



On the Radar

Issue 263

7 March 2016

On the Radar is a summary of some of the recent publications in the areas of safety and quality in health care. Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement or recommendation of any publication or provider. Access to particular documents may depend on whether they are Open Access or not, and/or your individual or institutional access to subscription sites/services. Material that may require subscription is included as it is considered relevant.

On the Radar is available online, via email or as a PDF document from <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/publications-resources/on-the-radar/>

If you would like to receive *On the Radar* via email, you can subscribe on our website <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/> or by emailing us at mail@safetyandquality.gov.au. You can also send feedback and comments to mail@safetyandquality.gov.au.

For information about the Commission and its programs and publications, please visit <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au>

You can also follow us on Twitter @ACSQHC.

On the Radar

Editor: Dr Niall Johnson niall.johnson@safetyandquality.gov.au

Contributors: Niall Johnson

Reports

Triple Aim Strategies to Improve Behavioral Health Care

Health Research & Educational Trust

Chicago, IL: Health Research & Educational Trust; 2016. p. 22.

URL	http://www.hpoe.org/resources/hpoehretaha-guides/2747
Notes	<p>The American Hospital Association, through its Hospitals in Pursuit of Excellence program, have released this brief (22-page) guide that (according to their website) “describes strategies, action steps and examples for hospitals, health systems and community stakeholders working together to develop a well-coordinated, accessible, affordable and accountable system for delivering behavioral health care. ... Effectively addressing behavioral health issues in the community calls for hospitals and health systems to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate behavioral and physical health care services • Build networks or partnerships with community stakeholders—including other hospitals or health systems, clinics, social service agencies, and local and state organizations—to coordinate care • Implement alternative payment models to sustain needed services <p>This approach aligns with the Triple Aim to improve the patient experience of care (including quality and satisfaction), improve the health of populations and reduce the per capita cost of health care.”</p>

National Safety Standards for Invasive Procedures
 NHS England Patient Safety Domain
 London: NHS England; 2015. p. 49.

URL	https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/natssips-safety-standards.pdf
Notes	NHS England has published these standards that are designed to make care safer for patients having invasive procedures. They standards reflect learnings from analyses of near misses, serious incidents, and “never events”. NHS organisations are encouraged to develop and maintain their own standardised procedures and develop methods to evaluate their compliance with them.

Journal articles

Characteristics of hospitals receiving the largest penalties by US pay-for-performance programmes
 Figueroa JF, Wang DE, Jha AK
 BMJ Quality & Safety. 2016 March 3, 2016.

DOI	http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/early/2016/03/03/bmjqs-2015-005040.extract
Notes	Pay for performance schemes are frequently contentious and one of the aspects most-oft raised is whether the measures being used are reflecting performance (or something else). This study looked at the characteristics of those hospitals that have received the largest penalties under the three US national pay-for-performance (P4P) schemes (Hospital Readmission Reduction Program, Hospital Value-Based-Purchasing and Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program). The authors report that they found large hospitals, major teaching and safety-net hospitals were far more likely to be penalised the most by all three national pay-for-performance programmes. They proceed to argue that while “it is possible that these hospitals provide poorer quality of care, recent evidence suggests that much of the observed difference in outcomes like readmissions between high performers and low performers is driven by factors largely outside of a hospitals’ control . These include clinical and social factors like patient's marital status, education level, annual income and patient's baseline functional status. Critics have therefore called into question the extent to which these P4P programmes are targeting variations in quality of care versus variations in patient case-mix. Consequently, multiple organisations have called for legislation that better accounts for appropriate case-mix adjustment to help isolate between hospital variation that actually reflects quality of care.”

The gap between policy and practice: a systematic review of patient-centred care interventions in chronic heart failure
 Kane PM, Murtagh FEM, Ryan K, Mahon NG, McAdam B, McQuillan R, et al.
 Heart Failure Reviews. 2015;20(6):673-87.

DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10741-015-9508-5
Notes	This literature review of patient-centred care in the area of chronic heart failure focused on 15 articles (from the original 13,944 screened) reporting on 10 studies involving 2,540 CHF patients. The patient-centred care interventions focused on collaborative goal setting between patients and their healthcare professionals. Noting that the strength of evidence is poor, the authors report that patient-centred care “has been shown to reduce symptom burden, improve health-related quality of life, reduce readmission rates and enhance patient engagement for patients with CHF”.

For information on the Commission’s work on patient and consumer centred care, see <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-and-consumer-centred-care/>

Better health care: A way forward

Blumenthal D

Journal of the American Medical Association. 2016.

DOI	http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=2499844
Notes	<p>While focused on the American health system this Viewpoint piece in <i>JAMA</i> may prompt reflection on health systems elsewhere. Blumenthal, President of the US Commonwealth Fund, examines three areas where the USA could, in his view, make major improvements that would yield great benefits to the American people. Summarised on the Commonwealth Fund’s webpage (http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/in-brief/2016/mar/better-health-care) these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding access to health care services ... gains would be possible by broadening the Medicaid expansion to additional states; by ensuring the viability of the insurance marketplaces by reaching out to a diverse population of enrollees; and by maintaining the law’s individual mandate. • Controlling the costs of care. The last five years have been marked by modest health care cost growth. Maintaining this low growth rate will require a move away from fee-for-service reimbursement and toward approaches like accountable care organizations and bundled payment. It will also be important to find a way to control the cost of prescription drugs, potentially by allowing Medicare and Medicaid to negotiate with pharmaceutical companies. • Improving quality of care. Reforming payment to reflect—and reward—the quality of care delivered will require simplified measurement systems, data collection that can deliver feedback in close to real time, and the ability for medical information to follow patients through the health care system.

Australian Journal of Primary Health

Volume 22(1) 2016

URL	http://www.publish.csiro.au/nid/262/issue/8046.htm
Notes	<p>A new issue of <i>Australian Journal of Primary Health</i> has been published, with the theme ‘Commissioning in Primary Healthcare: The Rhetoric and the Reality’.</p> <p>Articles in this issue of <i>Australian Journal of Primary Health</i> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioning services and Primary Health Networks (Mark Booth and Anne-marie Boxall) • Commissioning: perspectives from the ground (Paresh Dawda, Angelene True and Leanne Wells) • Something old, something new, something borrowed, something blue? Reviewing the evidence on commissioning and health services (Suzanne Robinson, Helen Dickinson and Leanne Durrington) • Children and young people in out-of-home care: canaries in the coal mine of healthcare commissioning (Susan M Webster) • Commissioning for healthcare: a case study of the general practitioners After Hours Program (Karen Carlisle, Rhonda Fleming and Alison Berrigan) • A strategy to reposition the South Australian health system for quality and value (Sinéad O'Brien, Nicola Edge and Simon Clark)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioning in New Zealand: learning from the past and present (Jacqueline Cumming) • A rapid review of the impact of commissioning on service use, quality, outcomes and value for money: implications for Australian policy (Karen Gardner, G. Powell Davies, Karen Edwards, Julie McDonald, Terry Findlay, Rachael Kearns, Chandni Joshi and Mark Harris) • Challenges of commissioning and contracting for integrated care in the National Health Service (NHS) in England (Rachael Addicott) • Community service contracting for older people in urban China: a case study in Guangdong Province (Wenyi Lin) • Regional health workforce planning through action research: lessons for commissioning health services from a case study in Far North Queensland (Annette June Panzera, Richard Murray, Ruth Stewart, Jane Mills, Neil Beaton and Sarah Larkins)
--	--

Journal of Health Services Research & Policy
 April 2016; Vol. 21, No. 2

URL	http://hsr.sagepub.com/content/21/2?etoc
Notes	<p>A new issue of the <i>Journal of Health Services Research & Policy</i> has been published. Articles in this issue of the <i>Journal of Health Services Research & Policy</i> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editorial: How to improve the quality of evidence when new treatments are funded conditional on collecting evidence of effectiveness and safety (David Glynn, Bruce Campbell, Mirella Marlow, and Hannah Patrick) • The PRISMS taxonomy of self-management support: derivation of a novel taxonomy and initial testing of its utility (Gemma Pearce, H L Parke, H Pinnock, E Epiphanou, C L A Bourne, A Sheikh, and S JC Taylor) • An innovative strategy to increase a professional workforce: the fast track initiative for health visitors in England (Lynn Sayer, K Louise Barriball, Julie Bliss, Savita Bakhshi, and Alison E While) • How is feedback from national clinical audits used? Views from English National Health Service trust audit leads (Angelina Taylor, Jenny Neuburger, Kate Walker, David Cromwell, and Oliver Groene) • Trends in job satisfaction among German nurses from 1990 to 2012 (Mohamad Alameddine, Jan Michael Bauer, M Richter, and A Sousa-Poza) • Using institutional theory to analyse hospital responses to external demands for finance and quality in five European countries (Susan Burnett, Peter Mendel, Francisco Nunes, Siri Wiig, Hester van den Bovenkamp, A Karlun, G Robert, J Anderson, C Vincent, and N Fulop) • Measuring and improving performance • What happens when GPs engage in commissioning? Two decades of experience in the English NHS (Rosalind Miller, Stephen Peckham, Anna Coleman, Imelda McDermott, Stephen Harrison, and Kath Checkland)

URL	http://ajm.sagepub.com/content/31/2?etoc
Notes	<p>A new issue of the <i>American Journal of Medical Quality</i> has been published. Articles in this issue of the <i>American Journal of Medical Quality</i> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editorial: Off-Label Prescribing: Justified or Not? (Xiulu Ruan and Alan David Kaye) • Clinical Decision Support for Early Recognition of Sepsis (Robert C Amland and Kristin E Hahn-Cover) • Improving Depression Care Through an Online Learning Collaborative (Melissa Starkey, Dawn Wiest, and Amir Qaseem) • Performance Feedback Improves Compliance With Quality Measures (Veronica Loy, James Kwiatt, Amar Dodda, Eric Martin, Ashish Dua, and Kia Saeian) • Clinical Quality Improvement Curriculum for Faculty in an Academic Medical Center (Mamata Yanamadala, Lisa G Criscione-Schreiber, Jeffrey Hawley, Mitchell T Heflin, and Bimal R Shah) • Reduction in Central Line–Associated Bloodstream Infection Rates After Implementations of Infection Control Measures at a Level 3 Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (Vikramaditya Dumpa, Bonny Adler, Delena Allen, Deborah Bowman, Amy Gram, Pat Ford, and Sulaiman Sannoh) • Organization Complexity and Primary Care Providers’ Perceptions of Quality Improvement Culture Within the Veterans Health Administration (Danijela Korom-Djakovic, Anne Canamucio, Michele Lempa, Elizabeth M Yano, and Judith A Long) • Finding Order in Chaos: A Review of Hospital Ratings (Wenke Hwang, Jordan Derk, Michelle LaClair, and Harold Paz) • An Education- and Telephone-Based Intervention to Improve Follow-up to Vision Care in Patients With Diabetes: A Prospective, Single-Blinded, Randomized Trial (Camila S Zangalli, Ann P Murchison, Nicole Hale, Lisa A Hark, Laura T Pizzi, Yang Dai, Benjamin E Leiby, and Julia A Haller) • Interdisciplinary Quality Improvement Conference: Using a Revised Morbidity and Mortality Format to Focus on Systems-Based Patient Safety Issues in a VA Hospital: Design and Outcomes (Wendy H Gerstein, Judith Ledford, Jacqueline Cooper, Melissa G Lloyd, Timothy Moore, Farzana Harji, Vivian Twitty, Annette Brooks, R C Oliver, and J M Goff, Jr) • Alabama Physicians and Accountable Care Organizations: Will What We Don’t Know Hurt Us? (M Paige Powell, Lindsey R Post, and Blake A Bishop) • Partnering With VA Stakeholders to Develop a Comprehensive Patient Safety Data Display: Lessons Learned From the Field (Qi Chen, Marlina H. Shin, Jeffrey A Chan, Jennifer L Sullivan, Ann M Borzecki, Michael Shwartz, Peter E Rivard, Jonathan Hatoun, and Amy K Rosen) • Measuring Quality in Ambulatory Orthopedic Surgery (Ravi Vaswani, Lorraine Hutzler, and Joseph Bosco) • No Neonate Left Behind: A QI Approach to Critical Congenital Heart Screening in the NICU (Sarah Drennan, Jessica Clarke-Pounder, and Maureen Walsh Koricke)

URL	http://journals.lww.com/jhqonline/toc/2016/03000
Notes	<p>A new issue of the <i>Journal for Healthcare Quality</i> has been published. Articles in this issue of the <i>Journal for Healthcare Quality</i> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advancing a Culture of Health: Population Health Programs in Place at Essential Hospitals and Academic Medical Centers (2012–2014) (Perez, Bianca; Szekendi, Marilyn K.; Taylor-Clark, Kalahn; Vaughn, Jocelyn; Susman, Katherine) • The Use of the Whole Primary-Care Team, Including Community Health Workers, to Achieve Success in Increasing Colon Cancer Screening Rate (Arsenault, Paul R.; John, Laura St.; O'Brien, Liam M.) • Pathway to Best Practice in Spirometry in the Ambulatory Setting (Peracchio, Carol) • Innovation Practice Using Pervasive Mobile Technology Solutions to Improve Population Health Management: A Pilot Study of Gestational Diabetes Patient Care in Australia (Wickramasinghe, Nilmini; Gururajan, Raj) • Patient Factors Predictive of Hospital Readmissions Within 30 Days (Kroch, Eugene; Duan, Michael; Martin, John; Bankowitz, Richard A.) • How Hospitals Reengineer Their Discharge Processes to Reduce Readmissions (Mitchell, Suzanne E.; Martin, Jessica; Holmes, Sally; van Deusen Lukas, Carol; Cancino, R; Paasche-Orlow, M; Brach, C; Jack, B)

BMJ Quality and Safety online first articles

URL	http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/early/recent
Notes	<p><i>BMJ Quality and Safety</i> has published a number of 'online first' articles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilising a team for the WHO Surgical Safety Checklist: a qualitative video study (Terhi Korhakangas) • Patient-centred bedside rounds—exploring patient preferences before patient-centred care (Naseema B Merchant, Daniel G Federman) • Editorial: Between the guidelines: SQUIRE 2.0 and advances in healthcare improvement practice and reporting (Hilary Mosher, Greg Ogrinc) • Editorial: Adherence: the Holy Grail? (Christine M Bond) • The denominator problem: national hospital quality measures for acute myocardial infarction (Jeffrey Bruckel, Xiu Liu, Samuel F Hohmann, Andrew S Karson, Elizabeth Mort, David M Shahian) • Characteristics of hospitals receiving the largest penalties by US pay-for-performance programmes (Jose F Figueroa, David E Wang, Ashish K Jha)

International Journal for Quality in Health Care online first articles

URL	http://intqhc.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/recent?papetoc
Notes	<p><i>International Journal for Quality in Health Care</i> has published a number of 'online first' articles, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association between accessibility to emergency cardiovascular centers and cardiovascular mortality in Japan (Akiko Kada, Naohiro Yonemoto, Hiroyuki Yokoyama, Hiroshi Nonogi, J-PULSE III Investigators)

Online resources

Medical Devices Safety Update

Volume 4, Number 2, March 2016

<http://www.tga.gov.au/publication-issue/medical-devices-safety-update-volume-4-number-2-march-2016>

The Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) has released the latest edition of its medical device safety bulletin. Topics covered in this issue include:

- **Endoscope reprocessing** 'top hazard' – the Emergency Care Research Institute has named inadequate cleaning of endoscopes as the top health technology hazard worldwide, followed by **clinical alarm hazards**.
- **Device cybersecurity**
- **Safely retaining devices** – how to safely retain devices after a medical device incident before sending them to the TGA or returning them to the sponsor/manufacturer for analysis.
- **Sponsor workshops** – upcoming TGA workshops for medical device sponsors to explain their post-market roles and responsibilities.
- **Recent safety alerts**.

[USA] AHRQ Health Literacy Universal Precautions Toolkit

<http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/quality-resources/tools/literacy-toolkit/index.html>

The US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality has released a second edition of its Health Literacy Universal Precautions Toolkit. The Toolkit is designed to help primary care practices reduce the complexity of health care, increase patient understanding of health information, and enhance support for patients of all health literacy levels.

For information on the Commission's work on health literacy, including the *National Statement on Health Literacy*, see <http://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/patient-and-consumer-centred-care/health-literacy/>

[UK] NICE Guidelines and Quality Standards

<http://www.nice.org.uk>

The UK's National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) has published new (or updated) guidelines and quality standards. The latest updates are:

- NICE Quality Standard QS116 **Domestic violence** and abuse <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs116>
- NICE Quality Standard QS117 Preventing **excess winter deaths** and illness associated with cold homes <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs117>
- NICE Guideline NG44 **Community engagement**: improving health and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng44>

[USA] AHRQ Perspectives

<https://psnet.ahrq.gov/perspectives>

The Perspectives on Safety section of the US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's website features expert viewpoints on current themes in patient safety. Three new perspectives have been posted:

- **Accountability in Patient Safety** – this Annual Perspective reviews the context of the "no blame" movement and the recent shift toward a framework of a just culture, which incorporates appropriate accountability in health care.

- ***Burnout Among Health Professionals and Its Effect on Patient Safety*** – this Annual Perspective summarises studies published in 2015, with a particular focus on the relationship between burnout and patient safety, and interventions to address burnout among clinicians.
- ***Computerized Provider Order Entry and Patient Safety*** – this Annual Perspective summarizes novel findings and research directions in computerized provider order entry in 2015.

Disclaimer

On the Radar is an information resource of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The Commission is not responsible for the content of, nor does it endorse, any articles or sites listed. The Commission accepts no liability for the information or advice provided by these external links. Links are provided on the basis that users make their own decisions about the accuracy, currency and reliability of the information contained therein. Any opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care.