

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

Primary Care Physician Involvement During Hospitalization: a Qualitative Analysis of Perspectives from Frequently Hospitalized Patients

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-053784
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-May-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Rieger, Erin; University of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine Kushner, Josef; Lenox Hill Hospital, Department of Medicine Sriram, Veena; The University of British Columbia, School of Population and Public Health Klein, Abbie; University of Chicago Department of Medicine Wiklund, Lauren; Michigan State University, Department of Psychology Meltzer, David; University of Chicago Department of Medicine Tang, Joyce; University of Chicago Department of Medicine
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PRIMARY CARE, INTERNAL MEDICINE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

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 Primary Care Physician Involvement During Hospitalization: a Qualitative Analysis of
4
5 Perspectives from Frequently Hospitalized Patients
6
7
8

9 Erin Y. Rieger,¹ Josef N.S. Kushner,² Veena Sriram,³ Abbie Klein,⁴ Lauren O. Wiklund,⁵ David
10
11 O. Meltzer,⁴ Joyce W. Tang^{4*}
12
13

14 ¹Pritzker School of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA
15

16 ²Department of Medicine, Lenox Hill Hospital, New York City, New York, USA
17

18 ³School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British
19
20 Columbia, Canada
21
22

23 ⁴Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA
24

25 ⁵Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA
26
27

28 *Corresponding author at University of Chicago, 5841 South Maryland Avenue, MC 5000,
29
30 Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA; Email address: jtang@bsd.uchicago.edu
31
32

33
34 Manuscript word count: 3,999/4,000
35
36

37
38 Abstract word count: 238/300
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and preferences related to primary care physician (PCP) involvement during hospitalization across two care models.

Design: Qualitative study embedded within a randomized controlled trial. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients. Transcripts were analyzed using qualitative template analysis.

Setting: In the Comprehensive Care Program (CCP) Study, in Illinois, USA, Medicare patients at increased risk of hospitalization are randomly assigned to: 1) care by a comprehensive care program physician who serves as a primary care physician (PCP) across both inpatient and outpatient settings; or 2) care by a PCP as outpatient and by hospitalists as inpatients (standard care).

Participants: Twelve standard care and 12 CCP patients were interviewed.

Results: Themes included: 1. Positive attitude towards PCP; 2. Longitudinal continuity with PCP valued; 3. Patient preference for PCP involvement in hospital care; 4. Patient experience of interaction with PCP during hospitalization (rare in standard care; in CCP, frequent interaction with PCP fostered patient involvement in decision making); 5. Patient experience of PCP interaction with hospital-based providers (no interaction for standard care patients; CCP patients emphasizing PCP's role in interdisciplinary coordination).

1
2
3 **Conclusion:** Frequently hospitalized patients value PCP involvement in the hospital setting.
4
5 CCP patients highlighted how an established relationship with their PCP improved inter-
6
7 disciplinary coordination and engagement with decision-making. Inpatient-outpatient
8
9 relational continuity may be an important component of programs for frequently
10
11 hospitalized patients. Opportunities for enhancing PCP involvement during hospitalization
12
13 should be considered.
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

Article summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study provided a unique context within a RCT with one group of patients cared for by hospitalists and one group cared for by their PCP during hospitalization
- This study's qualitative approach allowed for a rich exploration of patients' experiences and preferences related to PCP involvement in hospitalization
- Self-selection bias is a possible limitation - patients recruited for the embedded qualitative study may have been a healthier and more engaged group than the overall study population
- This study was conducted at an academic medical center; experiences of the standard care group reflect the context of receiving care from trainees

INTRODUCTION

Before the mid-1990s, primary care physicians (PCPs) in the United States (U.S.) typically oversaw care for their own patients when they were hospitalized. Since that time, the number of hospitalists has significantly increased within the U.S.[1] This shift in care delivery model was motivated by perceptions about increased hospitalist efficiency, availability, specialized expertise, and possible cost and mortality reductions.[1, 2] Despite such advantages, the hospitalist model may increase fragmentation between inpatient and outpatient care, particularly for patients who are frequently hospitalized.[1] Previous studies found that hospitalized patients frequently had limited knowledge about their diagnosis, care plan, or post-discharge instructions.[3–5] Other studies identified discrepancies between hospitalized patients and their inpatient physicians in perceived goals of care,[6] and limited opportunities for shared decision-making.[3, 7, 8] A possible contributing factor to these communication barriers is lack of an established relationship between hospitalized patients and their inpatient physicians. In comparison, PCPs with whom patients have ongoing relationships often have intimate knowledge of patients' preferred communication style, values, family context, and care preferences, but infrequently communicate directly with patients during hospitalization.[9–11] Communication between PCPs and inpatient providers during hospitalization may also be limited in frequency and scope.[12, 13]

Particularly for patients with complex needs, PCP involvement during hospitalization may greatly impact patient experience due to their familiarity with their patients' complex health history and established relationship with patients. However, few studies directly

1
2
3 compare the hospitalization experiences of patients cared for by their PCP versus by
4 hospitalists. These are limited to quantitative comparisons related to satisfaction.[14, 15]
5
6
7
8 There is a need for qualitative patient perspectives on the role of a PCP in the hospital
9
10 setting.

11
12
13 We conducted a qualitative study of frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and
14 preferences related to PCP involvement during hospitalization. This qualitative study was
15 embedded within a larger randomized controlled trial, the Comprehensive Care Program
16 (CCP) Study. Patients at increased risk of hospitalization are randomly assigned to one of 2
17
18 care models: 1) a CCP physician who serves as both the outpatient PCP and hospital
19 attending (intervention arm) or 2) outpatient care from a PCP and hospital care from
20 hospitalists (standard care).[16] This study context provides a unique opportunity to
21 explore and compare the experiences and preferences surrounding PCP involvement
22 during hospitalization between patients cared for by hospitalists as compared with a
23 patient's own PCP.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **METHODS**

39 **Setting**

40
41
42 The CCP study at the University of Chicago Medicine (UCM) is a randomized controlled trial
43 assessing the effect of an interdisciplinary care team for patients at high risk of
44 hospitalization. The overall CCP study recruited Medicare Part A and B enrollees with at
45 least one hospitalization at UCM within the previous twelve months. Patients randomized
46
47 to the intervention group were cared for by PCPs with limited panels of approximately 200
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patients to enable them to care for their patients as the primary attending in both inpatient
4 and outpatient settings. As outpatients, the patients also receive care from a social worker,
5
6 two nurses, and a clinic coordinator. Patients randomized to the control group received
7
8 “standard of care,” which included following with their prior PCP (or were offered
9
10 assistance in obtaining one if they did not have one) and being treated by hospitalist
11
12 physicians if admitted to UCM.[16]
13
14
15
16
17

18 The broader CCP study compares clinical outcomes, health care costs, and experiences of
19
20 patients in CCP versus standard care.[16] This embedded study used qualitative interviews
21
22 with a subset of both CCP and standard care patients to better understand and compare
23
24 patients’ experiences and preferences surrounding the role of their PCP during
25
26 hospitalization.
27
28
29
30

31 **Participant selection**

32
33
34 The participants for the embedded qualitative study were drawn from the broader CCP
35
36 study. Additional inclusion criteria included, participation in the CCP study for at least one
37
38 year, and having at least three hospitalizations within the previous twelve months (based
39
40 on self-report during quarterly phone surveys), with the most recent hospitalization
41
42 occurring at UCM. For intervention group patients, medical records were screened to
43
44 confirm that their assigned CCP physician served as their primary attending during the
45
46 most recent hospitalization. Patients were recruited by a research assistant or medical
47
48 student in-person or by phone between July 2017 and August 2018. Recruitment continued
49
50 until data saturation was reached.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Development of interview guide

The semi-structured interview guide was developed by an interdisciplinary team including a CCP physician (JT), a medical student without ties to CCP (JK), a CCP social worker (NG), and a research assistant without ties to CCP (JH). Two members of the team (JT, JH) had prior experience in qualitative research methods. The interview guide was further modified after review by three patients in the intervention arm of the CCP study. The final interview guide (Appendix A) focused on patients' care experiences during and after their most recent hospitalization at UCM, with an emphasis on: 1) communication with physicians and nurses in the hospital setting, particularly surrounding goals of the hospitalization and decision-making; 2) post-discharge care; and 3) relationship with their PCP and their PCP's role during hospitalization.

Data collection

Semi-structured interviews, approximately 30 minutes in length, were conducted in-person at UCM by a medical student and a research assistant, neither with ties to CCP (JK or AK). Patients provided verbal consent for the interview and received a \$30 gift card for participation. Patient characteristics including sex, age, and healthcare utilization were collected from the medical record. This study received approval from the University of Chicago Institutional Review Board (IRB12-1440).

Data analysis

The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by the research team; identifiable personal data were redacted. The interview transcripts were analyzed using template

1
2
3 analysis, a methodology developed by Crabtree & Miller.[17] Template analysis was
4
5 selected as a systematic yet flexible methodology that lends itself to analysis across the two
6
7 groups of subjects. The qualitative analysis team (JT, ER, JK) was composed of one CCP
8
9 physician and two medical students. The three team members separately reviewed five
10
11 interview transcripts (3 control group; 2 CCP group) and engaged in discussions to develop
12
13 a preliminary “template” (coding guide), a hierarchical organization of the identified
14
15 themes.[18] Through an iterative process, additional codes were added to the template as
16
17 they arose from the five sample transcripts. The three team members then applied the
18
19 initial template to code the transcripts using NVivo 11 (QRS International) software. Two
20
21 coders reviewed each of the twenty-four transcripts. During analysis, the team met weekly
22
23 to resolve discrepancies in coding through discussion, and to revise the template. After the
24
25 template was finalized, themes were developed through repeated review of codes and
26
27 discussion. These themes were described, and representative quotes were selected and
28
29 agreed upon by the entire research team. The qualitative analysis team practiced reflexivity
30
31 through open communication about their preconceptions and how their roles in patient
32
33 care relate to their perspective.[19]
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Patient and public involvement**

42
43
44
45 Three CCP patients provided feedback on the interview guide during development. As a check on
46
47 the validity of the analysis, results were reviewed and discussed with the CCP study patient
48
49 and community advisory board and with CCP physicians, team members, and
50
51 administrators.
52
53
54

55 **RESULTS**

Patient sample

Twenty-four interviews were conducted, 12 with CCP patients and 12 with standard care patients. Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant characteristics.

Characteristics	All patients (n=24)	Standard care patients (n=12)	Comprehensive Care Program patients (n=12)
Age in years ^a [mean (standard deviation)]	53 (14)	57 (15)	49 (11)
Female [n (%)]	12 (50)	6 (50)	6 (50)
Years since CCP study enrollment ^a [mean (standard deviation)]	2.7 (1.2)	2.7 (1.3)	2.7 (1.1)
Chronic medical conditions [n (%)]			
Heart failure	11 (46)	7 (58)	4 (33)
Coronary artery disease	6 (25)	4 (33)	2 (17)
Diabetes	11 (46)	7 (58)	4 (33)
End-stage renal disease	10 (42)	5 (42)	5 (42)
Chronic lung disease ^b	8 (33)	7 (58)	1 (8)
Cancer	2 (8)	1 (8)	1 (8)
Rheumatologic disease ^c	2 (8)	0	2 (17)
Other ^d	2 (8)	1 (8)	1 (8)

^a At time of interview.

^b Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, Asthma, Interstitial lung disease, Pulmonary arterial hypertension, Cystic fibrosis.

^c Scleroderma, Crohn's disease.

^d Sickle cell disease, Spina bifida.

For CCP and standard care groups combined, 50% were female and the average age was 53 years. Patients had been enrolled in the CCP study for an average of 2.7 years at the time of interview. All patients had two or more chronic medical conditions. Of the standard care patients, 67% received primary care from internal medicine resident physicians; all CCP patients were cared for by attending physicians.

Table 2. Themes across standard care and Comprehensive Care Program groups.

Theme	Standard care patients (n=12)	Comprehensive Care Program patients (n=12)
1. Positive attitude towards PCP	Valued comfort communicating with PCP, and PCP compassion. CCP patients additionally reported shared trust.	
2. Longitudinal continuity with PCP valued	Experienced frequent turnover of PCP	Described longitudinal relationships with their PCP which improved over time
3. Patient preference for PCP involvement in hospital care	Majority preferred some contact with PCP during hospitalization	Preferred inpatient treatment by PCP due to shared trust and their prior knowledge of the patient
4. Patient experience of interaction with PCP during hospitalization	Most did not interact with their PCP during hospitalization	Described active involvement of their PCP in decision-making
5. Patient experience of PCP interaction with hospital-based providers	Most were not aware of interaction between PCP and hospital providers	Emphasized PCP's role aligning the knowledge and goals of various providers

PCP, primary care physician.

Theme 1: Positive attitude towards PCP

Themes from interviews are summarized in Table 2.

Patient is comfortable talking with their PCP

A majority of CCP patients and a few standard care patients described feeling comfortable conversing with their PCP. Patients in both groups valued that their PCP listened to what they said. Several CCP patients, but only a few of the standard care patients, thought discussions were better with their PCP than with hospital providers. A common perception was that the patient could speak more openly with their PCP.

It's good because I can openly talk to him and not be afraid to tell him if something is not going right. (Female, standard care)

Several CCP patients also described engaging with their PCP about topics outside of medicine, including challenging social issues.

You want to be straight up with your primary about things. You want to tell him everything, what's giving you problems. Well my wounds are giving me problems, do you have any other issues? And you tell him: well depression issues, housing issues. (Male, CCP)

PCP is caring towards patient

1
2
3 Across CCP and standard care, several patients expressed that they felt cared for by their
4
5 PCP. Patients appreciated that the PCP was concerned about their health and that the
6
7 physician offered their time and attention.
8
9

10
11 She sits and talks to me, she [...] connects with me, you know. Not just like business
12
13 type thing, but a family type thing. (Male, CCP)
14
15

16 17 Shared trust between patient and PCP 18

19
20 Half of CCP patients, but none of the standard care patients, mentioned shared trust with
21
22 their PCP. In several instances, CCP patients stated that their PCP trusted them to make
23
24 their own decisions about care. Participants also described an increased level of trust in
25
26 their CCP's judgment over time.
27
28

29
30 See we have this really good relationship, and she knows that I am an informed
31
32 patient. I know my body and I can pretty much tell her more than she can tell me
33
34 about my body, and so she trusts me the same way I trust her. (Female, CCP)
35
36
37

38 39 **Theme 2: Longitudinal continuity with PCP valued** 40

41
42 Many standard care and CCP patients emphasized that it takes time to build a relationship
43
44 with a PCP. A majority of standard care participants described discontinuity with their
45
46 PCPs. A few patients attributed the frequent changes to receiving primary care from
47
48 residents who graduated and transitioned their patients to new trainees.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [...] this'll be my 4th primary care doctor in 10 years. But, you know, you guys do
4 your 2 or 3 year residency, then you're off [...] But at some point you've got to learn,
5
6 like what you're doing with me. (Male, standard care)
7
8
9

10
11 In comparison, CCP patients experienced greater relational continuity with their physician.
12
13 A majority of CCP patients mentioned that the relationship with their CCP physician
14 improved over time as they got to know each other. Two participants described a difficult
15 start that morphed into a positive relationship.
16
17
18
19

20
21 Once you get to know a person it gets better because you know the first couple of
22 times it's not going to be smooth sailing. (Male, CCP)
23
24
25
26

27 **Theme 3: Patient preference for PCP involvement in hospital care**

28
29

30
31 A majority of standard care patients and nearly all CCP patients stated that their PCP
32 should be involved during hospitalization. However, there was variation in the preferred
33 form of involvement. A majority of standard care patients thought that ideally a PCP would
34 remain in communication with their patient during hospitalization.
35
36
37
38

39
40
41 It shows they care, they're concerned about my being, my health. And that's a good
42 thing. (Female, standard care)
43
44
45
46

47 Patients commonly preferred that this interaction be in person, with a few specifically
48 stating that they would prefer to be treated by their PCP while in the hospital. A few
49 standard care patients noted that their PCP could have been able to offer emotional
50 support during hospitalization.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [...] he probably could have informed me and let me know more about what was
4
5 going on, and I would have had less anxiety. I would have felt more relieved. (Male,
6
7 standard care)
8
9

10
11 Further, a few standard care patients thought that a PCP should remain in communication
12
13 with the patient's care team during hospitalization. PCP involvement was considered
14
15 beneficial due to their prior knowledge of the patient's health conditions.
16
17

18
19 I don't think he should just be in the office all the time. I think he should know about
20
21 me being in the hospital and why and help me to maintain my health. I mean, these
22
23 other doctors, they don't really see me that much. They don't know much about me.
24
25 They just know what I come in and I complain about, and then they fix that and then
26
27 they send me on my way? What if I have another issue that they're not aware of that
28
29 my primary care doctor is aware of? (Female, standard care)
30
31
32
33

34
35 On the other hand, some standard care patients stated that they chose not to reach out to
36
37 their PCP during hospitalization due to lack of a relationship with their PCP. Others shared
38
39 that they had no expectation of PCP involvement during hospitalization. These patients
40
41 thought it was sufficient for the PCP to view records following discharge or answer
42
43 questions if contacted by the hospital team.
44
45

46
47 I just concentrate on the doctors at hand, and I know that they're making notes so he
48
49 see it on the chart. I don't have it where I can text him and let him know each time
50
51 I'm in the hospital. I don't do that [...] like I see him every two months. So, by the
52
53 time I see him, I'm quite sure there's a flag somewhere to let him know I've been in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the hospital, and he can read the chart and see that I've been in the hospital so.

4
5 (Female, standard care)
6
7
8

9 Among CCP patients, all described a preference to be treated by their PCP in the hospital setting.
10
11 For several, a PCP's knowledge about their health and personal preferences was thought to
12 expedite care and improve adherence to previously developed plans.
13
14

15
16
17 Besides my opinion, she should be able to make the decision. She should be the one
18 running stuff. Should no other doctor be running nothing or make no decisions
19 because you don't know me. (Female, CCP)
20
21
22

23
24
25 A few CCP patients also pointed to the shared trust with their PCP. Due to previous
26 hospitalizations or office visits patients perceived that the PCP had greater understanding of the
27 patient's preferences, and the patient felt comfortable with the PCP's plan.
28
29
30

31
32
33 [...] I feel like with any other doctor, it would be like: 'You were just ready to go
34 home, now all of a sudden I say this and you're not feeling well.' I think she knows
35 that it's not just necessary that I'm not saying I'm not feeling well, I think she knows
36 what I've told her already, why I like the blood transfusions, so she don't look at it
37 like a ploy. (Female, CCP)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Theme 4: Patient experience of interaction with PCP during hospitalization**

46
47

48
49 There was considerable variation between the two groups in interaction between the
50 patient and PCP during hospitalization. Most standard care patients did not interact with
51 their PCP during hospitalization.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 He usually gets the report after I'm out [...] I just go through whatever doctor sees
4 me in the emergency room, and then they send to the floor (Female, standard care)
5
6
7

8
9 For the few patients who described interaction, some initiated, and some were contacted
10 by their PCP. The form of PCP-patient interaction also varied. A few patients received in
11 person-visits from their PCP and one talked with their PCP over the phone. Patients
12 expressed positive feelings towards their PCP visiting them in the hospital. However, there
13 was little elaboration about how and to what extent the PCP actively participated in their
14 care during hospitalization.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 For CCP patients, nearly all described frequent in-person interaction with their PCP during
25 hospitalization. Most patients discussed their plan of care with the PCP. Half described
26 making decisions with their PCP about treatment options or the timing of discharge.
27
28
29
30

31
32 Mainly I talked to my Comprehensive doctor. She's like the main authority over all of
33 that. They have to talk to her first, you know to see if I'm okay with leaving. She'll
34 come ask me: 'How do you feel about leaving today?' If I say 'I don't feel like leaving,'
35 she'll be like: 'You can stay an extra day,' and stuff like that, you know? (Male, CCP)
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Theme 5: Patient experience of PCP interaction with hospital-based providers**

43
44

45
46 There was also significant variation between the two groups in experience of interaction
47 between the PCP and hospital providers. Only two standard care patients described being
48 aware of interaction between their PCP and hospital providers, such as providing guidance
49 to the inpatient care team. A few standard care patients openly expressed uncertainty and
50 concern about whether their PCP was contacted during their hospitalization.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 I don't know for sure that they're calling him and letting him know or if he's getting
4 the reports or any of that. I need to know that he's getting this information to know
5
6 I'm there. (Female, standard care)
7
8
9

10
11 Among CCP patients, a majority described their PCP being in communication with other
12 hospital providers. Several of these patients referred to the PCP as leader of their
13 healthcare team in the hospital. Patients described their PCPs keeping specialists informed
14 and interfacing with the other providers when the patient had a concern or conflict.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 She's my main doctor, so she makes sure everybody gets the email when I'm in the
22 hospital. They'll know that: 'OK I gotta go see how he's doing, and see if I can give
23 him any help for his pain or anything.' So that's the best thing I can ask for. That's
24 probably why I switched from another hospital. Since I can just ask my
25 Comprehensive Care anything wrong with me, she'll make sure that all my other
26 doctors know too, so I ain't gotta be worrying about it, like my pain, or if I miss an
27 appointment they'll all be informed that I'm in the hospital [...] (Male, CCP)
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 DISCUSSION

40
41
42 The main aim of this study was to explore frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and
43 preferences related to PCP involvement during hospitalization. A unique contribution of
44 this study was the qualitative comparison of perspectives of standard care patients who
45 were cared for by hospitalists or housestaff teams to those of CCP patients being treated by
46 their own PCP during hospitalization.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Both standard care and CCP patients expressed a preference for repeated interactions with
4 their PCP over time to build a relationship and shared knowledge. While CCP patients
5 described consistent relationships with their PCPs that benefited from shared experiences
6 across inpatient and outpatient settings, many standard care patients described relational
7 discontinuity with PCPs, which sometimes weakened these relationships. These results
8 were consistent with prior research that patients prefer, and may benefit from, relational
9 continuity of care with physicians,[20–23] and that patients' trust in their PCP was
10 associated with the duration of their relationship.[24]
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 It is concerning that in this study of patients with frequent hospitalization and multiple
24 chronic conditions, many in standard care may not experience the benefits of long-term
25 relational continuity. Most of the patients experiencing discontinuity received care in a
26 resident clinic characterized by frequent turnover. It is possible that the purposive
27 sampling of this embedded qualitative study disproportionately selected for standard care
28 patients with resident PCPs. Unfortunately, these patients' experiences with PCP
29 discontinuity are not unique. Previous studies found that, as compared to patients with
30 attending PCPs, patients with resident PCPs were more likely to have multiple health
31 conditions, and be non-white, of low socioeconomic status, and on Medicare or Medicaid
32 insurance.[25–29] Patients who transition care to a new resident reported challenges
33 including missed tests and difficulty building a relationship with a new provider.[30]
34
35 Patients may also experience PCP discontinuity due to the resident clinic schedule.[31]
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 A vast majority of patients in this study wanted their PCP to be involved during
53 hospitalization, a preference consistent with previous findings.[9, 32] Despite the overall
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 preference for PCP involvement during hospitalization, few standard care patients
4
5 described actual involvement of their PCP during hospitalization; when involved, the PCP
6
7 role was usually limited to single visits or brief conversations with the patient or hospital
8
9 providers. The finding that a majority of the standard care patients did not have interaction
10
11 with their PCPs during hospitalization echoes previous research.[9, 10]
12
13

14
15
16 In contrast, consistent with the structure of the program, CCP patients described
17
18 substantial involvement of their PCPs during hospitalization. A major contribution of this
19
20 study was in highlighting the value of PCP involvement in the hospital setting through the
21
22 lens of patients in CCP. Specifically, patients in CCP emphasized the PCP's role as a leader of
23
24 their care team. Patients found it reassuring to have their PCP working to align the
25
26 knowledge and goals of the various hospital providers. CCP patients expressed that shared
27
28 trust with their PCP allowed for more patient involvement in care decisions due to greater
29
30 patient comfort to voice disagreement, and PCP respect for the patient's input. As the CCP
31
32 model is further developed and disseminated to other care settings, longitudinal
33
34 relationships and direct patient engagement in the inpatient setting will be important
35
36 components to uphold.
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Inpatient-outpatient relational continuity is a component of other interdisciplinary
44
45 programs for frequently hospitalized patients. The nature of team involvement in the
46
47 inpatient setting varies. For instance, the University of Colorado intensive outpatient clinic
48
49 team collaborates with hospital providers to develop care plans.[33] In the CareMore
50
51 Health System, hospitalists treat high-risk patients for a limited duration across the
52
53 transition from inpatient to rehabilitation or community settings.[34] Social workers in the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Northwestern University Complex High Admission Management Program provide
4 continuity by rounding on their admitted patients.[35] It is unknown if and to what extent
5
6 findings from this CCP study may translate to programs with inpatient-outpatient
7
8 continuity involving a non-PCP provider, or inpatient involvement that is not direct care.
9
10 Incorporating patient perceptions into evaluation plans for these interdisciplinary
11
12 programs could refine our understanding of the nature of involvement needed.
13
14
15
16
17

18 In practice, it is uncommon for patients in the United States to be treated by their PCP
19
20 while hospitalized. In a sample of 2013 Medicare data, PCPs cared for their own patient in
21
22 only 14.2% of hospital admissions.[36] However, for frequently hospitalized patients,
23
24 increasing PCP engagement in the inpatient setting may improve patient experiences, even
25
26 if the PCP is not providing direct care. PCPs can use their relationship with the patient to
27
28 help assess preferences and identify needs. This may benefit the patient by encouraging
29
30 patient engagement in decision-making, strengthening the patient-PCP relationship, and
31
32 improving interdisciplinary coordination across settings. To achieve this, a first challenge is
33
34 ensuring that PCPs receive information when their patient is hospitalized.[37] Health care
35
36 systems may also consider how to provide PCPs with time and compensation for
37
38 communicating with their hospitalized patients and their inpatient care teams by phone or
39
40 in-person visit.[38]
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 There are several limitations of the patient sample and analysis. First, patients recruited for
48
49 the embedded qualitative study may have been a healthier and more engaged group than
50
51 the overall study population. In the case of CCP patients, those with positive feelings
52
53 towards the program may have been most likely to participate. Second, while all CCP
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patients had attending physicians as PCPs, 67% of the standard care patients had resident
4
5 physicians as PCPs. Although a limitation, it also reflects the reality that complex,
6
7 vulnerable, patients who experience frequent hospitalizations often receive primary care
8
9 from residents. Third, the exclusive focus on PCPs in the analysis is a limitation. CCP PCPs
10
11 may share similar roles or characteristics with specialists or other providers who see
12
13 patients across care settings.
14
15

16 17 18 **CONCLUSION**

19
20
21 In summary, this study was a valuable contribution to the existing literature on PCP
22
23 involvement during hospitalization due to the qualitative comparison of perspectives of
24
25 standard care and CCP patients. Specifically, the results suggested that for frequently
26
27 hospitalized patients, active inpatient involvement by a consistent PCP with knowledge of
28
29 the patient's health and personal preferences could improve patient experience with
30
31 interdisciplinary coordination and engagement in care during hospitalization. For
32
33 frequently hospitalized patients not being treated in the hospital by their PCP, future
34
35 research is needed to clarify which forms of PCP engagement may be most likely to confer
36
37 these benefits.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Acknowledgements** Thank you to the patients interviewed in the study for their time and
48
49 willingness to discuss their medical care. Thank you also to Andrea Flores, MA for her role
50
51 in developing the sampling approach used in this study.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Funding This work was supported by: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation grant CMS-1C1-12- 0001; Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Patient Centered Outcomes Research Faculty Development Program grant K12; and National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging grant 5T35AG029795-12.

Author Statement JT and DM conceptualized the study. JT, DM, VS, JK and LW designed the methodology. JK and AK conducted the interviews. JT, ER, and JK conducted the analysis and wrote the original draft. DM, VS, AK, and LW participated in reviewing and editing the manuscript.

Competing interests None declared.

Ethics approval This study received approval from the University of Chicago Institutional Review Board (IRB12-1440).

Patient consent for publication None required.

ORCID iDs

Erin Y. Rieger <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0888-5056>

Veena Sriram <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7235-253X>

Abbie Klein <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1077-1269>

Lauren O. Wiklund <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9997-0813>

David O. Meltzer <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6728-8729>

Joyce W. Tang <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4792-924X>

Data availability statement Data are available on reasonable request. Transcripts have not been shared to protect anonymity of patients.

REFERENCES

1. Wachter RM, Goldman L. The Hospitalist Movement 5 Years Later. *JAMA* 2002;287:487–94. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.4.487>.
2. Meltzer D, Manning WG, Morrison J, et al. Effects of physician experience on costs and outcomes on an academic general medicine service: results of a trial of hospitalists. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:866–74.
3. Berger ZD, Boss EF, Beach MC. Communication behaviors and patient autonomy in hospital care: A qualitative study. *Patient Educ Couns* 2017;100:1473–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.03.006>.
4. Calkins DR, Davis RB, Reiley P, et al. Patient-physician communication at hospital discharge and patients' understanding of the postdischarge treatment plan. *Arch Intern Med* 1997;157:1026–30. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.1997.00440300148014>
5. Olson DP, Windish DM. Communication discrepancies between physicians and hospitalized patients. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170:1302–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.239>.
6. Figueroa JF, Schnipper JL, McNally K, et al. How often are hospitalized patients and providers on the same page with regard to the patient's primary recovery goal for hospitalization? *J Hosp Med* 2016;11:615–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2569>.
7. Storm M, Davidson L. Inpatients' and providers' experiences with user involvement in inpatient care. *Psychiatr Q* 2010;81:111–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-009-9122-6>.
8. Apker J, Baker M, Shank S, et al. Optimizing Hospitalist-Patient Communication: An Observation Study of Medical Encounter Quality. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2018;44:196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2017.08.011>.
9. Hruby M, Pantilat SZ, Lo B. How do patients view the role of the primary care physician in inpatient care? *Am J Med* 2001;111:21–5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9343\(01\)00965-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9343(01)00965-2).
10. Huang KB, Weber U, Johnson J, et al. Primary Care Physician Involvement in Shared Decision Making for Critically Ill Patients and Family Satisfaction with Care. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2018;31:64–72. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2018.01.170211>.
11. Brener SS, Bronksill SE, Comrie R, et al. Association between in-hospital supportive visits by primary care physicians and patient outcomes: A population-based cohort study: PCP Visits to Hospitalized Patients. *J Hosp Med* 2016;11:418–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2561>.
12. Adams D, Flores A, Coltri A, et al. A Missed Opportunity to Improve Patient Satisfaction? Patient Perceptions of Inpatient Communication With Their Primary Care Physician. *Am J Med Qual* 2016;31:568–76.
13. Kripalani S, LeFevre F, Phillips CO, et al. Deficits in Communication and Information Transfer Between Hospital-Based and Primary Care Physicians: Implications for Patient Safety and Continuity of Care. *JAMA* 2007;297:831–41. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.297.8.831>.

14. Seiler A, Visintainer P, Brzostek R, et al. Patient satisfaction with hospital care provided by hospitalists and primary care physicians. *J Hosp Med* 2012;7:131–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.973>.
15. Chen LM, Birkmeyer JD, Saint S, et al. Hospitalist Staffing and Patient Satisfaction in the National Medicare Population: Hospitalist Care and Patient Satisfaction. *J Hosp Med* 2013;8:126–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2001>.
16. Meltzer DO, Ruhnke GW. Redesigning Care For Patients At Increased Hospitalization Risk: The Comprehensive Care Physician Model. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2014;33:770–7. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0072>.
17. Crabtree BF, Miller WF. A template approach to text analysis: Developing and using codebooks. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WF, eds. *Doing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 1992:93–109.
18. King N. Template Analysis. In: Simon G and Cassell C, eds. *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 1998:118–34.
19. Malterud, K. Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The lancet* 2001;358.9280:483–488.
20. Aboulgate A, Abel G, Elliott MN, et al. Do English patients want continuity of care, and do they receive it? *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:e567–e75. <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp12X653624>.
21. Waibel S, Henao D, Aller MB, et al. What do we know about patients' perceptions of continuity of care? A meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2012;24:39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzr068>.
22. Bayliss EA, Ellis JL, Shoup JA, et al. Effect of Continuity of Care on Hospital Utilization for Seniors With Multiple Medical Conditions in an Integrated Health Care System. *Ann Fam Med* 2015;13:123–9. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1739>.
23. Pereira Gray DJ, Sidaway-Lee K, White E, et al. Continuity of care with doctors—a matter of life and death? A systematic review of continuity of care and mortality. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e021161. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021161>.
24. Mainous AG, Baker R, Love MM, et al. Continuity of care and trust in one's physician: evidence from primary care in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Fam Med* 2001;33:22–7.
25. Doctoroff L, McNally D, Vanka A, et al. Inpatient-outpatient Transitions for Patients with Resident Primary Care Physicians: Access and Readmission. *Am J Med* 2014;127:886.e15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2014.03.038>.
26. Zallman L, Ma J, Xiao L, et al. Quality of US Primary Care Delivered by Resident and Staff Physicians. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25:1193–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-010-1456-0>.
27. Yancy WS, Macpherson DS, Hanusa BH, et al. Patient Satisfaction in Resident and Attending Ambulatory Care Clinics. *J Gen Intern Med* 2001;16:755–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2001.91005.x>.
28. Charlson ME, Karnik J, Wong M, et al. Does experience matter?: A comparison of the practice of attendings and residents. *J Gen Intern Med* 2005;20:497–503. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.0085.x>.

29. Essien UR, He W, Ray A, et al. Disparities in Quality of Primary Care by Resident and Staff Physicians: Is There a Conflict Between Training and Equity?. *J Gen Intern Med* 2019;34:1184–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-04960-5>.
30. Pincavage AT, Lee WW, Beiting KJ, et al. What Do Patients Think About Year-End Resident Continuity Clinic Handoffs?: A Qualitative Study. *J Gen Intern Med* 2013;28:999–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-013-2395-3>.
31. Wieland ML, Jaeger TM, Bundrick JB, et al. Resident Physician Perspectives on Outpatient Continuity of Care. *J Grad Med Educ* 2013;5:668–73. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-05-04-40>.
32. Shoeb M, Merel SE, Jackson MB, et al. “Can we just stop and talk?” patients value verbal communication about discharge care plans. *J Hosp Med* 2012;7:504–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.1937>.
33. Durfee J, Johnson T, Batal H, et al. The impact of tailored intervention services on charges and mortality for adult super-utilizers. *Healthcare* 2018;6:253–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hjdsi.2017.08.004>.
34. Powers BW, Milstein A, Jain SH. Delivery Models for High-Risk Older Patients: Back to the Future?. *JAMA* 2016;315:23. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2015.17029>.
35. Theodorou ME, Henschen BL, Chapman M. The Comprehensive Care Plan: A Patient-Centered, Multidisciplinary Communication Tool for Frequently Hospitalized Patients. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2020;46:217–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2020.01.002>.
36. Stevens JP, Nyweide DJ, Maresh S, et al. Comparison of Hospital Resource Use and Outcomes Among Hospitalists, Primary Care Physicians, and Other Generalists. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:1781–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.5824>.
37. Jones CD, Vu MB, O'Donnell CM, et al. A Failure to Communicate: A Qualitative Exploration of Care Coordination Between Hospitalists and Primary Care Providers Around Patient Hospitalizations. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30:417–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-3056-x>.
38. Goroll AH, Hunt DP. Bridging the Hospitalist–Primary Care Divide through Collaborative Care. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:308–9. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1411416>.

Appendix A: Interview Guide

“We’re going to talk for about 30 minutes about your last hospitalization at U Chicago, the people who worked with you then, and your primary care doctor. I’m particularly interested in your thoughts on how you talk with these people, how they talk with you, and how these conversations and relationships affect how you feel. I’m going to record this so I can remember accurately what you said. However, nothing you say will impact your care or your relationship with doctors here; I will be the only one who can connect you to the written record of the interview. You can choose not to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. Shall we get started?”

Think back to your last hospitalization here at University of Chicago.

- 1) Why did you come to the hospital?
- 2) How did you feel about the care you received while you were in the hospital?
- 3) Can you describe your mood while you were in the hospital?
 - a) What made you feel that way?
- 4) In general, how did you feel the conversations went with your medical team during your hospital stay?
 - a) What kinds of things did your doctors and nurses talk with you about?
 - b) Who talked with you most about your medical care, such as any treatments or tests that you would receive?

- 1
2
3 c) How well did you understand the doctor's plan for your care while you were in the
4 hospital?
5
6
7
8
9 d) What did you want to happen as a result of your stay in the hospital?
10
11
12 i) How well did the medical team understand what you wanted?
13
14
15
16 5) I'd like to ask you some questions about how you and your medical team made
17 decisions about your care while you were in the hospital. Think about one important
18 decision that had to be made while you were in the hospital (for example, related to
19 getting a test or procedure or starting a new medication).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 a) Can you describe that situation to me?
27
28
29 b) Did your doctor present you with different options for your care? Can you tell me
30 about them?
31
32
33
34
35 c) What was your understanding of the options?
36
37
38
39 d) How did you feel about the options?
40
41
42 e) How well do you think your doctors understood your opinion on these options?
43
44
45
46 f) Tell me about your involvement in making the decision.
47
48
49 g) How do you feel about this decision?
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 6) How was this visit similar to other times you may have been in the hospital before you joined the CCP study?
- 7) How was this visit different than other times you may have been in the hospital before you joined the CCP study?
- 8) When you were discharged from the hospital, what kind of instructions were you given on caring for yourself?
- a) How well did these instructions fit with your daily life?
 - b) Who helped take care of you after your hospital stay? How well prepared was your family/caregiver to care for you after your hospital stay?
 - c) Who was responsible for your follow-up care or for monitoring you or checking in with you to make sure that you were doing well after your hospital stay?
 - d) How did you feel about the follow-up care you received?
 - e) Tell me about how prepared [insert name of clinic doctor or staff] was to care for you after your hospital stay.
- 9) Do you have a primary care doctor?
- a) Can you describe your relationship with him or her?
 - b) How do you feel overall about your primary care doctor?
 - i) What do you appreciate most about your primary care doctor?

- 1
2
3 ii) If there was one thing you would change about your primary care doctor, what
4
5 would it be?
6
7
8
9 c) How do you feel about your conversations with him or her? Are there differences in
10
11 the way you talk with your primary care doctor, compared with your discussions
12
13 with your doctors in the hospital?
14
15
16
17 d) When you are in the hospital, do you typically stay in touch with your primary care
18
19 doctor? Tell me more about that.
20
21
22
23 e) What role, if any, do you think your primary care doctor should have in your care
24
25 while you are in the hospital?
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

PROTOCOL – JANUARY 2019

Background

Before the mid-1990s, primary care providers (PCPs) generally were responsible for coordinating care of their hospitalized patients. Since that time, hospitalists—specialists in inpatient care—have significantly increased within the US healthcare system (1). The shift in care model was motivated by factors including increased hospitalist efficiency, availability, and specialization (1). For instance, a randomized controlled trial (conducted 1997-1999) found that patients of hospitalists had reduced healthcare costs and lower thirty and sixty-day mortalities (2). The study suggested that this was largely mediated by the hospitalists' expertise in managing common inpatient conditions (2).

Despite such advantages, critics of the hospitalist model are concerned that patient care suffers due to fragmentation of care (1). A previous study identified significant discrepancies between the knowledge patients had of their own medical conditions and the knowledge patients' hospital physicians perceived that patients had (3). On the day of discharge, only 57% of patients correctly named their diagnosis (3). Additionally, only 10% of patients recalled being told of medication side effects (3). The lack of an established rapport between patients and physicians may also contribute to communication barriers. A PCP, based on their prior discussions with a patient, likely has greater knowledge of family context, values, communication style, and care preferences (4). Particularly for patients with complex needs, such dimensions of care can greatly impact medical decision making.

The Comprehensive Care Program (CCP) at University of Chicago Medicine (UCM) is a randomized controlled trial assessing the benefit of an interdisciplinary care team for patients with high risk of hospitalization. The teams are led by physicians who care for their panel of patients across both inpatient and ambulatory settings (5). Broadly, the CCP aims to compare the healthcare costs, outcomes, and experiences of patients in CCP versus usual care. A sub-study of this project uses qualitative interviews to better understand patient experiences with communication and decision-making during hospitalization.

1. Wachter RM, Goldman L. "The hospitalist movement 5 years later." *Jama* 287.4 (2002): 487-494.

2. Meltzer D, Manning WG, Morrison J, Shah MN, Jin L, Guth T, Levinson W. (2002). "Effects of physician experience on costs and outcomes on an academic general medicine service: results of a trial of hospitalists." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 137.11 (2002): 866-874.

3. Olson DP, Windish DM. "Communication discrepancies between physicians and hospitalized patients." *Archives of Internal Medicine* 170.15 (2010): 1302-1307.

4. Minichiello, TA, Ling D, Ucci DK. "Breaking bad news: a practical approach for the hospitalist." *Journal of Hospital Medicine* 2.6 (2007): 415-421.

5. Meltzer DO, Ruhnke GW. "Redesigning care for patients at increased hospitalization risk: the comprehensive care physician model." *Health Affairs* 33.5 (2014): 770-777.

Specific Aims:

1. Explore patient experiences with communication and decision-making during hospitalization specifically surrounding trust, understanding, and alliance of goals between physician and patient.
2. Describe patient experiences and preferences on the role of their primary care provider during hospitalization.
3. Compare patient experiences in the CCP and standard care across these themes.

Hypothesis

We hypothesize that frequently hospitalized patients will describe limited involvement of their Primary Care Provider (PCP) during hospitalization as well as barriers to communication with their inpatient care team. Themes may include concerns about inpatient provider knowledge of values, context, and care preferences. In comparison, we hypothesize that patients seen by a Comprehensive Care Physician while hospitalized will describe trust, a valued interpersonal relationship, and established communication style with their physician. This is a qualitative, exploratory project, and we will be open to additional themes in the data as they emerge.

Methods

Participant Selection

The CCP study recruited from the population of Medicare Part A and B enrollees with at least one hospitalization at UCM within the previous twelve months. Patients randomized to the control group receive standard of care: as inpatients they are treated by hospitalists and as outpatients are treated by a separate primary care physician. Patients randomized to the experimental group are cared for by a team made up of a CCP internal medicine physician, social workers, and nurses. The CCP physicians have smaller patient panels and, accordingly, are able to allocate more time to each individual and coordinate care in both inpatient and outpatient settings.

The participants for the qualitative sub-study were drawn from the broader CCP study. Eligible patients had at least three hospitalizations within the previous twelve months (based on self-report during quarterly phone surveys), with their most recent hospitalization occurring at UCM. For experimental group patients, medical records were also screened to confirm that they were seen by their assigned CCP physician during the most recent hospitalization. Patients in the experimental and control groups were invited to participate by phone or in-person visit.

Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews, approximately a half hour in length, were conducted in-person at UCM. The semi-structured interview guide was developed collaboratively by the

interdisciplinary research team and incorporated feedback of three CCP program patients. Ten interviews were conducted with control group patients and ten with experimental group patients. Patients were asked for verbal consent for the interview and the audio recording of the interview (IRB12-1440). At the conclusion of the interview, patients received a \$30 gift card. The interviews were transcribed and, in order to maintain confidentiality, the interview audio was deleted. Identifiable personal data in the transcripts was redacted. Patient characteristics including sex, age, and healthcare utilization were collected and summarized.

Data Analysis

The interview transcripts will be analyzed using template analysis, a methodology coined by Crabtree & Miller (1992) (1). Two researchers will separately review three interview transcripts in order to identify possible themes. The researchers will then discuss in order to reach consensus on the preliminary “template,” a hierarchical organization of the identified themes (2). The initial template will be used to code the remaining seven transcripts on the NVivo software. Through an iterative process, additional themes may be added to the template as they arise from the transcripts. After the template is finalized, salient themes will be identified based on review and discussion of codes. These themes will be described, and representative quotes will be selected.

In order to identify similarities and differences in the experiences of the experimental and control group patients, matrix analysis will be performed using the NVivo software. Matrix analysis involves the generation of tables to compare the two groups. As a check on the validity of the analysis, several participants in the CCP study will be asked to provide feedback on the results.

Overall, this qualitative approach will allow for exploration of patient experiences and attitudes. The openness of this method can lead to identification of new theories and hypotheses.

1. Crabtree BF, Miller WF (1992). A template approach to text analysis: Developing and using codebooks. In B. F. Crabtree & W. L. Miller (Eds.), *Research methods for primary care, Vol. 3. Doing qualitative research* (pp. 93-109). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

2. King N (1998). “Template Analysis” In Symon G, Catherine C. *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research. A Practical Guide.* (pp. 118-134). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

<http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/>

Page/line no(s).

Title and abstract

<p>Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended</p>	<p>pg. 1, line 1</p>
<p>Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions</p>	<p>pg. 2, line 1</p>

Introduction

<p>Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement</p>	<p>pg. 5, line 19</p>
<p>Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions</p>	<p>pg. 6, line 3</p>

Methods

<p>Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 15</p>
<p>Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability</p>	<p>pg. 7, line 17 pg. 8, line 8 pg. 8, line 18 pg. 9, line 7</p>
<p>Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 6, line 5 pg. 6, line 14</p>
<p>Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 7, line 8</p>
<p>Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 9 pg. 8, line 13</p>
<p>Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 7 pg. 9, line 10</p>

1 2 3 4 5	Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	pg. 7, line 17 pg. 8, line 14
6 7 8	Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	pg. 9, line 15
9 10 11 12	Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	pg. 8, line 14
13 14 15 16	Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	pg. 8, line 15
17 18 19 20	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale**	pg. 9, line 11

Results/findings

23 24 25 26	Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory	pgs. 9-18
27 28 29	Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	pgs. 9-18

Discussion

32 33 34 35 36 37	Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	pgs. 18-21
38 39	Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	pg. 20, line 1

Other

42 43 44	Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	pg. 22, line 9
45 46	Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting	pg. 22, line 1

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. **Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations.** *Academic Medicine*, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014
DOI: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Primary Care Physician Involvement During Hospitalization: a Qualitative Analysis of Perspectives from Frequently Hospitalized Patients

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-053784.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Oct-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Rieger, Erin; University of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine Kushner, Josef; Lenox Hill Hospital, Department of Medicine Sriram, Veena; The University of British Columbia, School of Population and Public Health Klein, Abbie; University of Chicago Department of Medicine Wiklund, Lauren; Michigan State University, Department of Psychology Meltzer, David; University of Chicago Department of Medicine Tang, Joyce; University of Chicago Department of Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice, Patient-centred medicine, Health services research
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, PRIMARY CARE, INTERNAL MEDICINE, Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

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
4 Primary Care Physician Involvement During Hospitalization: a Qualitative Analysis of
5
6
7 Perspectives from Frequently Hospitalized Patients
8
9

11 Erin Y. Rieger,¹ Josef N.S. Kushner,² Veena Sriram,³ Abbie Klein,⁴ Lauren O. Wiklund,⁵ David
12
13
14 O. Meltzer,⁴ Joyce W. Tang^{4*}
15
16

17
18
19 ¹Pritzker School of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA
20

21
22 ²Department of Medicine, Lenox Hill Hospital, New York City, New York, USA
23

24
25
26 ³School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British
27
28
29 Columbia, Canada
30

31
32 ⁴Department of Medicine, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA
33

34
35
36 ⁵Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA
37

38
39 *Corresponding author at University of Chicago, 5841 South Maryland Avenue, MC 5000,
40
41
42 Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA; Email address: jtang@bsd.uchicago.edu
43
44

45
46
47 Manuscript word count: 3,997/4,000
48

49
50
51 Abstract word count: 238/300
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and preferences related to primary care physician (PCP) involvement during hospitalization across two care models.

Design: Qualitative study embedded within a randomized controlled trial. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with patients. Transcripts were analyzed using qualitative template analysis.

Setting: In the Comprehensive Care Program (CCP) Study, in Illinois, USA, Medicare patients at increased risk of hospitalization are randomly assigned to: 1) care by a comprehensive care program physician who serves as a primary care physician (PCP) across both inpatient and outpatient settings; or 2) care by a PCP as outpatient and by hospitalists as inpatients (standard care).

Participants: Twelve standard care and 12 CCP patients were interviewed.

Results: Themes included: 1. Positive attitude towards PCP; 2. Longitudinal continuity with PCP valued; 3. Patient preference for PCP involvement in hospital care; 4. Potential for in-depth involvement of PCP during hospitalization often unrealized (involvement rare in standard care;

1
2
3
4 in CCP, frequent interaction with PCP fostered patient involvement in decision making); 5. PCP
5
6
7 collaboration with hospital-based providers frequently absent (no interaction for standard care
8
9
10 patients; CCP patients emphasizing PCP's role in interdisciplinary coordination).

11
12
13
14 **Conclusion:** Frequently hospitalized patients value PCP involvement in the hospital setting. CCP
15
16
17 patients highlighted how an established relationship with their PCP improved inter-disciplinary
18
19
20 coordination and engagement with decision-making. Inpatient-outpatient relational continuity
21
22
23 may be an important component of programs for frequently hospitalized patients. Opportunities
24
25
26
27
28 for enhancing PCP involvement during hospitalization should be considered.
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

Article summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study provided a unique context within a RCT with one group of patients cared for by hospitalists and one group cared for by their PCP during hospitalization
- This study's qualitative approach allowed for a rich exploration of patients' experiences and preferences related to PCP involvement in hospitalization
- Self-selection bias is a possible limitation - patients recruited for the embedded qualitative study may have been a healthier and more engaged group than the overall study population
- This study was conducted at an academic medical center; experiences of the standard care group reflect the context of receiving care from trainees

INTRODUCTION

Before the mid-1990s, primary care physicians (PCPs) in the United States (U.S.) typically oversaw care for their own patients when they were hospitalized. Since that time, the number of hospitalists has significantly increased within the U.S.[1] This shift in care delivery model was motivated by perceptions about increased hospitalist efficiency, availability, specialized expertise, and possible cost and mortality reductions.[1, 2] Despite such advantages, the hospitalist model may increase fragmentation between inpatient and outpatient care, particularly for patients who are frequently hospitalized.[1] Previous studies found that hospitalized patients frequently had limited knowledge about their diagnosis, care plan, or post-discharge instructions.[3–5] Other studies identified discrepancies between hospitalized patients and their inpatient physicians in perceived goals of care,[6] and limited opportunities for shared decision-making.[3, 7, 8] A possible contributing factor to these communication barriers is lack of an established relationship between hospitalized patients and their inpatient physicians. In comparison, PCPs with whom patients have ongoing relationships often have intimate knowledge of patients' preferred communication style, values, family context, and care preferences, but infrequently communicate directly with patients during hospitalization.[9–11]

1
2
3
4 Communication between PCPs and inpatient providers during hospitalization may also be
5
6
7 limited in frequency and scope.[12, 13]
8
9

10
11 Particularly for patients with complex needs, PCP involvement during hospitalization may
12
13
14 greatly impact patient experience due to their familiarity with their patients' complex health
15
16
17 history and established relationship with patients. However, few studies directly compare the
18
19
20 hospitalization experiences of patients cared for by their PCP versus by hospitalists. These are
21
22
23 limited to quantitative comparisons related to satisfaction.[14, 15] There is a need for qualitative
24
25
26 patient perspectives on the role of a PCP in the hospital setting.
27
28
29

30
31
32 We conducted a qualitative study of frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and
33
34
35 preferences related to PCP involvement during hospitalization. This qualitative study was
36
37
38 embedded within a larger randomized controlled trial, the Comprehensive Care Program (CCP)
39
40
41 Study. Patients at increased risk of hospitalization are randomly assigned to one of 2 care
42
43
44 models: 1) a CCP physician who serves as both the outpatient PCP and hospital attending
45
46
47 (intervention arm) or 2) outpatient care from a PCP and hospital care from hospitalists (standard
48
49
50 care).[16] This study context provides a unique opportunity to explore and compare the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 experiences and preferences surrounding PCP involvement during hospitalization between
5
6
7 patients cared for by hospitalists as compared with a patient's own PCP.
8
9

11 METHODS

16 Setting

20 The CCP study at the University of Chicago Medicine (UCM) is a randomized controlled trial
21
22 assessing the effect of an interdisciplinary care team for patients at high risk of hospitalization.
23
24

26 The overall CCP study recruited Medicare Part A and B enrollees with at least one
27
28 hospitalization at UCM within the previous twelve months. Patients randomized to the
29
30 intervention group were cared for by PCPs with limited panels of approximately 200 patients to
31
32 enable them to care for their patients as the primary attending in both inpatient and outpatient
33
34 settings. As outpatients, the patients also receive care from a social worker, two nurses, and a
35
36 clinic coordinator. Patients randomized to the control group received "standard of care," which
37
38 included following with their prior PCP (or were offered assistance in obtaining one if they did
39
40 not have one) and being treated by hospitalist physicians if admitted to UCM.[16]
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The broader CCP study compares clinical outcomes, health care costs, and experiences of
5
6
7 patients in CCP versus standard care.[16] This embedded study used qualitative interviews with
8
9
10 a subset of both CCP and standard care patients to better understand and compare patients'
11
12
13 experiences and preferences surrounding the role of their PCP during hospitalization.
14
15

16 17 18 **Participant selection**

19
20
21
22 The participants for the embedded qualitative study were drawn from the broader CCP study.
23
24
25 Additional inclusion criteria included, participation in the CCP study for at least one year, and
26
27
28 having at least three hospitalizations within the previous twelve months (based on self-report
29
30
31 during quarterly phone surveys), with the most recent hospitalization occurring at UCM. For
32
33
34 intervention group patients, medical records were screened to confirm that their assigned CCP
35
36
37 physician served as their primary attending during the most recent hospitalization. Patients were
38
39
40 recruited by a research assistant or medical student in-person or by phone between July 2017 and
41
42
43
44
45
46 August 2018. Recruitment continued until data saturation was reached.
47
48
49

50 **Development of interview guide**

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The semi-structured interview guide was developed by an interdisciplinary team including a CCP
5
6
7 physician (JT), a medical student without ties to CCP (JK), a CCP social worker (NG), and a
8
9
10 research assistant without ties to CCP (JH). Two members of the team (JT, JH) had prior
11
12
13 experience in qualitative research methods. The interview guide was further modified after
14
15
16 review by three patients in the intervention arm of the CCP study. The final interview guide
17
18
19 (Appendix A) focused on patients' care experiences during and after their most recent
20
21
22 hospitalization at UCM, with an emphasis on: 1) communication with physicians and nurses in
23
24
25 the hospital setting, particularly surrounding goals of the hospitalization and decision-making; 2)
26
27
28 post-discharge care; and 3) relationship with their PCP and their PCP's role during
29
30
31 hospitalization.
32
33
34

35 36 37 38 **Data collection**

39
40
41
42 Semi-structured interviews, approximately 30 minutes in length, were conducted in-person at
43
44
45 UCM by a medical student and a research assistant, neither with ties to CCP (JK or AK).

46
47
48
49 Patients provided verbal consent for the interview and received a \$30 gift card for participation.

50
51
52
53 All patients had previously provided written consent for the broader CCP study. Patient
54
55
56 characteristics including sex, age, and healthcare utilization were collected from the medical
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 record. This study received approval from the University of Chicago Institutional Review Board
5
6
7 (IRB12-1440).
8
9

10 11 **Data analysis** 12

13
14
15 The interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by the research team; identifiable
16
17 personal data were redacted. The interview transcripts were analyzed using template analysis, a
18
19 methodology developed by Crabtree & Miller.[17] Template analysis was selected as a
20
21 systematic yet flexible methodology that lends itself to analysis across the two groups of
22
23 subjects. The qualitative analysis team (JT, ER, JK) was composed of one CCP physician and
24
25 two medical students. The three team members separately reviewed five interview transcripts (3
26
27 control group; 2 CCP group) and engaged in discussions to develop a preliminary “template”
28
29 (coding guide), a hierarchical organization of the identified themes.[18] Some codes were
30
31 identified inductively and others were rooted in the interview guide questions. Through an
32
33 iterative process, additional codes were added to the template as they arose from the five sample
34
35 transcripts. The three team members then applied the initial template to code the transcripts using
36
37 NVivo 11 (QRS International) software. Two coders reviewed each of the twenty-four
38
39 transcripts. During analysis, the team met weekly to resolve discrepancies in coding through
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discussion, and to revise the template. After the template was finalized, themes were developed
4
5
6
7 through repeated review of codes and discussion. These themes were described, and
8
9
10 representative quotes were selected and agreed upon by the entire research team. The qualitative
11
12
13 analysis team practiced reflexivity through open communication about their preconceptions and
14
15
16 how their roles in patient care relate to their perspective.[19]
17
18
19
20

21 **Patient and public involvement**

22
23
24
25 Three CCP patients provided feedback on the interview guide during development. As a check on the
26
27
28 validity of the analysis, results were reviewed and discussed with the CCP study patient and
29
30
31 community advisory board and with CCP physicians, team members, and administrators.
32
33
34
35

36 **RESULTS**

37 **Patient sample**

38
39
40
41
42 Twenty-four interviews were conducted, 12 with CCP patients and 12 with standard care
43
44
45
46
47 patients. Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1.
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Table 1.** Participant characteristics.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Characteristics	All patients (n=24)	Standard care patients (n=12)	Comprehensive Care Program patients (n=12)
Age in years ^a [mean (standard deviation)]	53 (14)	57 (15)	49 (11)
Female [n (%)]	12 (50)	6 (50)	6 (50)
Years since CCP study enrollment ^a [mean (standard deviation)]	2.7 (1.2)	2.7 (1.3)	2.7 (1.1)
Chronic medical conditions [n (%)]			
Heart failure	11 (46)	7 (58)	4 (33)
Coronary artery disease	6 (25)	4 (33)	2 (17)
Diabetes	11 (46)	7 (58)	4 (33)
End-stage renal disease	10 (42)	5 (42)	5 (42)
Chronic lung disease ^b	8 (33)	7 (58)	1 (8)
Cancer	2 (8)	1 (8)	1 (8)
Rheumatologic disease ^c	2 (8)	0	2 (17)
Other ^d	2 (8)	1 (8)	1 (8)

^a At time of interview.

^b Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, Asthma, Interstitial lung disease, Pulmonary arterial hypertension, Cystic fibrosis.

^c Scleroderma, Crohn's disease.

^d Sickle cell disease, Spina bifida.

1
2
3
4 For CCP and standard care groups combined, 50% were female and the average age was 53
5
6
7 years. Patients had been enrolled in the CCP study for an average of 2.7 years at the time of
8
9
10 interview. All patients had two or more chronic medical conditions. Of the standard care
11
12
13 patients, 67% received primary care from internal medicine resident physicians; all CCP patients
14
15
16 were cared for by attending physicians.
17
18
19
20

21 **Theme 1: Positive attitude towards PCP**

22
23
24
25

26 Themes and additional quotes from interviews are summarized in Table 2.
27
28
29

30 Patient is comfortable talking with their PCP

31
32
33

34 A majority of CCP patients and a few standard care patients described feeling comfortable
35
36
37 conversing with their PCP. Patients in both groups valued that their PCP listened to what they
38
39
40 said. Several CCP patients, but only a few of the standard care patients, thought discussions were
41
42
43 better with their PCP than with hospital providers. A common perception was that the patient
44
45
46 could speak more openly with their PCP.
47
48
49
50
51

52 It's good because I can openly talk to him and not be afraid to tell him if something is not
53
54
55 going right. (Female, standard care)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Several CCP patients also described engaging with their PCP about topics outside of medicine,
5
6
7 including challenging social issues.
8
9

10
11 You want to be straight up with your primary about things. You want to tell him
12
13
14 everything, what's giving you problems. Well my wounds are giving me problems, do
15
16
17 you have any other issues? And you tell him: well depression issues, housing issues.
18
19

20
21 (Male, CCP)
22
23

24
25
26 PCP is caring towards patient
27
28

29
30 Across CCP and standard care, several patients expressed that they felt cared for by their PCP.
31
32

33
34 Patients appreciated that the PCP was concerned about their health and that the physician offered
35
36
37 their time and attention.
38
39

40
41 She sits and talks to me, she [...] connects with me, you know. Not just like business type
42
43
44 thing, but a family type thing. (Male, CCP)
45
46
47

48
49 Shared trust between patient and PCP
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Half of CCP patients, but none of the standard care patients, mentioned shared trust with their
5
6
7 PCP. In several instances, CCP patients stated that their PCP trusted them to make their own
8
9
10 decisions about care. Participants also described an increased level of trust in their CCP's
11
12
13 judgment over time.
14

15
16
17
18 See we have this really good relationship, and she knows that I am an informed patient. I
19
20
21 know my body and I can pretty much tell her more than she can tell me about my body,
22
23
24 and so she trusts me the same way I trust her. (Female, CCP)
25
26
27
28

29 **Table 2.** Themes and exemplary quotes across standard care and Comprehensive Care Program
30 groups.
31

Theme	Standard care patients (n=12)	Comprehensive Care Program patients (n=12)
1. Positive attitude towards PCP	Valued comfort communicating with PCP, and PCP compassion. CCP patients additionally reported shared trust.	<p data-bbox="444 1419 1341 1577"><i>I was able to talk with [PCP], he was able to talk with me, and we were comfortable speaking with each other...I'm going through this, and he's like: 'I understand what you're going through, we're going to do this, this, and this.'</i> (Male, standard care)</p> <p data-bbox="444 1612 1341 1770"><i>...[PCP] lets me know that 'everything's going to be okay, I've got you. If there's anything you need, if you feel like you have any problems, just let me know.' ...you need that on your team sometimes.</i> (Male, CCP)</p>

<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 2. Longitudinal</p> <p>5 continuity with</p> <p>6 PCP valued</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>26</p> <p>27</p> <p>28</p> <p>29</p> <p>30</p> <p>31</p> <p>32</p> <p>33</p> <p>34</p> <p>35</p> <p>36</p> <p>37</p> <p>38</p> <p>39</p> <p>40</p> <p>41</p> <p>42 3. Patient</p> <p>43 preference for</p> <p>44 PCP</p> <p>45 involvement in</p> <p>46 hospital care</p> <p>47</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p> <p>51</p> <p>52</p> <p>53</p> <p>54</p> <p>55</p> <p>56</p> <p>57</p> <p>58</p> <p>59</p> <p>60</p>	<p>Experienced frequent turnover</p> <p>of PCP</p> <p><i>I usually prefer not to see the</i></p> <p><i>residents...I've got a long life-</i></p> <p><i>history as far as medical stuff,</i></p> <p><i>and if I have to go through it</i></p> <p><i>every two years it's not worth it</i></p> <p><i>to me. (Female, standard care)</i></p> <p>Majority preferred some contact</p> <p>with PCP during hospitalization</p> <p><i>I think the team should go back</i></p> <p><i>to the primary care and say:</i></p> <p><i>'This is what we're doing. Do</i></p> <p><i>you have any suggestions for</i></p>	<p>Described longitudinal</p> <p>relationships with their PCP which</p> <p>improved over time</p> <p><i>We've known each other a little</i></p> <p><i>while now, because I was going</i></p> <p><i>through doctors: some come some</i></p> <p><i>go. But I've been with Dr. PCP here</i></p> <p><i>for a minute now, so I try to assess</i></p> <p><i>everything I can do. Let her know</i></p> <p><i>everything about me, so I won't be</i></p> <p><i>uncomfortable with her and she</i></p> <p><i>won't be uncomfortable with me.</i></p> <p><i>So when I do get in a situation like</i></p> <p><i>I'm hurting, I'm in pain, my</i></p> <p><i>anxiety, she'll know straight up</i></p> <p><i>what's going on. She can assess it</i></p> <p><i>right then and there the best way</i></p> <p><i>she can. (Male, CCP)</i></p> <p>Preferred inpatient treatment by</p> <p>PCP due to shared trust and their</p> <p>prior knowledge of the patient</p> <p><i>...it's just a comfortable</i></p> <p><i>feeling... When I'm admitted into</i></p> <p><i>the hospital I feel like they're my</i></p>
--	---	--

<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p>26</p> <p>27</p> <p>28</p> <p>29</p> <p>30</p> <p>31</p> <p>32</p> <p>33</p> <p>34</p> <p>35</p> <p>36</p> <p>37</p> <p>38</p> <p>39</p> <p>40</p> <p>41</p> <p>42</p> <p>43</p> <p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>46</p> <p>47</p> <p>48</p> <p>49</p> <p>50</p> <p>51</p> <p>52</p> <p>53</p> <p>54</p> <p>55</p> <p>56</p> <p>57</p> <p>58</p> <p>59</p> <p>60</p>	<p><i>us?’ Because they know your health better than the new people. (Male, standard care)</i></p> <p>4. Potential for in-depth involvement of PCP during hospitalization often unrealized</p> <p>Most did not interact with their PCP during hospitalization</p> <p><i>Check on me, talk to me, say something. But they don’t. (Male, standard care)</i></p> <p>5. PCP collaboration with hospital-based providers frequently absent</p> <p>Most were not aware of interaction between PCP and hospital providers</p> <p><i>No particular role...while I'm in the hospital, [the PCP] can communicate with doctors if</i></p>	<p><i>security. You get what I'm saying? Like they have my back. If something goes wrong, even if they're not there in the moment, it's only a matter of time before they get there and whatever's the issue, I know I'm going to be treated fairly. (Female, CCP)</i></p> <p>Described active involvement of their PCP in decision-making</p> <p><i>I took [the PCP’s] advice and took the option that she give first as opposed to plan B, plan C, whatever, because she informed me and worked with me and knows my health and how the medication will affect me and what I need to do. (Male, CCP)</i></p> <p>Emphasized PCP’s role aligning the knowledge and goals of various providers</p> <p><i>The people when you come into the hospital: they don't know you...It</i></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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

they needed to communicate with him. (Female, standard care)

takes Dr. PCP and the doctors to get together and communicate with each other. Because he knows me and he knows what I went through—and he went through all that with me—he can communicate with the doctors and tell the doctors about me. With what he knows and what we've been dealing with with my medications...they can give me the better care. (Female, CCP)

PCP, primary care physician.

Theme 2: Longitudinal continuity with PCP valued

Many standard care and CCP patients emphasized that it takes time to build a relationship with a PCP. A majority of standard care participants described discontinuity with their PCPs. A few patients attributed the frequent changes to receiving primary care from residents who graduated and transitioned their patients to new trainees.

1
2
3
4 [...] this'll be my 4th primary care doctor in 10 years. But, you know, you guys do your 2
5
6
7 or 3 year residency, then you're off [...] But at some point you've got to learn, like what
8
9
10 you're doing with me. (Male, standard care)

11
12
13
14 In comparison, CCP patients experienced greater relational continuity with their physician. A
15
16
17 majority of CCP patients mentioned that the relationship with their CCP physician improved
18
19
20 over time as they got to know each other. Two participants described a difficult start that
21
22
23 morphed into a positive relationship.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Once you get to know a person it gets better because you know the first couple of times
31
32
33 it's not going to be smooth sailing. (Male, CCP)
34
35
36

37 **Theme 3: Patient preference for PCP involvement in hospital care**

38
39
40
41 A majority of standard care patients and nearly all CCP patients stated that their PCP should be
42
43
44 involved during hospitalization. However, there was variation in the preferred form of
45
46
47 involvement. A majority of standard care patients thought that ideally a PCP would remain in
48
49
50 communication with their patient during hospitalization.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 It shows they care, they're concerned about my being, my health. And that's a good thing.
5
6

7 (Female, standard care)
8
9
10

11 Patients commonly preferred that this interaction be in person, with a few specifically stating that
12
13 they would prefer to be treated by their PCP while in the hospital. A few standard care patients
14
15 noted that their PCP could have been able to offer emotional support during hospitalization.
16
17
18

19 [...] he probably could have informed me and let me know more about what was going
20
21

22 on, and I would have had less anxiety. I would have felt more relieved. (Male, standard
23
24
25

26 care)
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Further, a few standard care patients thought that a PCP should remain in communication with
34
35 the patient's care team during hospitalization. PCP involvement was considered beneficial due to
36
37 their prior knowledge of the patient's health conditions.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 I don't think he should just be in the office all the time. I think he should know about me
45
46

47 being in the hospital and why and help me to maintain my health. I mean, these other
48
49

50 doctors, they don't really see me that much. They don't know much about me. They just
51
52

53 know what I come in and I complain about, and then they fix that and then they send me
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 on my way? What if I have another issue that they're not aware of that my primary care
5
6
7 doctor is aware of? (Female, standard care)
8
9

10
11 On the other hand, some standard care patients stated that they chose not to reach out to their
12
13
14 PCP during hospitalization due to lack of a relationship with their PCP. Others shared that they
15
16
17 had no expectation of PCP involvement during hospitalization. These patients thought it was
18
19
20 sufficient for the PCP to view records following discharge or answer questions if contacted by
21
22
23 the hospital team.
24
25
26
27
28

29 I just concentrate on the doctors at hand, and I know that they're making notes so he see it
30
31
32 on the chart. I don't have it where I can text him and let him know each time I'm in the
33
34
35 hospital [...] So, by the time I see him, I'm quite sure there's a flag somewhere to let him
36
37
38 know I've been in the hospital, and he can read the chart and see that I've been in the
39
40
41 hospital so. (Female, standard care)
42
43
44
45
46

47 Among CCP patients, all described a preference to be treated by their PCP in the hospital setting. For
48
49
50 several, a PCP's knowledge about their health and personal preferences was thought to expedite care and
51
52
53 improve adherence to previously developed plans.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Besides my opinion, she should be able to make the decision. She should be the one
5
6
7 running stuff. Should no other doctor be running nothing or make no decisions because
8
9
10 you don't know me. (Female, CCP)

11
12
13
14 A few CCP patients also pointed to the shared trust with their PCP. Due to previous hospitalizations or
15
16
17 office visits patients perceived that the PCP had greater understanding of the patient's preferences, and
18
19
20 the patient felt comfortable with the PCP's plan.
21
22

23
24
25
26 [...] I feel like with any other doctor, it would be like: 'You were just ready to go home,
27
28
29 now all of a sudden I say this and you're not feeling well.' I think she knows that it's not
30
31
32 just necessary that I'm not saying I'm not feeling well, I think she knows what I've told
33
34
35 her already, why I like the blood transfusions, so she don't look at it like a ploy. (Female,
36
37
38 CCP)
39
40
41
42

43 **Theme 4: Potential for in-depth involvement of PCP during hospitalization often unrealized**

44
45
46
47
48 There was considerable variation between the two groups in interaction between the patient and
49
50
51 PCP during hospitalization. Most standard care patients did not interact with their PCP during
52
53
54 hospitalization.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 He usually gets the report after I'm out [...] I just go through whatever doctor sees me in
5
6
7 the emergency room, and then they send to the floor. (Female, standard care)
8
9

10
11 For the few patients who described interaction, some initiated, and some were contacted by their
12
13
14 PCP. The form of PCP-patient interaction also varied. A few patients received in person-visits
15
16
17 from their PCP and one talked with their PCP over the phone. Patients expressed positive
18
19
20 feelings towards their PCP visiting them in the hospital. However, there was little elaboration
21
22
23 about how and to what extent the PCP actively participated in their care during hospitalization.
24
25
26

27
28
29 For CCP patients, nearly all described frequent in-person interaction with their PCP during
30
31
32 hospitalization. Most patients discussed their plan of care with the PCP. Half described making
33
34
35 decisions with their PCP about treatment options or the timing of discharge.
36
37
38

39
40 Mainly I talked to my Comprehensive doctor. She's like the main authority over all of
41
42
43 that. They have to talk to her first, you know to see if I'm okay with leaving. She'll come
44
45
46 ask me: 'How do you feel about leaving today?' If I say 'I don't feel like leaving,' she'll
47
48
49 be like: 'You can stay an extra day,' [...] (Male, CCP)
50
51
52

53 54 **Theme 5: PCP collaboration with hospital-based providers frequently absent** 55 56 57

1
2
3
4 There was also significant variation between the two groups in experience of interaction between
5
6
7 the PCP and hospital providers. Only two standard care patients described being aware of
8
9
10 interaction between their PCP and hospital providers, such as providing guidance to the inpatient
11
12
13 care team. A few standard care patients openly expressed uncertainty and concern about whether
14
15
16 their PCP was contacted during their hospitalization.
17
18

19
20
21 I don't know for sure that they're calling him and letting him know or if he's getting the
22
23
24 reports or any of that. I need to know that he's getting this information to know I'm there.
25
26
27

28 (Female, standard care)
29
30

31
32 Among CCP patients, a majority described their PCP being in communication with other hospital
33
34
35 providers. Several of these patients referred to the PCP as leader of their healthcare team in the
36
37
38 hospital. Patients described their PCPs keeping specialists informed and interfacing with the
39
40
41 other providers when the patient had a concern or conflict.
42
43
44

45
46
47 She's my main doctor, so she makes sure everybody gets the email when I'm in the
48
49
50 hospital. They'll know that: 'OK I gotta go see how he's doing, and see if I can give him
51
52
53 any help for his pain or anything.' So that's the best thing I can ask for. That's probably
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 why I switched from another hospital. Since I can just ask my Comprehensive Care
4
5
6
7 anything wrong with me, she'll make sure that all my other doctors know too, so I ain't
8
9
10 gotta be worrying about it, like my pain, or if I miss an appointment they'll all be
11
12
13 informed that I'm in the hospital [...] (Male, CCP)
14
15
16
17

18 DISCUSSION

19
20
21
22 The main aim of this study was to explore frequently hospitalized patients' experiences and
23
24 preferences related to PCP involvement during hospitalization. A unique contribution of this
25
26 study was the qualitative comparison of perspectives of standard care patients who were cared
27
28 for by hospitalists or housestaff teams to those of CCP patients being treated by their own PCP
29
30 during hospitalization.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Both standard care and CCP patients expressed a preference for repeated interactions with their
41
42 PCP over time to build a relationship and shared knowledge. While CCP patients described
43
44 consistent relationships with their PCPs that benefited from shared experiences across inpatient
45
46 and outpatient settings, many standard care patients described relational discontinuity with PCPs,
47
48
49
50 which sometimes weakened these relationships. These results were consistent with prior research
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 that patients prefer, and may benefit from, relational continuity of care with physicians,[20–23]
5
6
7 and that patients' trust in their PCP was associated with the duration of their relationship.[24]
8
9

10
11 It is concerning that in this study of patients with frequent hospitalization and multiple chronic
12
13
14 conditions, many in standard care may not experience the benefits of long-term relational
15
16
17 continuity. Most of the patients experiencing discontinuity received care in a resident clinic
18
19
20 characterized by frequent turnover. It is possible that the purposive sampling of this embedded
21
22
23 qualitative study disproportionately selected for standard care patients with resident PCPs.
24
25
26

27
28 Unfortunately, these patients' experiences with PCP discontinuity are not unique. Previous
29
30
31 studies found that, as compared to patients with attending PCPs, patients with resident PCPs
32
33
34 were more likely to have multiple health conditions, and be non-white, of low socioeconomic
35
36
37 status, and on Medicare or Medicaid insurance.[25–29] Patients who transition care to a new
38
39
40 resident reported challenges including missed tests and difficulty building a relationship with a
41
42
43 new provider.[30] Patients may also experience PCP discontinuity due to the resident clinic
44
45
46
47
48 schedule.[31]
49

50
51
52 A vast majority of patients in this study wanted their PCP to be involved during hospitalization, a
53
54
55 preference consistent with previous findings.[9, 32] Despite the overall preference for PCP
56
57
58

1
2
3 involvement during hospitalization, few standard care patients described actual involvement of
4
5
6
7 their PCP during hospitalization; when involved, the PCP role was usually limited to single visits
8
9
10 or brief conversations with the patient or hospital providers. The finding that a majority of the
11
12
13 standard care patients did not have interaction with their PCPs during hospitalization echoes
14
15
16
17 previous research.[9, 10]
18
19
20

21 In contrast, consistent with the structure of the program, CCP patients described substantial
22
23
24 involvement of their PCPs during hospitalization. A major contribution of this study was in
25
26
27
28 highlighting the value of PCP involvement in the hospital setting through the lens of patients in
29
30
31 CCP. Specifically, patients in CCP emphasized the PCP's role as a leader of their care team.
32
33

34
35 Patients found it reassuring to have their PCP working to align the knowledge and goals of the
36
37
38 various hospital providers. CCP patients expressed that shared trust with their PCP allowed for
39
40
41 more patient involvement in care decisions due to greater patient comfort to voice disagreement,
42
43
44 and PCP respect for the patient's input. As the CCP model is further developed and disseminated
45
46
47
48 to other care settings, longitudinal relationships and direct patient engagement in the inpatient
49
50
51 setting will be important components to uphold.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Inpatient-outpatient relational continuity is a component of other interdisciplinary programs for
5
6
7 frequently hospitalized patients. The nature of team involvement in the inpatient setting varies.
8

9
10 For instance, the University of Colorado intensive outpatient clinic team collaborates with
11
12
13 hospital providers to develop care plans.[33] In the CareMore Health System, hospitalists treat
14
15
16 high-risk patients for a limited duration across the transition from inpatient to rehabilitation or
17
18
19 community settings.[34] Social workers in the Northwestern University Complex High
20
21
22 Admission Management Program provide continuity by rounding on their admitted patients.[35]
23

24
25
26

27 It is unknown if and to what extent findings from this CCP study may translate to programs with
28
29
30 inpatient-outpatient continuity involving a non-PCP provider, or inpatient involvement that is not
31
32
33 direct care. Incorporating patient perceptions into evaluation plans for these interdisciplinary
34
35
36 programs could refine our understanding of the nature of involvement needed.
37
38

39
40
41 In practice, it is uncommon for patients in the United States to be treated by their PCP while
42
43
44 hospitalized. In a sample of 2013 Medicare data, PCPs cared for their own patient in only 14.2%
45
46
47 of hospital admissions.[36] However, for frequently hospitalized patients, increasing PCP
48
49
50 engagement in the inpatient setting may improve patient experiences, even if the PCP is not
51
52
53 providing direct care. PCPs can use their relationship with the patient to help assess preferences
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and identify needs. This may benefit the patient by encouraging patient engagement in decision-
4
5
6
7 making, strengthening the patient-PCP relationship, and improving interdisciplinary coordination
8
9
10 across settings. To achieve this, a first challenge is ensuring that PCPs receive information when
11
12
13 their patient is hospitalized.[37] Health care systems may also consider how to provide PCPs
14
15
16 with time and compensation for communicating with their hospitalized patients and their
17
18
19 inpatient care teams by phone or in-person visit.[38]
20
21
22
23
24

25 There are several limitations of the patient sample and analysis. First, patients recruited for the
26
27
28 embedded qualitative study may have been a healthier and more engaged group than the overall
29
30
31 study population. In the case of CCP patients, those with positive feelings towards the program
32
33
34 may have been most likely to participate. Second, while all CCP patients had attending
35
36
37 physicians as PCPs, 67% of the standard care patients had resident physicians as PCPs. Although
38
39
40 a limitation, it also reflects the reality that complex, vulnerable, patients who experience frequent
41
42
43 hospitalizations often receive primary care from residents. Third, the exclusive focus on PCPs in
44
45
46 the analysis is a limitation. CCP PCPs may share similar roles or characteristics with specialists
47
48
49 or other providers who see patients across care settings.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 CONCLUSION

57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 In summary, this study was a valuable contribution to the existing literature on PCP involvement
5
6
7 during hospitalization due to the qualitative comparison of perspectives of standard care and
8
9
10 CCP patients. Specifically, the results suggested that for frequently hospitalized patients, active
11
12
13 inpatient involvement by a consistent PCP with knowledge of the patient's health and personal
14
15
16 preferences could improve patient experience with interdisciplinary coordination and
17
18
19 engagement in care during hospitalization. For frequently hospitalized patients not being treated
20
21
22 in the hospital by their PCP, future research is needed to clarify which forms of PCP engagement
23
24
25 may be most likely to confer these benefits.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Acknowledgements** Thank you to the patients interviewed in the study for their time and
37
38
39 willingness to discuss their medical care. Thank you also to Andrea Flores, MA for her role in
40
41
42 developing the sampling approach used in this study.
43
44
45
46

47 **Funding** This work was supported by: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Center for
48
49
50 Medicare and Medicaid Innovation grant CMS-1C1-12- 0001; Agency for Healthcare Research
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Quality, Patient Centered Outcomes Research Faculty Development Program grant K12; and
4
5
6
7 National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging grant 5T35AG029795-12.
8
9
10

11 **Author Statement** JT and DM conceptualized the study. JT, DM, VS, JK and LW designed the
12
13
14 methodology. JK and AK conducted the interviews. JT, ER, and JK conducted the analysis and
15
16
17 wrote the original draft. DM, VS, AK, and LW participated in reviewing and editing the
18
19
20
21 manuscript.
22
23
24

25 **Competing interests** None declared.
26
27
28
29

30 **Ethics approval** This study received approval from the University of Chicago Institutional
31
32
33 Review Board (IRB12-1440).
34
35
36
37

38 **Patient consent for publication** None required.
39
40
41

42 **ORCID iDs**

43 Erin Y. Rieger <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0888-5056>

44 Veena Sriram <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7235-253X>

45 Abbie Klein <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1077-1269>

46 Lauren O. Wiklund <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9997-0813>

47 David O. Meltzer <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6728-8729>

48 Joyce W. Tang <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4792-924X>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Data availability statement** Data are available on reasonable request. Transcripts have not been
5 shared to protect anonymity of patients.
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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

REFERENCES

1. Wachter RM, Goldman L. The Hospitalist Movement 5 Years Later. *JAMA* 2002;287:487–94. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.4.487>.
2. Meltzer D, Manning WG, Morrison J, et al. Effects of physician experience on costs and outcomes on an academic general medicine service: results of a trial of hospitalists. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137:866–74.
3. Berger ZD, Boss EF, Beach MC. Communication behaviors and patient autonomy in hospital care: A qualitative study. *Patient Educ Couns* 2017;100:1473–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2017.03.006>.
4. Calkins DR, Davis RB, Reiley P, et al. Patient-physician communication at hospital discharge and patients' understanding of the postdischarge treatment plan. *Arch Intern Med* 1997;157:1026–30. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.1997.00440300148014>
5. Olson DP, Windish DM. Communication discrepancies between physicians and hospitalized patients. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170:1302–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.239>.
6. Figueroa JF, Schnipper JL, McNally K, et al. How often are hospitalized patients and providers on the same page with regard to the patient's primary recovery goal for hospitalization? *J Hosp Med* 2016;11:615–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2569>.
7. Storm M, Davidson L. Inpatients' and providers' experiences with user involvement in inpatient care. *Psychiatr Q* 2010;81:111–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-009-9122-6>.
8. Apker J, Baker M, Shank S, et al. Optimizing Hospitalist-Patient Communication: An Observation Study of Medical Encounter Quality. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2018;44:196–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2017.08.011>.
9. Hruby M, Pantilat SZ, Lo B. How do patients view the role of the primary care physician in inpatient care? *Am J Med* 2001;111:21–5. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9343\(01\)00965-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9343(01)00965-2).
10. Huang KB, Weber U, Johnson J, et al. Primary Care Physician Involvement in Shared Decision Making for Critically Ill Patients and Family Satisfaction with Care. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2018;31:64–72. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2018.01.170211>.
11. Brener SS, Bronksill SE, Comrie R, et al. Association between in-hospital supportive visits by primary care physicians and patient outcomes: A population-based cohort study: PCP

- 1
2
3
4 Visits to Hospitalized Patients. *J Hosp Med* 2016;11:418–24.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2561>.
6
7 12. Adams D, Flores A, Coltri A, et al. A Missed Opportunity to Improve Patient Satisfaction?
8 Patient Perceptions of Inpatient Communication With Their Primary Care Physician. *Am J*
9 *Med Qual* 2016;31:568–76.
10
11 13. Kripalani S, LeFevre F, Phillips CO, et al. Deficits in Communication and Information
12 Transfer Between Hospital-Based and Primary Care Physicians: Implications for Patient
13 Safety and Continuity of Care. *JAMA* 2007;297:831–41.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.297.8.831>.
15
16 14. Seiler A, Visintainer P, Brzostek R, et al. Patient satisfaction with hospital care provided by
17 hospitalists and primary care physicians. *J Hosp Med* 2012;7:131–6.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.973>.
19
20 15. Chen LM, Birkmeyer JD, Saint S, et al. Hospitalist Staffing and Patient Satisfaction in the
21 National Medicare Population: Hospitalist Care and Patient Satisfaction. *J Hosp Med*
22 2013;8:126–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.2001>.
23
24 16. Meltzer DO, Ruhnke GW. Redesigning Care For Patients At Increased Hospitalization
25 Risk: The Comprehensive Care Physician Model. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2014;33:770–7.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0072>.
27
28 17. Crabtree BF, Miller WF. A template approach to text analysis: Developing and using
29 codebooks. In: Crabtree BF, Miller WF, eds. *Doing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks,
30 CA: Sage Publications 1992:93–109.
31
32 18. King N. Template Analysis. In: Simon G and Cassell C, eds. *Qualitative methods and*
33 *analysis in organizational research: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
34 Publications 1998:118–34.
35
36 19. Malterud, K. Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *The*
37 *lancet* 2001;358.9280:483–488.
38
39 20. Aboulghate A, Abel G, Elliott MN, et al. Do English patients want continuity of care, and
40 do they receive it? *Br J Gen Pract* 2012;62:e567–e75.
41 <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp12X653624>.
42
43 21. Waibel S, Henao D, Aller MB, et al. What do we know about patients' perceptions of
44 continuity of care? A meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Int J Qual Health Care*
45 2012;24:39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzr068>.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 22. Bayliss EA, Ellis JL, Shoup JA, et al. Effect of Continuity of Care on Hospital Utilization
5 for Seniors With Multiple Medical Conditions in an Integrated Health Care System. *Ann*
6 *Fam Med* 2015;13:123–9. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1739>.
7
8
9 23. Pereira Gray DJ, Sidaway-Lee K, White E, et al. Continuity of care with doctors—a matter
10 of life and death? A systematic review of continuity of care and mortality. *BMJ Open*
11 2018;8:e021161. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021161>.
12
13 24. Mainous AG, Baker R, Love MM, et al. Continuity of care and trust in one’s physician:
14 evidence from primary care in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Fam Med*
15 2001;33:22–7.
16
17 25. Doctoroff L, McNally D, Vanka A, et al. Inpatient-outpatient Transitions for Patients with
18 Resident Primary Care Physicians: Access and Readmission. *Am J Med* 2014;127:886.e15-
19 20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2014.03.038>.
20
21 26. Zallman L, Ma J, Xiao L, et al. Quality of US Primary Care Delivered by Resident and
22 Staff Physicians. *J Gen Intern Med* 2010;25:1193–7. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-010-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-010-1456-0)
23 1456-0.
24
25 27. Yancy WS, Macpherson DS, Hanusa BH, et al. Patient Satisfaction in Resident and
26 Attending Ambulatory Care Clinics. *J Gen Intern Med* 2001;16:755–62.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2001.91005.x>.
28
29 28. Charlson ME, Karnik J, Wong M, et al. Does experience matter?: A comparison of the
30 practice of attendings and residents. *J Gen Intern Med* 2005;20:497–503.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.0085.x>.
32
33 29. Essien UR, He W, Ray A, et al. Disparities in Quality of Primary Care by Resident and
34 Staff Physicians: Is There a Conflict Between Training and Equity?. *J Gen Intern Med*
35 2019;34:1184–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-04960-5>.
36
37 30. Pincavage AT, Lee WW, Beiting KJ, et al. What Do Patients Think About Year-End
38 Resident Continuity Clinic Handoffs?: A Qualitative Study. *J Gen Intern Med*
39 2013;28:999–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-013-2395-3>.
40
41 31. Wieland ML, Jaeger TM, Bundrick JB, et al. Resident Physician Perspectives on Outpatient
42 Continuity of Care. *J Grad Med Educ* 2013;5:668–73. [https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-05-04-](https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-05-04-40)
43 40.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 32. Shoeb M, Merel SE, Jackson MB, et al. “Can we just stop and talk?” patients value verbal
5 communication about discharge care plans. *J Hosp Med* 2012;7:504–7.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.1937>.
7
8 33. Durfee J, Johnson T, Batal H, et al. The impact of tailored intervention services on charges
9 and mortality for adult super-utilizers. *Healthcare* 2018;6:253–8.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hjdsi.2017.08.004>.
11
12 34. Powers BW, Milstein A, Jain SH. Delivery Models for High-Risk Older Patients: Back to
13 the Future?. *JAMA* 2016;315:23. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2015.17029>.
14
15 35. Theodorou ME, Henschen BL, Chapman M. The Comprehensive Care Plan: A Patient-
16 Centered, Multidisciplinary Communication Tool for Frequently Hospitalized Patients. *Jt*
17 *Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2020;46:217–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2020.01.002>.
18
19 36. Stevens JP, Nyweide DJ, Maresh S, et al. Comparison of Hospital Resource Use and
20 Outcomes Among Hospitalists, Primary Care Physicians, and Other Generalists. *JAMA*
21 *Intern Med* 2017;177:1781–7. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.5824>.
22
23 37. Jones CD, Vu MB, O’Donnell CM, et al. A Failure to Communicate: A Qualitative
24 Exploration of Care Coordination Between Hospitalists and Primary Care Providers Around
25 Patient Hospitalizations. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30:417–24.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-3056-x>.
27
28 38. Goroll AH, Hunt DP. Bridging the Hospitalist–Primary Care Divide through Collaborative
29 Care. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:308–9. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1411416>.
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

Appendix A: Interview Guide

“We’re going to talk for about 30 minutes about your last hospitalization at U Chicago, the people who worked with you then, and your primary care doctor. I’m particularly interested in your thoughts on how you talk with these people, how they talk with you, and how these conversations and relationships affect how you feel. I’m going to record this so I can remember accurately what you said. However, nothing you say will impact your care or your relationship with doctors here; I will be the only one who can connect you to the written record of the interview. You can choose not to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. Shall we get started?”

Think back to your last hospitalization here at University of Chicago.

- 1) Why did you come to the hospital?
- 2) How did you feel about the care you received while you were in the hospital?
- 3) Can you describe your mood while you were in the hospital?
 - a) What made you feel that way?
- 4) In general, how did you feel the conversations went with your medical team during your hospital stay?
 - a) What kinds of things did your doctors and nurses talk with you about?
 - b) Who talked with you most about your medical care, such as any treatments or tests that you would receive?

1
2
3 c) How well did you understand the doctor's plan for your care while you were in the hospital?
4
5

6 d) What did you want to happen as a result of your stay in the hospital?
7
8

9 i) How well did the medical team understand what you wanted?
10
11

12
13 5) I'd like to ask you some questions about how you and your medical team made decisions
14 about your care while you were in the hospital. Think about one important decision that had to be
15 made while you were in the hospital (for example, related to getting a test or procedure or
16 starting a new medication).
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 a) Can you describe that situation to me?
24
25

26 b) Did your doctor present you with different options for your care? Can you tell me about
27 them?
28
29
30

31 c) What was your understanding of the options?
32
33

34 d) How did you feel about the options?
35
36

37 e) How well do you think your doctors understood your opinion on these options?
38
39
40

41 f) Tell me about your involvement in making the decision.
42
43
44

45 g) How do you feel about this decision?
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 6) How was this visit similar to other times you may have been in the hospital before you joined
53 the CCP study?
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 7) How was this visit different than other times you may have been in the hospital before you
4
5 joined the CCP study?
6
7
8
9 8) When you were discharged from the hospital, what kind of instructions were you given on
10
11 caring for yourself?
12
13
14 a) How well did these instructions fit with your daily life?
15
16
17 b) Who helped take care of you after your hospital stay? How well prepared was your
18
19 family/caregiver to care for you after your hospital stay?
20
21
22
23 c) Who was responsible for your follow-up care or for monitoring you or checking in with you
24
25 to make sure that you were doing well after your hospital stay?
26
27
28
29 d) How did you feel about the follow-up care you received?
30
31
32 e) Tell me about how prepared [insert name of clinic doctor or staff] was to care for you after
33
34 your hospital stay.
35
36
37
38 9) Do you have a primary care doctor?
39
40
41 a) Can you describe your relationship with him or her?
42
43
44 b) How do you feel overall about your primary care doctor?
45
46
47
48 i) What do you appreciate most about your primary care doctor?
49
50
51 ii) If there was one thing you would change about your primary care doctor, what would it be?
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 c) How do you feel about your conversations with him or her? Are there differences in the way
4 you talk with your primary care doctor, compared with your discussions with your doctors in the
5 hospital?
6
7
8
9

10
11 d) When you are in the hospital, do you typically stay in touch with your primary care doctor?
12
13 Tell me more about that.
14
15

16
17 e) What role, if any, do you think your primary care doctor should have in your care while you
18 are in the hospital?
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

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

<http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/>

Page/line no(s).

Title and abstract

<p>Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended</p>	<p>pg. 1, line 1</p>
<p>Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions</p>	<p>pg. 2, line 1</p>

Introduction

<p>Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement</p>	<p>pg. 5, line 19</p>
<p>Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions</p>	<p>pg. 6, line 3</p>

Methods

<p>Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 15</p>
<p>Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability</p>	<p>pg. 7, line 17 pg. 8, line 8 pg. 8, line 18 pg. 9, line 7</p>
<p>Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 6, line 5 pg. 6, line 14</p>
<p>Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 7, line 8</p>
<p>Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 9 pg. 8, line 13</p>
<p>Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**</p>	<p>pg. 8, line 7 pg. 9, line 10</p>

1 2 3 4 5	Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	pg. 7, line 17 pg. 8, line 14
6 7 8	Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	pg. 9, line 15
9 10 11 12	Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	pg. 8, line 14
13 14 15 16	Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	pg. 8, line 15
17 18 19 20	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale**	pg. 9, line 11

Results/findings

23 24 25 26	Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory	pgs. 9-18
27 28 29	Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	pgs. 9-18

Discussion

32 33 34 35 36 37	Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	pgs. 18-21
38 39	Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	pg. 20, line 1

Other

42 43 44	Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	pg. 22, line 9
45 46	Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting	pg. 22, line 1

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

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
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. **Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations.** *Academic Medicine*, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014
DOI: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388

For peer review only