QI derived from the literature and half of
33
34 the newly developed QI were supported by expert consensus this methodology seems to be plausible
35
36 and practicable.
37
38
39

40
41 Although the questions focussed on experiences regarding the related patients with multimorbidity,
42
43 the results from focus groups with relatives show that for some participants it was difficult to focus on
44
45 their role as (caregiving) relative. Many participants referred to their own health care experiences
46
47 being affected by multiple conditions themselves, which reflects the spectrum of issues and challenges
48
49 in the field as the prevalence of multimorbidity increases in older age [31].
50
51
52

53 Discussion of results and comparison with existing literature
54

55
56
57 The complexities of managing multimorbidity are widely known [10] and there is a growing amount of
58
59 literature on interventions for improving outcomes in patients with multimorbidity [11,32]. Different
60

1
2
3 approaches to tackle the challenges of caring for patients with multimorbidity were discussed, from
4 the Chronic Care Model [13], a systematic collection and review of interventions [32] and quality
5 standards [33] to a German meta-algorithm [14], but a quality indicator set involving the perspective
6 of affected patients and their (potential) informal caregivers is still missing.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Since 2016, patients enrolled in statutory health insurance in Germany have a right to be provided with
14 a recorded medication plan if they are prescribed at least three different long-term medications, which
15 is very much appreciated by persons with multimorbidity in our study and elsewhere [34]. If patients
16 consent, these data can be saved to the electronic health card or record to allow for a standardized
17 digital exchange of this information of these data between providers [35,36]. Despite preferring a
18 written medication plan and stating the problem of insufficient communication between prescribing
19 physicians, participants of our focus groups judged this incorporation ambivalently as they saw
20 problems concerning data safety and confidentiality [37] as well as (older) GPs digital literacy.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Patients' with multimorbidity wish for patient education, fostering of self-management and periodic
33 check-ups might arise from their experiences with patient education and regular control of, e.g., blood
34 values, respiratory function and blood pressure during the structured disease management
35 programmes (DMP, e.g., [38]) that many patients with diabetes, COPD or heart failure take part in.
36 DMP for single diseases and lone-standing self-management interventions for patients with
37 multimorbidity have shown to be helpful (e.g., [39,40]), which supports the patient-education QI (see
38 also [19]). While a recent systematic review supports the importance of monitoring treatment effects
39 and clinical parameters [11], this is no plea for generalised periodic check-ups without a definite
40 indication.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The proposition of a GP-coordinated care was not supported by the expert panel as this care model is
53 not yet sufficiently embedded within routine care in Germany [41], although §73 SGB V [42] makes
54 way for general practitioner-centred primary care (coordination) since 2003, which is also highlighted
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the policy paper of the German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians from 2012
4
5 [43].
6
7

8
9 Literature-based QI validated by the focus group focus mostly on aspects that address interpersonal
10
11 communication, holistic treatment approaches and processes that allow patients to make their own
12
13 choices based on comprehensive information. This aligns our findings with the wide scientific
14
15 consensus that the treatment of patients with multimorbidity should be informed by a patient-centred
16
17 approach [19,44–46]. The majority of the quality statements proposed by National Institute for Health
18
19 and Care Excellence (NICE [33]) align with the indicators resulting from our study (e.g., “assessing
20
21 values, priorities and goals”, “care coordination” and “reviewing medicines and other treatments”). All
22
23 measurement frameworks seem to have one thing in common: taking shared-decision making into
24
25 account as central aspect of patient-centred care [47].
26
27
28

29
30 An explanation for the lack of support for the QI dealing with screening and assessment issues in the
31
32 focus groups might be due to the participants’ perspective as individuals and end users of care
33
34 structures and processes. Qualitative methods are mostly able to elicit patients’ personal experiences
35
36 with and views on health care (processes) and laypersons are seldom confronted with meta-level
37
38 issues directed at groups of patients and not individual patients.
39
40
41

42
43 Other projects aiming at the development of quality frameworks in multimorbidity predominantly
44
45 focussed on outcome measurement [48–50]. Scientific evidence on generic health outcome measures
46
47 to assess quality of care for patients with multimorbidity is still lacking. In the light of patients’ with
48
49 multimorbidity individual goals and priorities it proves difficult to define outcome indicators suitable
50
51 for all. Keeping that in mind, our QI set addressing mainly care processes and covering a broad range
52
53 of care domains is evidence-based and seems to be very adequate for the evaluation of quality of care
54
55 for patients with multimorbidity.
56
57

58
59 Future research
60

1
2
3 Primary care patients (≥ 65 years) and their GPs will be questioned using standardized patient reported
4 outcome measures (related to the identified QI) and other instruments (measuring behaviour
5 described in the identified QI) to study validity and applicability of the developed set of QI. The definite
6 set of QI will be determined based on the study results.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 Practical implications

14
15
16 The QI set finally developed in the MULTiqual-study can be used as a framework for assessing the
17 quality of care in the German health care system. It will facilitate implementation of treatment
18 standards, increase the use of existing guidelines [14,51] and help to reduce over-, under- and misuse
19 of healthcare resources. The QI set will serve as a reference framework for future evaluations of
20 complex interventions and care models for patients with multimorbidity.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 CONCLUSION

30
31
32 Our study has demonstrated that focus groups with patients and their relatives add important aspects
33 in QI development, should be incorporated by default in QI development processes and constitute a
34 reasonable addition to traditional QI development [19,20]. Future challenges lie in the adoption of
35 these quality criteria as practical and valid standardized measures and their implementation in primary
36 care.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Author contributions

49 MS, DL, JSz: Acquisition of funding for and conception, design and supervision of the study. AB, KG, NP,
50 JSc: moderation of focus groups. AB, KG, CH, NP and JSc: data analysis and interpretation. NP: drafting
51 of the manuscript. AB, KG, CH, DL, JSc, JSz, MS: critical revision of former versions and final approval
52 of the manuscript.
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 Acknowledgements

1
2
3 We would like to thank all patients and their relatives for their time and effort invested in participating
4
5 in the focus groups, the experts for participating in the expert panel, Tabea Eissing for her contributions
6
7 in the development of the focus group guides and Thomas Kloppe for co-moderating one of the focus
8
9 groups.
10

11 **Data availability statement**

12
13
14 The data generated and analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due study's
15
16 assurances to participants that the full raw focus group data would not be shared publicly, and that all
17
18 attempts would be made to maintain confidentiality. We named the people who are responsible for
19
20 data analysis to the focus group participants in the written consent and they did not agree to the
21
22 sharing of the full raw data.
23
24

25 **Funding**

26
27 This work was supported by the Innovation Fund of the Federal Joint Committee (G-BA; grant no.
28
29 01VSF16058). The funding body had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to
30
31 publish or preparation of the manuscript.
32
33

34 **Competing Interests**

35
36 None declared.
37
38

39 **Ethics Approval**

40
41 Ethics approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Hamburg Medical Association, (10th
42
43 September 2018, PV5846), from the Clinical Ethics Committee Heidelberg (19th December 2018, S-
44
45 665/2018), and the Medical Association of Baden-Wuerttemberg (13th November, B-F-2018-096).
46
47

48 **Consent to participate**

49
50 Participants gave written informed consent to participate in the study and for the focus groups to be
51
52 recorded, transcribed and the data being published anonymously.
53
54

55 **Consent for publication**

56
57 Not applicable.
58
59

60 **References**

- 1 Advisory Council on the Assessment of Developments in the Health Care System [Sachverständigenrat zur Begutachtung der Entwicklung im Gesundheitswesen]. Special Report 2009. Coordination and Integration - Health Care in an Aging Society. [Sondergutachten 2009. Koordination und Integration - Gesundheitsversorgung in einer Gesellschaft des längeren Lebens.] https://www.svr-gesundheit.de/fileadmin/Gutachten/Sondergutachten_2009/Kurzfassung_engl_2009.pdf (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
- 2 Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, et al. Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing Res Rev* 2011;10:430–9. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2011.03.003
- 3 France EF, Wyke S, Gunn JM, et al. Multimorbidity in primary care: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:e297-307. doi:10.3399/bjgp12X636146
- 4 Gijzen R, Hoeymans N, Schellevis FG, et al. Causes and consequences of comorbidity: a review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001;54:661–74. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(00)00363-2
- 5 Clyne B, Cooper JA, Hughes CM, et al. “Potentially inappropriate or specifically appropriate?” Qualitative evaluation of general practitioners views on prescribing, polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate prescribing in older people. *BMC Fam Pract* 2016;17:109. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0507-y
- 6 Koller D, Schön G, Schäfer I, et al. Multimorbidity and long-term care dependency--a five-year follow-up. *BMC Geriatr* 2014;14:70. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-14-70
- 7 van den Bussche H, Kaduszkiewicz H, Schäfer I, et al. Overutilization of ambulatory medical care in the elderly German population?--An empirical study based on national insurance claims data and a review of foreign studies. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:129. doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1357-y
- 8 Jin H, Tang C, Wei Q, et al. Age-related differences in factors associated with the underuse of recommended medications in acute coronary syndrome patients at least one year after hospital discharge. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord* 2014;14:127. doi:10.1186/1471-2261-14-127
- 9 Sönnichsen A, Trampisch US, Rieckert A, et al. Polypharmacy in chronic diseases-Reduction of Inappropriate Medication and Adverse drug events in older populations by electronic Decision Support (PRIMA-eDS): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2016;17:57. doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1177-8
- 10 Wallace E, Salisbury C, Guthrie B, et al. Managing patients with multimorbidity in primary care. *BMJ* 2015;350:h176. doi:10.1136/bmj.h176
- 11 Muth C, Blom JW, Smith SM, et al. Evidence supporting the best clinical management of patients with multimorbidity and polypharmacy: a systematic guideline review and expert consensus. *J Intern Med* 2019;285:272–88. doi:10.1111/joim.12842
- 12 Bodenheimer T. Improving Primary Care for Patients With Chronic Illness. *JAMA* 2002;288:1775. doi:10.1001/jama.288.14.1775
- 13 Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH, Grumbach K. Improving Primary Care for Patients With Chronic Illness: The Chronic Care Model, Part 2. *JAMA* 2002;288:1909. doi:10.1001/jama.288.15.1909

- 1
2
3 14 German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians [DEGAM]. Guideline
4 Multimorbidity [Leitlinie Multimorbidität]. <http://www.degam.de/degam-leitlinien-379.html>.
5 (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
6
- 7
8 15 Federal Ministry of Health [Bundesministerium für Gesundheit].
9 [https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf)
10 [/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/5_Publikationen/Gesundheit/Broschueren/200629_BMG_Das_deutsche_Gesundheitssystem_EN.pdf) (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
11
- 12 16 National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians [Kassenärztliche
13 Bundesvereinigung]. https://www.kbv.de/media/sp/Gesamt_Systeme_Installationen.pdf
14 (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
15
- 16 17 Herzberg H, Bernateck K, Welti F, et al. Patient Participation in Development of Quality Indicators
17 using the Example of National Disease Management Guidelines for Chronic Heart Failure – A
18 Qualitative Analysis of Collective Perspectives [Patientenbeteiligung bei der Entwicklung von
19 Qualitätsindikatoren am Beispiel der Nationalen VersorgungsLeitlinie Chronische Herzinsuffizienz
20 – Eine qualitative Analyse kollektiver Sichtweisen]. *Gesundheitswesen* 2016;78:373–7.
21 doi:10.1055/s-0035-1548880
22
- 23 18 Valderas JM, Gangannagripalli J, Nolte E, et al. Quality of care assessment for people with
24 multimorbidity. *J Intern Med* 2019; 285: 289-300. doi:10.1111/joim.12881
25
- 26 19 Pohontsch NJ, Herzberg H, Joos S, et al. The professional perspective on patient involvement in
27 the development of quality indicators: a qualitative analysis using the example of chronic heart
28 failure in the German health care setting. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2015;9:151–9.
29 doi:10.2147/PPA.S74064
30
- 31 20 Kötter T, Schaefer FA, Scherer M, et al. Involving patients in quality indicator development - a
32 systematic review. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2013;7:259–68. doi:10.2147/PPA.S39803
33
- 34 21 Kötter T, Blozik E, Scherer M. Methods for the guideline-based development of quality
35 indicators--a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:21. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-21
36
- 37 22 Campbell SM, Shield T, Rogers A, et al. How do stakeholder groups vary in a Delphi technique
38 about primary mental health care and what factors influence their ratings? *Qual Saf Health Care*
39 2004;13:428–34. doi:10.1136/qhc.13.6.428
40
- 41 23 Baudendistel I, Noest S, Peters-Klimm F, et al. Bridging the gap between patient needs and
42 quality indicators: a qualitative study with chronic heart failure patients. *Patient Prefer*
43 *Adherence* 2015;9:1397–405. doi:10.2147/PPA.S83850
44
- 45 24 Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a
46 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007;19:349–57.
47 doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
48
- 49 25 Sofaer S, Firminger K. Patient perceptions of the quality of health services. *Annu Rev Public*
50 *Health* 2005;26:513–59. doi:10.1146/annurev.publhealth.25.050503.153958
51
- 52 26 Bahadori M, Yaghoubi M, Haghgoshye E, et al. Patients' and physicians' perspectives and
53 experiences on the quality of medical consultations: a qualitative study. *JBIM Evid Implement*
54 2020;18:247–255. doi:10.1097/XEB.0000000000000210
55
- 56 27 Pohl H. Evaluating quality in endoscopy. *Endoscopy* 2017; 49:581-587. doi:10.1055/s-0043-
57 104380
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 28 Kuckartz U. Qualitative Content Analysis [Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse]. 1st ed. Beltz Juventa 2012.
4
5 29 Potter J, Wetherell M. Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.
6 London: Sage 1987.
7
8 30 Steinke I. Quality Criteria in Qualitative Research. In: Flick U, von Kardorff E, Steinke I, eds. A
9 Companion to Qualitative Research. London: Sage 2004. 184–90.
10
11 31 Polenick CA, Leggett AN, Webster NJ, et al. Multiple Chronic Conditions in Spousal Caregivers of
12 Older Adults With Functional Disability: Associations With Caregiving Difficulties and Gains. *J*
13 *Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2020;75:160–72. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbx118
14
15 32 Smith SM, Wallace E, O’Dowd T, et al. Interventions for improving outcomes in patients with
16 multimorbidity in primary care and community settings. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;2016.
17 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006560.pub3
18
19 33 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Multimorbidity quality standard.
20 2017. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs153>. (accessed 13 Apr 2021).
21
22 34 Botermann L, Krueger K, Eickhoff C, et al. Patients’ handling of a standardized medication plan: a
23 pilot study and method development. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2016;10:621–30.
24 doi:10.2147/PPA.S96431
25
26 35 Klein S, Schellhammer S. Medication Infrastructure Development in Germany. In: Aanstad M,
27 Grisot M, Hanseth O, et al., eds. Information Infrastructures within European Health Care. Cham:
28 Springer 2017.
29
30 36 National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians [Kassenärztliche
31 Bundesvereinigung]. Medication plan [Medikationsplan].
32 <https://www.kbv.de/html/medikationsplan.php> (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
33
34 37 Dietzel GTW. From eEurope 2002 to the electronic health card: Chances for the Health Care
35 System [Von eEurope 2002 zur elektronischen Gesundheitskarte: Chancen für das
36 Gesundheitswesen]. *Dtsch Arztebl* 2002; 99: A 1417–1419
37
38 38 Fuchs S, Henschke C, Blümel M, et al. Disease Management Programs for Type 2 Diabetes in
39 Germany: A Systematic Literature Review Evaluating Effectiveness. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*
40 2014;111:453–63. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2014.0453
41
42 39 Mehring M, Donnachie E, Fexer J, et al. Disease Management Programs for Patients With COPD
43 in Germany: A Longitudinal Evaluation of Routinely Collected Patient Records. *Respir Care*
44 2014;59:1123–32. doi:10.4187/respcare.02748
45
46 40 Contant É, Loignon C, Bouhali T, et al. A multidisciplinary self-management intervention among
47 patients with multimorbidity and the impact of socioeconomic factors on results. *BMC Fam Pract*
48 2019;20:53. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0943-6
49
50 41 Lübeck R, Beyer M, Gerlach F. Rationale und Stand der hausarztzentrierten Versorgung in
51 Deutschland [Rationale and dissemination of “GP centered health care” (“HzV”) in Germany].
52 *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz* 2015;58:360–6.
53 doi:10.1007/s00103-015-2118-5
54
55 42 SGB V Gesetzliche Krankenversicherung - SGB V Sozialgesetzbuch.
56 <https://www.sozialgesetzbuch-sgb.de/sgbv/1.html> (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 43 German College of General Practitioners and Family Physicians [DEGAM]. General Practice —
4 Focused on the Whole Person [Allgemeinmedizin —spezialisiert auf den ganzen Menschen].
5 2012 .[http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/ Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-](http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf)
6 [Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf](http://www.degam.de/files/Inhalte/Degam-Inhalte/Ueber_uns/Positionspapiere/DEGAM-Position_Paper_on_the_Future.pdf). (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
7
8
9 44 Boyd CM, Lucas GM. Patient-centered care for people living with multimorbidity. *Curr Opin HIV*
10 *AIDS* 2014;9:419–27. doi:10.1097/COH.000000000000073
11
12 45 Schattner A, Bronstein A, Jellin N. Information and shared decision-making are top patients'
13 priorities. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:21. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-6-21
14
15 46 Kvåle K, Bondevik M. What is important for patient centred care? A qualitative study about the
16 perceptions of patients with cancer. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2008;22:582–9. doi:10.1111/j.1471-
17 6712.2007.00579.x
18
19 47 Godolphin W. Shared decision-making. *Healthc Q Tor Ont* 2009;12 Spec No Patient:e186-190.
20 doi:10.12927/hcq.2009.20947
21
22 48 Working Group on Health Outcomes for Older Persons with Multiple Chronic Conditions.
23 Universal health outcome measures for older persons with multiple chronic conditions. *J Am*
24 *Geriatr Soc* 2012;60:2333–41. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.04240.x
25
26 49 National Quality Forum (NQF). Multiple chronic conditions measurement framework.
27 [https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Re](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx)
28 [port.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2012/05/MCC_Measurement_Framework_Final_Report.aspx). (accessed 13 Apr 2021)
29
30 50 Akpan A, Roberts C, Bandeen-Roche K, et al. Standard set of health outcome measures for older
31 persons. *BMC Geriatr* 2018;18:36. doi:10.1186/s12877-017-0701-3
32
33 51 Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, et al. Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline
34 dissemination and implementation strategies. *Health Technol Assess Winch Engl* 2004;8:iii–iv, 1-
35 72.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Appendix to:** Pohontsch et al. Quality of care for people with multimorbidity: A focus group study
4
5 with patients and their relatives. BMJ Open 2021
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Literature review and rating/consensus process** 12

13
14 Prior to the focus groups a systematic literature search was conducted in different electronic
15 databases. References of relevant articles were reviewed to identify missed relevant publications.
16
17 Recommendations for clinical management of patients with multimorbidity were extracted and
18 translated to quality indicator candidates. After an online rating of relevance, strength of evidence
19 and their potential for undesirable effects, the interdisciplinary expert panel voted for keeping or
20 rejecting the potential QI via nominal group technique.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Guideline for Focus Groups with Patients

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care“

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we discuss your experiences, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and your chronic diseases.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: What has changed for you in your primary care compared to the past, since you no longer have only one, but three or more chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experience with primary care

I would like to ask you to tell us about your positive experiences with primary care.

2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far with your GP where you felt particularly well taken care of? Please think of your experiences as a patient with multiple chronic diseases at the same time.

2.1.2 What expectations do you have for your GP and his team?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

2.2.1 What experiences with your family doctor have you had so far where you felt that you were not well taken care of? What happened? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.

2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision for primary care

3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?

3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases looks like or should like.

3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like for someone like you?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects which you have given 4 points are so important to you.

For peer review only

Guideline for Focus Groups with Relatives

„Experiences of people with three or more chronic conditions and their relatives with primary care “

1. Entry: introduction round

Before we talk about your experience, I would like to do a small round of introductions.

1.1 Please introduce yourself briefly one by one. Please state your name, age and the chronic illnesses that affect your relative.

1.2 Please also briefly describe your relationship with your relative, who has multiple chronic conditions, and the extent to which you are involved in their care.

2. Experiences

Introductory question: In your opinion and your experience, what has changed in primary care compared to the past since your relative no longer has not only one but multiple chronic diseases?

2.1 Positive experiences with family doctor care

Now I would like to ask you to tell us about your good experiences with the family medical care of your relative, who is affected by several chronic diseases.

2.1.1 What experiences have you had so far where you would say that the GP was taking particularly good care of your relative?

2.1.2 What expectations/wishes do you have for the medical care of your relative who is affected by multiple chronic diseases?

2.2 Negative experiences with primary care

2.2.1 What experiences with medical care have you had where you would say that you and your relative was not well taken care of? Please also give reasons for your negative evaluation.

2.2.2 What would you have wished for in connection with this negative experience?

3. Vision of optimal primary care

3.1 If you pause for a moment and think about the situation of people with multiple chronic diseases in general: Which problems do you think exist in the primary care of people with several chronic diseases?

3.2 Please tell us what good primary care for patients with multiple chronic diseases and their relatives looks like or should like.

3.3 Imagine if **you** could design primary care for people with three or more chronic diseases yourself. What would ideal primary care look like? What would you wish for as a family member?

4. Conclusion of the discussion

Now we have come to the end of the first part of the discussion. We have talked about many things. Is there anything that we have not yet addressed, but that is still important to you and that you would like to add?

Break

5. Prioritization

During the break we have collected the aspects you find important for the primary care of people with multiple chronic diseases. Now we would like to ask you to evaluate these aspects and to give 1 to 4 points depending on their importance: 4= very important, 3= rather important, 2 = rather not important, 1= not important.

Now we would like you to explain why those aspects you have given 4 points are so important to you.

COREQ

1 “Quality of care for people with multimorbidity – A focus group study with patients and their relatives”

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No. (Comment)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	p. 7
Credentials	2	What were the researcher’s credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	p. 8
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	p. 8
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	p. 8
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	p. 8
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	p. 6
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Researchers introduced themselves and the study at the beginning of the focus group meetings.
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	p. 8
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	p. 7
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	p. 6
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	p. 6
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	p. 9
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	p. 9
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	in the department’s meeting room
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	Trained research assistant taking notes
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	p. 6/9
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	See suppl. files 1+2

Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	No, not applicable
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	p. 7
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	No, not applicable
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Approx. 120-135 minutes
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	No, because theoretical saturation is a concept originally developed within Grounded Theory. Later, it was termed data/thematic saturation for other qualitative methods. While the concept of saturation has helpfully been translated for other qualitative approaches it is not appropriate to impose it on all instances, for example conversation analysis and qualitative content analysis (using purposive, not theoretical sampling).
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. We did not return the transcripts to the focus group participants as this does not seem to be the usual procedure in studies using focus groups and qualitative content analysis and would have meant an unduly demand from the patients.
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	p. 7
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	p. 9-19
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	p. 7
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	p. 7
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	No. In health services research, where the data collection is an one-off exercise, participant checking might be more trouble than it is worth, especially in respect to the expenditure of the participants time. We therefore choose to ensure intersubjective reproducibility and comprehensibility by discussing the results with an interdisciplinary workgroup for qualitative methods.
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	p. 9-19 and table 1
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes, we think that data and findings presented are consistent, but also think that it is the readers'/reviewers' right/duty to judge about that.
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	p. 9-19
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	p. 9-19