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Electronic care coordination systems for people with advanced progressive illness: a mixed-methods evaluation in Scottish primary care

INTRODUCTION
Identifying people who would benefit from a palliative care approach, and ensuring that their needs and preferences are documented and shared across settings, is essential to providing well-coordinated care. Electronic Palliative Care Co-ordination Systems (EPaCCS) are being developed to enable sharing of patient information, preferences across care settings, and inform emergency and out-of-hours care. Across the UK, regional systems include Coordinate My Care (London), the South-West EPaCCS, and the Leeds EPaCCS. In Scotland, the Key Information Summary (KIS) was introduced in 2013 as an electronic care coordination system for anyone who might have urgent care needs, not just those identified for palliative care. A KIS is created in primary care by GPs (in contrast to Coordinate My Care and other EPaCCS that allow users in a variety of settings to create and update a patient record). A KIS allows selected parts of the GP electronic patient record to be shared with emergency services, accident and emergency departments, ambulance services, hospitals, community nursing teams, and some specialist palliative care services.

A KIS record facilitates ‘anticipatory care’, a person-centred care planning process requiring healthcare professionals to work with individuals, carers, and their families, to discuss and document their goals and priorities for care. For people with an advanced progressive illness, this includes information on cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) status, preferences for place of care or death, treatment escalation plans, carer details, and anticipatory medicines. An evaluation conducted in 2014, examined 605 patient records from nine general practices in one NHS board area and found that 60% of those who died with an advanced progressive illness had a KIS by the time of death. Overall, KIS’s were started 18 weeks before death, and those with a KIS were more likely to die in the community (n = 390) preferred place of care. People with a KIS included resuscitation status and 55% of KIS related to preferences for place of care.5 A recent systematic review found that evidence on EPaCCS is mostly expert opinion, and few rigorous evaluations have been conducted.7 There is some evidence...
that people with an EPaCCS record are more likely to die in their preferred place compared with the general population.4,10–12
Given the drive to roll out EPaCCS across the UK by 2021, including the KIS across Scotland,13,14 ongoing evaluation is needed.9
This study aimed to describe the evidence on the roll-out of a national electronic care coordination system, with specific reference to palliative care. The authors sought to:
estimate the proportion of people with an advanced progressive illness who had a KIS by the time of death and to determine when the KIS was started;
examine which elements of anticipatory care planning were most frequently recorded in the KIS;
and to explore general practice staff perceptions of the KIS to inform future innovations in electronic care coordination systems.

METHODS
Design
This was a mixed-methods study consisting of a retrospective review of the records of all patients who died in 18 Scottish general practices in four NHS board areas in 2017, and semi-structured interviews with at least one healthcare professional in each practice.

Recruitment of general practices
In Scotland, GPs are trained in generalist palliative care and provide palliative and end-of-life care to their patients, seeking advice and input from a specialist team as required. Average general practice list size in Scotland is approximately 6000 patients, though there is a large degree of variability.15
This study sought to recruit practices ranging in size from just >1000 patients to >10 000 patients. Practices located in urban, suburban, and rural areas were purposively sampled. The authors identified 18 general practices varying in size and rurality across four NHS boards: Lothian, Fife, Ayrshire and Arran, and Tayside. Based on previous studies it was estimated that this would provide a sample of 1200 to 1300 patients.8 Practices were informed of the study by the National Clinical Lead for Palliative Care member of the research team, or were contacted if they had been involved in previous studies with the research team.

Quantitative data collection and analysis; retrospective review of patient records
A GP, currently working in palliative medicine, collected data for all patients in each practice who died in 2017. Patients who died because of cancer, frailty, dementia, or organ failure (including liver, heart, renal, or pulmonary failure) were judged as having an advanced progressive illness. Data collected included dominant trajectory of decline, that is, cancer, organ failure, frailty and/or dementia; place of death; whether specific components of anticipatory care planning were documented in the KIS; and when information was first documented (see Supplementary Figure 1). One author rated each KIS as ‘highly useful’, ‘useful’, or of ‘limited use’, in guiding emergency or out-of-hours care at the end of life. These categories were developed by the multidisciplinary research team for the purpose of this evaluation and are described below:
• highly useful — clear plan regarding patient, and ideally family, wishes regarding current care and future planning;
• useful — some additional useful clinical information, but no clear wishes regarding current care or future planning; and
• limited use — a KIS present but no additional information added, no relevant boxes ticked, no free-text note.

Data were recorded in Excel and imported to IBM SPSS (version 24) for analysis. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines were followed for reporting purposes.16

Qualitative data collection and analysis
Semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted by one of the authors, a general practice nurse trained in qualitative research methods. Most participants were GPs, as they create and update the KIS, and some worked in out-of-hours primary
Figure 1. Proportion of patients with a Key Information Summary (KIS) in place before death, and if so, the median number of weeks before death KIS was started by trajectory. Percentages rounded to nearest whole.

Table 1. Descriptive overview of 1034 patient records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of anticipatory care planning of total records with a KIS, n(%)</th>
<th>Frailty/dementia</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Organ failure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resuscitation status recorded</td>
<td>222 (74)</td>
<td>186 (65)</td>
<td>72 (58)</td>
<td>482 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative care summary commenced</td>
<td>66 (22)</td>
<td>210 (73)</td>
<td>38 (30)</td>
<td>314 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred place of care recorded</td>
<td>180 (60)</td>
<td>152 (53)</td>
<td>58 (44)</td>
<td>390 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred place of final care/death recorded</td>
<td>153 (51)</td>
<td>118 (41)</td>
<td>36 (29)</td>
<td>307 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory medication started before death</td>
<td>71 (24)</td>
<td>106 (38)</td>
<td>27 (22)</td>
<td>206 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next of kin or carer recorded in KIS</td>
<td>196 (66)</td>
<td>156 (54)</td>
<td>72 (58)</td>
<td>424 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next of kin or carer contact details in KIS</td>
<td>127 (42)</td>
<td>129 (45)</td>
<td>56 (45)</td>
<td>312 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of anticipatory care planning, median weeks before death</th>
<th>Frailty/dementia</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Organ failure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIS commenced before death</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resuscitation status discussed before death</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palliative care summary commenced before death</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred place of care documented before death</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred place of final care documented before death</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipatory medication prescribed before death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of death, n(%)</th>
<th>Frailty/dementia</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Organ failure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>168 (41)</td>
<td>149 (41)</td>
<td>158 (60)</td>
<td>475 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>56 (14)</td>
<td>96 (27)</td>
<td>78 (29)</td>
<td>232 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care home</td>
<td>174 (43)</td>
<td>24 (7)</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>211 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>78 (22)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>84 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>32 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Variation. Practices varied in relation to KIS generation and completion. The proportion...
of patients with an advanced progressive illness who died with a KIS varied from 53% to 81% across practices. Documentation of resuscitation status within the KIS varied from 32% to 91%. Documentation of preferred place of death also varied, from 13% to 71% across practices (data not shown). Once a KIS was generated, it was updated iteratively, with information on resuscitation status, preferred place of care, preferred place of death, and anticipatory medicines added subsequently, though the order in which these components were added varied (data not shown).

### Association between KIS and place of death

Overall, 46% of patients died in hospital (Table 1). An χ² test was performed to examine the likelihood of dying in a community setting for those with a KIS compared with those with no KIS. For this analysis, ‘community’ consisted of deaths at home, in care homes, or in a hospice (51%, n = 527). Sixty-one per cent of those with a KIS died in the community compared to 30% of those without (Figure 2). There was a statistically significant association between having a KIS and dying in a community setting, \( \chi^2 = 86.2, \ P < 0.001 \). The odds of dying in the community were 3.7 times higher with a KIS than without one.

### Qualitative findings

**Participants.** Telephone interviews were conducted with staff in each practice. In 17 practices a GP was interviewed, and in one practice a group interview with two nurses took place. GPs had an average of 19 years’ experience (range 3 to 32 years). Ten of the GP participants also worked out-of-hours shifts.

For characteristics of interview participants see Table 2.

**Triggers for creating a KIS.** Triggers for creating a KIS included an advanced progressive illness, in particular dementia or cancer; frailty along with declining functional status; complex comorbidities, and complex mental health issues. Patients who frequently called an out-of-hours department or were admitted to hospital were also identified for a KIS. A request from the hospital could trigger a KIS. Some GPs started a KIS if they felt the patient would be unable to describe their medical history clearly:

‘... so there’s the ... nursing home patients, the dying patients, the people who [have] cancer going through a cancer journey if it’s at all awkward or complicated ...’ [Participant P] 6, Male [M], GP

‘I would most likely do it when I feel like a patient would be at risk ... if they wouldn’t be able to accurately tell their medical history to someone who’s working.’ [P8, M, GP]

People with cancer were more likely to have a KIS, but there was growing awareness that people with other advanced progressive conditions could benefit:

‘I think if you’ve got cancer you’re more likely to get a KIS ... but ... for the last couple of years ... we’re all getting better at recognising palliative care needs and hence putting in KIS data on folk with other non-cancer related problems ... severe heart failure, severe respiratory disease, dementia ...’ [P4, M, GP]

Some participants noted that it is still harder to remember to start a KIS for people with advanced progressive illnesses other than cancer, as there is often no clear trigger to start the conversation or process:

‘I’d say ... it’s harder to remember to do them [KIS], for people [with chronic conditions] ... we don’t have a particular way of flagging up and reminding people it’s a good idea for patients who’ve got ... more chronic conditions.’ [P13, Female [F], GP]

All practices held palliative or anticipatory care planning meetings, though these varied in frequency from weekly to once every 3 months. Following the palliative care meetings, the KIS would be reviewed or updated if new information needed to be added:

‘We discuss ... our palliative patients certainly in pretty much every meeting ... we aim to quickly run through the KIS and
Participants were aware of tools, such as the Supportive and Palliative Care Indicators Tool (SPICT)\(^{19}\) and the Scottish Patients at Risk of Readmission and Admission (SPARRA) score,\(^{20}\) to help identify patients for a palliative care approach and a KIS, but formal screening tools were rarely used:

‘… we get a feel of the frequency of contact, the nature of their problems and we decide it on that sort of basis, so no formalised way of doing it.’ \(\text{[P6, M, GP]}\)

Discussions about palliative care were started more readily following a significant event, such as a recent diagnosis of advanced progressive illness or hospital admission. It was more difficult for GPs to start discussions about palliative care where a person living at home was gradually becoming frail. Though, often when they did, they found that the person had already accepted a shift of focus from prolonging life to quality of life:

‘... if we’re seeing patients just ourselves and they’re maybe getting frail [and] elderly then we’d maybe talk to them about palliative care rather than active care — that is quite a difficult group to bring up that subject [with] though ... but then actually often people do surprise us and they’ve got to that conclusion long before we have and are quite happy to have it acknowledged.’ \(\text{[P3, F, GP]}\)

\textbf{Components of anticipatory care planning within the KIS.} All participants perceived the free-text section or ‘special notes’ as particularly useful:

‘Some of us use the special note a lot ... I use it every single time ... instead of ticking boxes and adding diagnoses actually putting some real-life information in I think is important ...’ \(\text{[P5, M, GP]}\)

Clinical information on the level of intervention or treatment for the patient was often documented in the ‘special notes’ section and deemed very helpful for out-of-hours care. Specifics about the patient and family dynamics, preferred place of death, living situation, and accessibility regarding visiting the person at home, were also often recorded in the ‘special notes’ section and considered highly useful:

‘Out-of-hours [it’s] the special notes box that I go for, the most useful bit because of clinical information and ceiling of care ... really useful information.’ \(\text{[P12, F, GP]}\)

\textbf{Perceived usefulness of the KIS for out-of-hours care.} Almost all GPs and practice nurses recognised the value of the KIS for out-of-hours and emergency care, especially those who have experience of delivering out-of-hours care:

‘I think the concept of having a shared summary with key information between all the different branches of ... primary and secondary care is exceptionally helpful, exceptionally useful.’ \(\text{[P13, F, GP]}\)

‘I do out-of-hours work as well so I know how helpful it can be when the KIS is updated properly and I also know how unhelpful and frustrating it can be when there’s no KIS.’ \(\text{[P9, M, GP]}\)

\textbf{Suggested improvements.} Seven participants used the word ‘clunky’ to describe the KIS. Several related this to the incompatibility of the KIS with other clinical systems, such as those used by district nurses or social care. Participants also felt that KIS completion involved duplication of effort, as they had to re-enter some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Experience in role, years</th>
<th>Computer system</th>
<th>Out-of-hours experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(F = \text{female.} \ M = \text{male.}\)
information into the KIS that was already held within the patient’s medical record. Many argued that this duplication could be reduced with more intelligent computer systems that could pull data between systems to auto-complete more aspects of the KIS:

‘... at the moment there is this ... feeling that you’re duplicating what you’re having to do so it’s almost as if that information could be gathered from the notes that you’re already putting into the system rather than having to put it in again.’ [P17, F, GP]

‘Um I think it’s clunky ... Because firstly to have five different tabs with multiple little boxes as a busy GP that’s not likely to be easily filled in very quickly ... I think that secondly as an out-of-hours doctor, [it is better] to have a paragraph which is very obvious which flashes up on your out-of-hours system. It gives you the current situation and any plans in one place as opposed to clicking on various screens and scrolling down.’ [P7, M, GP]

The anticipatory care plan check box on its own had limited value, as much anticipatory care planning information was contained within the ‘special notes’ section of the KIS. However, if an additional anticipatory care plan was available, participants said that a link from the KIS to this care plan would be useful:

‘I think maybe the anticipatory care planning bit could be expanded ... I think it could be a tick box to say like COPD [chronic obstructive pulmonary disease] anticipatory care plans ... with a link to print out what the anticipatory care plan was for ... they could be added on to that to give to the patient an actual written document with bigger writing that they can see.’ [P3, F, GP]

Participants recommended that staff external to primary care should be able to contribute to the KIS.

Some participants proposed that patients and carers should have more information about the KIS so they could request one. One participant suggested that the KIS should be developed in such a way that patients and carers could contribute to them:

‘I think the other thing would be better patient and carer information because ... they could and should come and ask ... ’I need a KIS’, do people know [about the KIS and to ask]? ’ [P15, M, GP]

‘... trying to develop a KIS that the carers could contribute [to].’ [P2, M, GP]

Knowing when to review the KIS was sometimes problematic, a notification as a reminder to review a KIS would help ensure that a KIS is updated more regularly:

‘I do some out-of-hours shifts as well ... for me ... the thing that is most helpful is the special notes but one of the challenges in ensuring that that’s up to date. Very often as an out-of-hours GP you’re reading special notes that are really out of date and not terribly helpful but you know if that bit’s done properly that can be really really helpful.’ [P17, F, GP]

A few participants suggested that clear guidance on the type of information to include in the special notes section would be useful:

[A] way to [improve the KIS] would be to encourage use of special note more somehow and perhaps guidance on how that function could be used better.’ [P5, M, GP]

DISCUSSION

Summary

The evaluation found that 69% (n = 712) of people who died with an advanced progressive illness had a KIS. People with cancer were most likely to have a KIS (80%, n = 288), whereas those with organ failure were least likely (47%, n = 125). Most people who died with frailty and/or dementia had a KIS that was typically started >1 year before death (Table 1).

The existence of an electronic care coordination record indicates that anticipatory care planning, or perhaps even early palliative care, had commenced. Over two-thirds of people with a KIS had their resuscitation status documented (68%, n = 482), and just over half had place of care preferences documented (55%, n = 390). However, for many others this information was not recorded, and there was wide variation in levels of KIS completion across practices. Despite this, the vast majority of KIS’s were judged to be useful, with the free-text section [special notes] providing the most useful information to guide emergency and out-of-hours care.

The existence of a KIS was positively associated with dying in the community (home, care home, or hospice), and those with a KIS were more likely to die in a community setting (Figure 2).
Drawing on these findings, the authors outline several considerations for the development of electronic care coordination systems (Box 1).

**Strengths and limitations**

Overall, 1304 patient records were analysed from 18 diverse general practices across four NHS boards, resulting in a more generalisable sample than is possible in single-site studies. The majority of the 17 GPs interviewed did out-of-hours work, thus offering clear insights on electronic care coordination systems from the perspective of professionals working both in-hours and out-of-hours. Two practice nurses were also interviewed; however, a larger number of practice nurses may have provided more diverse responses. The study steering group was composed of stakeholders from academia, policy, ehealth, general practice, specialist palliative care, and community nursing, thus ensuring relevance to practice.

In terms of limitations, ratings of KIS usefulness had face validity, and were based on subjective judgement. The GP researcher needed to be located within each general practice when categorising each KIS (as patient identifiable information was not collected), and independent rating by a second rater was not practical. To guide the researcher, the usefulness categories were generated through consensus within the research team, and examples of each category were agreed in advance to guide judgements.

The records of deceased patients were examined, so data analysis was based on completed KIS. However, healthcare professionals visiting a patient earlier on in their illness may not have complete KIS information as the KIS is updated iteratively over time. Consequently, data on KIS completeness and usefulness reflect KIS content at the end of life only. Earlier on in a person’s illness, the KIS may contain less information and may not be as useful.

It is possible that only practices that are proactive in the generation of KIS were identified for participation. However, the present study analyses show a wide variation in KIS utilisation across practices, showing that practices with relatively low levels of KIS generation were also recruited.

**Comparison with existing literature**

The proportion of people with a shared electronic care coordination record has increased from 60% to 69% when compared with the authors’ 2014 evaluation.\(^6\) This is also higher than reported in an evaluation of the Leeds EPaCCS, which found that 26.8% of patients dying with chronic advanced diseases between 2014 and 2015 had an EPaCCS.\(^6\) The present findings also suggest that KIS are now created earlier than before; a median of 45 weeks before death, compared with 18 weeks in 2014.\(^8\)

People with cancer were most likely to have a KIS (80%, n = 288), whereas those with organ failure were least likely (47%, n = 125). This reflects previous findings.\(^1,8,21-23\) A diagnosis of advanced cancer often triggers anticipatory care planning discussions, but for people with organ failure, the triggers are less clear.\(^26\)

Different illness trajectories might affect the appropriate time of starting a KIS. Rapidly progressive cancer has a shorter final phase than frailty, so a KIS may be most relevant in the final weeks to months. In contrast, the slow decline experienced by people with frailty and/or dementia suggests that starting a KIS early would be appropriate.

Informal or family carers play a vital role in caring for the person with an advanced progressive illness and enabling them to remain in a home setting.\(^32\) However, carers were not always identified in the KIS. Challenges to identifying carers of people with a terminal illness have been documented.\(^26,27\) General practices could be more proactive in identifying and documenting carer information within the KIS so that informal carers can be contacted quickly in the event of an unexpected or rapid change in the patient’s health.

Significantly, the existence of an electronic care coordination record was found to be positively associated with dying in the community [home, care home, or hospice] (Figure 2). This supports findings

---

**Box 1. Considerations for the development of electronic care coordination systems**

- Develop systems that can accommodate free-text information and provide guidance on what might be contained within free-text section(s). This might include clinical information, family dynamics, patient access information, and treatment preferences.
- Optimise interoperability so that relevant clinical information contained within the GP systems can be routinely extracted to populate fields.
- Enable write-access for all key professionals involved in the patient’s care.
- Minimise duplication of tick boxes thus reducing inconsistencies.
- Improve documentation of timing information so it is clear when information was last updated, and when it will next be reviewed.
- Include a clear section on carer information, to specify, carer(s’) name(s), relationship to carer, and contact information.
- Brand and promote any new electronic care coordination system so it is viewed by the public as something that is helpful to have for any illness, and that they can request from their GP.
from previous evaluations. From a South West England evaluation based on people who died between 2011 and 2012, Wye et al found that most people with an EPaCCS died in the community (range 87% to 93%), but noted selection bias given that so few patients expected to die within 1 year actually had an EPaCCS record (range 9% to 13%).26 Wye et al suggested that the high proportion of community deaths may be due to the type of patients with an EPaCCS. In the present evaluation, as most people who died with an advanced progressive illness had a KIS, the likelihood of selection bias was much lower. Given that under optimal conditions most people would prefer to die in the community,27 the present results add to growing evidence that the existence of an electronic care coordination record is associated with dying in the person’s preferred place.4,10–12
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Further research and evaluation is essential. Electronic care coordination systems are relatively new and rapidly evolving. Conventional research designs, assuming closed systems and experimental methods, are unsuited for such evaluations given the dynamic and constantly evolving contexts in which such systems are embedded. As argued by Greenhalgh and Papoutsi,15 research designs and methods, such as mixed-method case studies, consider interconnectedness and can provide a rich understanding of how systems come together as a whole. Drawing together different data from multiple sources and future mixed-method evaluations, including case studies, is recommended to understand the contribution of having an electronic care coordination record for a person with an advanced progressive illness, their family, and the wider healthcare system, as well as unintended consequences that might occur when an electronic care coordination record is not in place.
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