


BMJ Open Empowering the patient? Medication communication during hospital discharge: a qualitative study at an internal medicines ward in Norway

Stine Eidhammer Rognan ^{1,2}, Sofia Källemark-Sporrong,^{3,4}
Kajsa Rebecka Bengtsson,⁵ Helene Berg Lie,⁵ Yvonne Andersson,²
Morten Mowé,^{6,7} Liv Mathiesen⁵

To cite: Rognan SE, Källemark-Sporrong S, Bengtsson KR, *et al.* Empowering the patient? Medication communication during hospital discharge: a qualitative study at an internal medicines ward in Norway. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e044850. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044850

► Prepublication history and supplemental material for this paper is available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-044850>).

Received 22 September 2020
Accepted 20 May 2021



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2021. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to

Stine Eidhammer Rognan;
stine.eidhammer.rogan@sykehusapotekene.no

ABSTRACT

Objective Effective communication and patient empowerment before hospital discharge are important steps to ensure medication safety. Patients discharged from hospitals are often expected to assume self-management, frequently without healthcare personnel (HCP) having ensured patients' knowledge, motivation and/or skills. In this substudy of a larger study, we explore how patients experience medication communication during encounters with HCPs and how they are empowered at hospital discharge.

Design This is a qualitative case study. Data collection was done through qualitative observations of patient-HCP encounters, semistructured interviews with patients and drug reconciliation. Data were analysed using content analysis.

Setting An internal medicines ward at a university hospital in Norway.

Participants Nine patients aged 49–90 years were included close to the day of discharge.

Results The analysis revealed the following themes: (1) patient-centred care (PCC), which included 'understanding and involvement in the patient-as-person', 'establishment of a therapeutic alliance', and 'sharing power and responsibility'; and (2) biomedical (conventional) care, including the subthemes 'HCPs in power and control' and 'optimising medical outcomes, following guidelines'. Even though the elements of PCC were observed in several encounters, overall communication was not sufficiently fostering patient empowerment. Spending time with patients and building relations based on mutual trust seemed undervalued.

Conclusions The results provide a broader understanding of how patients experience medication communication at hospital discharge. Both the patients and the HCPs appear to be inculcated with biomedical traditions and are uncertain about the roles and opportunities associated with PCC. Attention should be paid to patient preferences and to the core elements of the PCC model from admission to discharge to empower patients in medication self-management.

INTRODUCTION

Effective communication and patient empowerment before hospital discharge

Strengths and limitations of this study

- We combined real-time observations and patient interviews, which is a powerful approach to understand and describe what happened.
- The sample size is limited; however, as the analysis had a specific aim, with full observations and rich interview data, the information power is high.
- Patients were mostly unperturbed by the presence of the observer, arguing inconsiderable observer effects.
- Researchers' sociocultural positions and values might have affected the results, although persons with different backgrounds were involved.
- The study was performed at an internal medicines ward located in one hospital and thus transferability can be questioned.

are important steps to ensure medication safety.^{1–4} Patients discharged from hospitals are often expected to assume self-management, frequently without healthcare personnel (HCP) having ensured patients' knowledge, motivation and/or skills.^{5–10}

Over the last decades, healthcare systems have shifted focus from the conventional (biomedical) way of practising medicine to an ambition to become involved in the full range of difficulties that patients experience (biopsychosocial model and patient-centred care, PCC), thus covering a larger picture than purely the biological factors.^{7,8} In this shift, patients are expected to move from the traditional, passive role, towards being more involved and participating in planning and decision-making regarding their health and treatment.⁷

In this study, we defined medication communication in accordance with Ozavci *et al.*³ that is, verbal and non-verbal exchange and understanding of information about the

treatment, focusing on medications, between patients, patients' next of kin and any HCP attending to the patient.

Patient empowerment has been described as the purpose in the PCC framework.¹¹ Patient empowerment is the philosophy of an HCP seeing the patient as an equal, acknowledging them as experts of their own lives.^{8 12} Patient empowerment and collaboration between patients and HCPs have been implemented in laws and healthcare reforms in many countries, including Norway.^{2 13–16} However, progress towards improving post-discharge health outcomes has been slow and the efficacy of interventions is currently indefinite.² PCC focuses on dialogues, HCPs listening to and supporting patients, and building 'therapeutic alliance' between them and the patient as a person, with the patient an equal party in the decision-making.^{4 8 17} Patients generally desire a PCC approach, being encouraged to mediate communication, with HCPs recognising their preferred level of engagement and supporting their self-management after discharge.¹⁵ Also highly valued by patients is HCPs' 'humaneness' (eg, warmth, respect and empathy), being given sufficient information and time, being treated as individuals, as well as establishing mutual trust.⁸

According to PCC, HCPs empowering patients is essential, not least at hospital discharge. Over the last decade, a number of studies have explored patients' perspectives of hospital discharge using interviews,^{18–27} observations,²⁸ combination of interviews and observations,^{29–35} and meta-summaries.^{15 36 37}

Although there is extensive research on patient empowerment, PCC and related concepts at discharge, it is often viewed from other perspectives than solely the patients'.³⁸ Patient values and perceptions must be appraised to a substantial degree in order to make evidence-based healthcare services supporting patient empowerment in medication management after hospital discharge.^{38 39}

In this substudy of a larger study,⁴⁰ we explore how the patients experiences medication communication in all encounters with all kinds of HCPs that could potentially include medication communication and how patients are empowered at hospital discharge.

METHODOLOGY

Patient and public involvement

A representative from the User's Board of the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise provided input to the study protocol (see online supplemental additional file 1) and ensured that the information sheet to be handed out and explained to the patients provided a good summary of what the participants needed to know before signing the consent form. The user representative has more than 5 years of experience from the User's Board and has a master's degree in welfare management.

Norwegian hospital context

Patients admitted to hospitals in Norway receive all their medications from the hospital during their stay,

but medications are not dispensed at discharge. Home-dwelling patients who are responsible for handling their medications will normally have to go to a pharmacy of their own choice and at their initiative to collect their prescribed medications after discharge.

Approach

This study uses a qualitative research design, consisting mostly of unstructured observations, in addition to semi-structured interviews and medication reconciliations. During the observations, the observer was present and identifiable, but without any role in the social setting.⁴¹ The criteria for reporting qualitative research (see online supplemental additional file 2)⁴² were followed to guide this research.

Setting and sampling strategy

The study setting was at an internal medicines ward in a university hospital in Norway. Patients were interviewed after discharge. The interviews took place at the patient's home, at a short-term nursing home department, a café or by telephone 1–2 weeks after discharge.

Inclusion of patients took place from September to December 2019, from Monday to Sunday, during regular daytime working hours, close to the day of their planned discharge. Thereafter patients were followed during HCP encounters through to hospital discharge. Of the 16 patients approached, one declined participation.

The sampling method was purposive. Patients of various age, ethnicity, estimated length of stay and diagnoses were approached. Patients eligible for inclusion should be ≥18 years, home-dwelling, responsible for their medication administration prior to hospital admission and expected to be discharged to their homes or to a short-term nursing home department. Preterminal or cognitively impaired patients were not eligible. Eligibility of a patient was assessed based on information from the patient's record and was discussed within the research team. Advice was sought from HCPs on the ward when needed before the patient was approached.

Data collection

Patients and HCPs were approached at the hospital by one of the observers (KRB, HBL and SER; all female), and written informed consent was obtained prior to enrolment. Patients were approached at their rooms, provided with both verbal and written information about the study, and offered time to read the information, before deciding on whether they would consent to participate. The observers disclosed their HCP background to the patients, that is, two pharmacy students and one pharmacist. However, during the observations they dressed to appear more like 'the girl from university' than HCPs dressed in white.^{43 44}

Relevant information from the observations was documented in a form, developed and piloted, comprising three patients (see online supplemental additional file 3). The observations were mostly unstructured and had a

patient-oriented focus on the content in the medication communication and contextual factors, actions, activities and interactions with HCPs. All encounters with HCPs that potentially involved medication communication were observed.

The interviews after discharge were conducted by KRB and HBL and were audiotaped if the patients consented. An interview guide (see online supplemental additional file 4) comprising a list of items and probing questions guided the interviewer. The guide included questions on patients' experiences of hospital stay, discharge and the period postdischarge, focusing on medication information and patients' beliefs about medicines. Also included were specific questions based on the observations of the individual patient. In conjunction with the interview, medication reconciliation was conducted according to the integrated medicines management model adapted to the Norwegian setting.⁴⁵

De-identified data were immediately stored in a protected area for sensitive data at the university. The observations were audiotaped if the patient was in a single room and if the patient and the HCP had consented. Patients provided additional informed consent to interviews that were audiotaped.

Authors' preunderstanding

Researchers with different backgrounds were involved, providing different perspectives. SER is a clinical pharmacist and a PhD student in clinical pharmacy. KRB and HBL were at the time pharmacy students in their final year (master's). SK-S is a social scientist holding a PhD in social medicine and working within social pharmacy at the university. YA is a medical scientist with a PhD in medical research. She is currently working as head of research at the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise. MM is the head of the medical clinic at the study hospital. He is a specialist in internal medicine, digestive medicine and geriatric medicine. LM is a pharmacist with a PhD in pharmacology currently working within clinical pharmacy at the university. The authors had from none to extensive experience with qualitative methods.

As seen above, the research team consisted of persons with different backgrounds (education, experience in hospital setting). However, all but one were female and all had a Northern-European background. The researchers were aware of how their sociocultural positions and value systems might have affected the results and discussed this during the research process.

Analysis

Criteria for inclusion in the analysis were presence of data from observations on the day of discharge and from interviews after discharge. This resulted in the inclusion of nine patients.

Data were transcribed consecutively to prevent memory bias. All transcribed data were analysed in Norwegian using conventional content analysis.⁴⁶ The first part of the analysis was inductive; codes were derived directly

from the first transcripts and a codebook consisting of codes theoretically relevant to the research question was developed in a 1-day consensus session (KRB, HBL, SER, SK-S, YA, LM). Transcripts were read and the codes were suggested by all six analysers individually. These preliminary codes were put on post-its on the wall. First individually and then together, the post-its were merged (if describing the same), put into groups or new codes added (if new codes came up during discussions).⁴⁶ Several 1-day consensus sessions (including more transcripts) were held, where the experience from coding was discussed and codes slightly changed. All transcripts were imported to the NVivo qualitative data analysis software⁴⁷ (by KRB, HBL, SER). During this part of the process, new codes were added to the codebook. The last revision of the coding was made using the final codebook. All coding made by one person was audited by the others. The first author (SER) condensed the text from the selected code groups into units of meaning, focusing on how patients experienced medication communication during encounters with HCPs at the hospital and how they were empowered at hospital discharge. Furthermore, after searching for similarities, differences and connections cross-case, the results were clustered into two main themes, PCC (biopsychosocial, empowerment) and the biomedical framework (non-empowerment).⁴⁸ The content was reduced into a condensate, and quotes that seemed to best reflect the themes were selected. In order to keep interpretations as close to the sociocultural context as possible and ensure interpretative validity, translation into English (condensate and quotes) was done by three of the authors (SER, LM, SK-S) after the analysis. Finally, translation was discussed with a native English-speaking person.

Saturation was considered to have been reached after constantly comparing the experiences and responses of the participants and appraising richness and depth of the data during the sampling period.⁴⁹ After 15 observed patients, we concluded we had reached saturation. Of the 15 patients in the main study, 6 were excluded for the substudy analysis as they lacked either interviews (n=2), observations on the day of discharge (n=1) or both (n=3).

The patients are presented using pseudonyms. Quotes are from observations if not specified with 'int' for interview.

RESULTS

This section covers the results of the thematic analysis of observations and interview data consisting of two parts: PCC (empowerment) and the biomedical framework (non-empowerment). **Box 1** contains information about the themes and subthemes.

Nine patients were observed and interviewed, and their demographics and other quantitative data are presented in **tables 1 and 2**.

Box 1 Overview of themes and subthemes

- Patient-centred care: real interest in the patient.
- ▶ Understanding and involvement with the patient as a person.
 - ▶ Establishment of a therapeutic alliance.
 - ▶ Sharing power and responsibility.
- Staying with the biomedical model.
- ▶ Healthcare personnel in power and control.
 - ▶ Optimising medical outcomes, following guidelines.

PCC: real interest in the whole patient

When looking at HCPs' behaviour reflecting real interest in the whole patient, essential elements of PCC were observed in several encounters. This could be HCPs listening to and getting to know the person behind 'the patient', making an effort to acknowledge the patient as expert of their own lives and supporting them in decision-making.^{8 11}

Understanding and involvement with the patient as a person

HCPs often asked patients about their general condition, sometimes asking them to prepare questions in advance of the encounter. Some HCPs sat down and listened actively, inviting patients to share what they had on their minds. When patients expressed complex problems, they experienced that HCPs acted on these; for example, they

Table 1 Patient demographics

Demographics	N=9
Sex	
Male	4
Female	5
Age, median (range)	71 (49–90)
Education	
Compulsory school/unknown	2
Upper secondary school	4
University	3
Length of hospital stay in days, median (range)	5 (4–18)
Observed days before discharge, median (range)	2 (1–6)
Main diagnoses according to discharge summary	
Atrial fibrillation	2
Pulmonary embolism	2
Pyelonephritis	1
Pulmonary oedema	1
Myocardial infarction	1
Gout	1
Heart failure	1
Citizenship	
Norwegian	8
Other	1

Table 2 Details regarding the semistructured interviews 1–2 weeks after discharge

Duration in minutes, median (range)	55 (33–87)
Location	
Home	4
Temporary sheltered unit	1
Café	3
Telephone	1

were offered consultations with a psychologist or a social worker.

Doctor: Do you think of something more you are wondering about? Think through or note it down, later today we can go through the medicines together.

Establishment of a therapeutic alliance

Alliances were built when HCPs recognised the patient as a person, used their names and included them as partners using the plural form 'we'. HCPs could remember what had been important during the hospital stay; for example, they commented on how the patient's condition had changed for the better and showed real interest in their further follow-up. Some of the HCPs acknowledged patients' previous experience and knowledge. Sometimes, HCPs could remember details about patients' children, jobs and private life, which seemed to have a stimulating impact on the dialogue.

Doctor: That's definitely a good idea, we will do that.

Nurse: Here are the medicines you are familiar with. Do you want us to go through them together?

HCPs seemed honest and most often kept their promise, such as getting back to the patient if they said they would. Some patients experienced continuity in the follow-up and experienced that HCPs informed them about what was going to happen next and sometimes who would come to visit when.

Nurse: We'll see you in a while for the doctor's visit.

Nurse: We'll be back at 11 o'clock to take your blood pressure.

Doctor: I'll finish up the papers and the discharge summary and then we can have a little talk around 3 o'clock.

There were a couple of friendly faces that used to come in quite often and I think that helped because you could ask them the questions and they would get to know why you are asking and not wasting their time. —John (male, 58, int)

Sharing power and responsibility

Most of the HCPs seemed to have a focus on sharing information and increasing both the patients' and their knowledge. Some of the HCPs recognised patients'

information-seeking behaviour. For example, patients who appeared to desire a certain sense of control in medication management were provided with complete information covering all drug names and doses. HCPs also asked specific questions about patients' experiences with medications, and patients were sometimes given the opportunity to influence decisions. HCPs involved patients' next of kin when required by the patients and respected patients who expressed not wanting to take on any responsibility in the decision-making.

When one of the patients agreed that the previous, non-compliant use of medications could have contributed to the hospital admittance, this patient experienced strong urge from HCPs not to quit medications after discharge. HCPs explained why medications were important and made efforts to find good solutions. For example, when the patient expressed reluctance to take one of the medications, the HCP changed to another and both parties became satisfied.

I was fussing about the drug combination. Which my body or my stomach is not very fond of. I had to push them before they took my problems seriously, but I argued it through, and got a new medicine. We decided to do that jointly. They explained why I'm getting it, the side effects and that it would take some time. —Edvin (male, 61, int)

One of the patients experienced getting timely motivation and preparation for self-management.

I was quite surprised that they wanted me to do the injections myself right from the beginning. They mentioned it, the second day, "do you want to do it yourself" and I looked at it and thought "I have never given an injection in my whole life" [laughs]. —John (male, 58, int)

HCPs seemed to focus on providing patients with everything they needed and sometimes asked if patients felt safe about the decision of being discharged. Some of the physicians sat down with patients while they went through a customised written discharge summary together. One physician made sure that the patient had his glasses so that they both could read. HCPs summed up and repeated information, either to answer questions the patients had or at their own initiative.

Doctor: Are you still ok with syringes or do you want to have tablets instead?

Doctor: You have a huge list of medicines. The changes in medicines are marked in bold. Did you understand what was new? Take care of the sheet and show it to the home care nurse.

Some patients who experienced elements of the PCC model pointed out in the interviews that more time with and continuity among HCPs as well as timing of information were specific areas for improvement.

I'd quite like to know why they stopped that one medicine. My suspicion may be early on we did have a discussion, and I was not fully conscious. —John (male, 58, int)

Staying with the biomedical model

HCPs complied with the biomedical model when they appeared not to show real interest in the patient as a person or building alliances, treating the patient only based on biomedical parameters such as measurements and evidence-based therapy guidelines. Less interest in the patient was observed when HCPs interrupted the patient while speaking, or when they talked to each other without including the patient.

Nurses and nurse assistants thought they knew everything. I didn't like their personality. I didn't bother to discuss with them, but when I heard what they said I thought this is some nonsense. —Sigrid (female, 71, int)

HCPs in power and control

Generally, HCPs were in power and control over the process on the ward. Most often, HCPs told patients what to expect, for example, practical planning of the day. However, sometimes patients were given promises that were not kept, for example, a nurse saying "I will come back to take a new blood pressure" but then not coming back. Sometimes the discharge was delayed, without the patient being informed in a timely manner.

Generally, I had to wait for medicines to be delivered to me in the morning, because it was up to the doctors to decide which ones I should have. —Heidi (female, 53, int)

Most frequently, patients were informed about changes in their medications after the decision had been made and they were not invited into any discussion about options. Some of the HCPs did not seem eager to inform the patients about medications, although they had the opportunities, for example, when they were administering them. The nurses often talked about other things while handing out the medications, for example, practical planning of the day. Some patients experienced that the medication, name and dose were unknown when asked to swallow it.

Nurse: Here are your medicines. Do you want a glass of water or a slice of bread?

The level of detail in the given information varied and often depended on the patient's request. HCPs were sometimes unspecific in their communication about medications, and in the interviews patients expressed that this made them uncertain as to when the responsibility for administration was transferred back to them after hospital discharge.

Box 2 Synnøve

"I did not have any expectations to the staff. They were nice and dazzling everyone so it was nothing, it was perfectly fine (...) The doctor had finished the papers and when the nurse gave me the discharge summary I could leave the hospital whenever I wanted. It was listed which medicines I should use and which was new. The only thing that was a bit strange was that the doctor had prescribed a new medicine for... I think it was blood clot, and it did not fit with another medicine that I had used from before. And when I got to the pharmacy to collect my prescriptions, she told me "they don't go together." This was a Friday, I let it take its course during the weekend. I had an appointment scheduled with the GP on the following Monday. When I mentioned this, he immediately called the hospital and they replaced the new medicine with another one that was a better fit." —Synnøve (female, 84, int)

It says butenamid in the discharge summary, is that the same as burinex? And "against heart failure," isn't it a diuretic? Diuretic because of heart failure would have been more precise. —Alfred (male, 80, int)

I don't think we ever clarified whether I should be using that medicine (...) on the letter telling me what I need [reading the generic name]. That's the same? —John (male, 58, int)

One patient experienced how HCPs seemed surprised when she resisted the changes she was presented with.

They said I should start with a new medicine. I said, no I don't want to. And then the nurse, no the doctor was like... what? They probably didn't expect to hear me saying that. —Heidi (female, 53, int)

Some patients on the other hand seemed to derive security from the 'HCP knows best' perspective. One of the patients (Synnøve in box 2) told how she was made aware of an error in the hospital doctor's prescription and how she obeyed the doctor even though she was aware that it was associated with a risk. She trusted her general practitioner (GP) to solve the problem.

Optimising medical outcomes, following guidelines

When HCPs informed patients about why they were given medical treatment, they often explained by referring to biomedical parameters. HCPs focused on optimising the medical treatment, following standardised evidence-based therapy guidelines, for example, for cardiac failure, with less focus on increasing patients' understanding or preparing them for self-management. Some of the patients could not recall why they were using their medications, or why some medications had been discontinued at the hospital. HCPs' primary focus seemed linked to how the treatment affected the outcomes, not necessarily listening to patients' needs. One patient experienced that while the hospital doctors adhered to the biomedical model, the GP had a more patient-oriented approach, and thus they provided different recommendations.

Nurse: You start on a new medicine today; it is more gentle to the kidneys.

Doctor: The ACE inhibitor is very beneficial for the future of the heart, and you have good reasons to use a beta-blocker to prevent the development of heart failure. Diuretics can be adjusted more as needed.

The side effects are a bit troublesome. We [the GP and I] decided earlier to take it out because it was causing my dizziness. At the hospital, they thought I should continue with lisinopril because of the heart having a little too low capacity. But do you have to go dizzy all the time because you have to think about your heart? It gets a bit... tiring so now we [the GP and I] have reduced to every other day. —Alfred (male, 80, int)

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore and understand how patients experience medication communication during hospital discharge and how they are empowered through it. Previous studies often melded the perspectives of HCPs, patients and next of kin, and limited observations to discharge conversations only.^{28–35} We aimed to capture patient experiences through comprehensive observations covering all encounters presumably involving medication communication, including the discharge conversation, in combination with interviews. Even though elements of PCC were observed in several encounters, overall communication was not sufficiently fostering patient empowerment. Spending time with patients and building relations based on mutual trust seemed undervalued.

PCC was observed when HCPs were listening to, recognising and empowering patients in decision-making and self-management. This is known to encourage patients' medication communication and understanding.¹⁵ However, HCPs did not systematically tailor the communication to fill the competence gap between themselves and the patients. Patients were sometimes interrupted despite it being well known that when interrupting the patient's 'voice of the lifeworld', HCPs' 'voice of medicine' effectively strips away the personal meaning of the illness.⁸

High-quality communication is known to foster patient empowerment, hence promoting positive health behaviour, for example, adherence to medications.⁹ Empowerment is related to competence and abilities, that is, high self-efficacy is required to over-rule a physician's prescription or knowing when and how to seek medical advice or support.^{6 10 16} One patient in our study (Synnøve in box 2) was informed about a potential drug–drug interaction at the pharmacy after discharge which could have led to a reduced effect of the medicine initiated at the hospital. Information seemed not to alter this patient's adherence to her medical treatment. Adherence is known to be positively associated with 'HCP's knows best' and doctors' health locus of control.⁶ However, attempts to empower patients when they are stressed and focused on returning home may increase uncertainty

and thereby possibly negatively affect empowerment and reduce adherence.^{6 12 15 50–53}

During the interviews, patients mostly expressed gratitude and satisfaction when asked what opportunities they had for patient participation. Differing patient expectations may explain why some of the patients were positively surprised when experiencing PCC, while others responded negatively with the biomedical model. A long tradition with the 'biomedical model' may have disabled resourceful patients, who always had been led by powerful HCPs, from taking advantage of their own knowledge. Patients willing to be led by powerful HCPs have an external health locus of control.⁶ One patient in our study had an internal health locus of control, that is, a high degree of self-efficacy. However, the cause of his hospital admission was probably related to intentional non-adherence to medications, and as this example highlights, internal health locus of control and a high degree of self-efficacy are no guarantee of possessing a satisfactory amount of knowledge to take on the required responsibility of making wise decisions.⁶ Sometimes, it is hard to evaluate patients' cognitive abilities and perceived lack of insight because cognitive limitations can be a barrier to HCPs practising PCC.^{10 54}

In our first substudy, we found that the (same) patients were mostly proactive, able to be involved and seemed motivated to seek instructions from HCPs. However, some patients chose not to ask all the questions they had, and it was evident that patients would have benefited from more information to understand the discharge process.⁴⁰ The degree to which patients are capable of participation is often dependent on how well informed they are.³⁸ Patients taking on different roles, or HCPs prejudices, could have influenced HCPs in delivering either the PCC or the biomedical model.^{15 55–57} It has been shown that less than 20% of the variability in patient preferences can be explained by situational and demographic characteristics; for example, illness or low degree of education can decrease the desire to be involved, whereas age can both increase and decrease it.⁵⁸ It is important that HCPs review their prejudices because thinking of a patient as, for example, 'vulnerable', powerless and without agency may lead to paternalism and incorrect estimation of the patient's capabilities.^{9 10 32 50 59 60}

Building therapeutic alliances, an important concept of PCC, comprises more than HCPs recognising that a friendly and sympathetic demeanour may increase patients' adherence to treatment.⁸ To safeguard patient autonomy it is important to build relationships between oneself as an HCP and the patient based on mutual trust.^{8 50 61 62} However, organisational staffing pressure and handover between clinical shifts are barriers to building such alliances during hospitalisation.⁹

According to the biomedical framework, the value of time spent with patients is recognised but not offered great priority.⁸ To further develop PCC, HCPs need to embrace dialogues with patients, negotiating about decisional responsibility, with adjustment for capacity, for

example, the 'sick role'.^{13 25} HCPs should share more of their knowledge and power; empowering the patient implies acknowledging the person's agency in the control of outcomes. Improving several aspects of patients' knowledge and self-confidence and how communication is provided is crucial to empowering patients in the management of medications after discharge. From a patient's perspective, HCPs listening more actively could be a good way to inaugurate PCC.^{1 63 64}

A strength of the study is the combination of real-time observations and patient interviews, which is a powerful approach to understand and describe what happened. What patients told did not always equal to what was observed, for example, one patient talking about a 30 min long discharge conversation that actually lasted for 10 min. Because the whole process from hospital admission to hospital discharge was not observed, all encounters supporting self-management were most certainly not observed; however, the interviews made sure that patients' perspectives were not lost.

A heterogeneous sample of participants were included; however, bias towards more empowered and confident patients, which could impact saturation, cannot be excluded. Saturation was perceived for the main study, comprising data from 15 patients. Some patients were excluded from this specific analysis as they were not interviewed and/or not observed on the day of discharge. Reasons for such lack of data were that participants withdrew their consent for the interview or that they were moved to another ward before discharge. The nine patients included in this substudy did not differ from those excluded by any visible characteristics, such as age or sex. As this analysis had a specific aim, with full observations and rich interview data, the information power is high, although the number of patients is limited.⁶⁵

Interviews with patients and HCPs (unpublished focus group interviews with HCPs) found that they were mostly unperturbed by the presence of the observer, arguing inconsiderable observer effects. One reason stated for this was that they were used to having student observers present on the ward.

This study was performed at an internal medicines ward located in one university hospital, and it is uncertain how well the study findings inform healthcare contexts that differ from the present context.

CONCLUSION

The results provide a broader understanding of how patients experience medication communication during hospital discharge. Both the patients and the HCPs appear to be inculcated with biomedical traditions and are uncertain about the roles and opportunities associated with PCC. Attention should be paid to patient preferences and to the core elements of the PCC model from admission to discharge to empower patients in medication self-management.

Author affiliations

- ¹Department of Pharmaceutical Services, Oslo Hospital Pharmacy, Oslo, Norway
- ²Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South-Eastern Norway, Oslo, Norway
- ³Department of Pharmacy, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
- ⁴Department of Pharmacy, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
- ⁵Department of Pharmacy, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ⁶Division of Medicine, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
- ⁷Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

Acknowledgements We thank the people included in the study for their time and contributions and the hospital ward for facilitating the study. We are grateful to the user representative, Berit Gallefoss Denstad, for her contributions to the planning of the study. Also, warm thanks to Elin Trapnes and Marianne Lea for their support during the planning of the study and the data collection period.

Contributors SER, SK-S, MM and LM conceptualised the study and developed the method. YA, HBL and KRB contributed to the development of the method. SER, HBL and KRB conducted the data collection. SER, SK-S, HBL, KRB, YA and LM analysed and interpreted patient data. SER, SK-S and LM wrote the original draft. YA, HBL, KRB and MM were major contributors to the writing, review and editing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding The study has been funded by the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South-Eastern Norway and the University of Oslo.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval The Regional Ethics Committee assessed the study and found no ethical approval necessary. The study was approved by the Privacy Ombudsman and the Hospital Investigational Review Board on 8 March 2019 (reference number 2019/6465). A gift (value of 150 Norwegian kroner, €13 or US\$14) was given to the patients participating in the interviews.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement No data are available. Due to the sensitive nature of the data in this study, patients and HCPs were assured raw data would remain confidential and would not be shared.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

ORCID iD

Stine Eidhammer Rognan <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6912-9641>

REFERENCES

- 1 World Health Organization (WHO). Medication without harm - global patient safety challenge on medication safety, 2017. Available: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255263/WHO-HIS-SDS-2017.6-eng.pdf;jsessionid=0C073A37638C4C78DF54B9EE86E87B7E?sequence=1> [Accessed 20 May 2020].
- 2 World Health Organization (WHO). Medication safety in transitions of care, 2019. Available: <https://www.who.int/patientsafety/medication-safety/TransitionOfCare.pdf?ua=1> [Accessed 20 May 2020].
- 3 Ozavci G, Bucknall T, Woodward-Kron R, et al. A systematic review of older patients' experiences and perceptions of communication about managing medication across transitions of care. *Res Social Adm Pharm* 2021;17:273–91.
- 4 Manias E. Medication communication: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 2010;66:933–43.
- 5 Greysen SR, Harrison JD, Kripalani S, et al. Understanding patient-centred readmission factors: a multi-site, mixed-methods study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2017;26:33–41.
- 6 Náfrádi L, Nakamoto K, Schulz PJ. Is patient empowerment the key to promote adherence? A systematic review of the relationship between self-efficacy, health locus of control and medication adherence. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0186458.
- 7 Halabi IO, Scholtes B, Voz B, et al. "Patient participation" and related concepts: A scoping review on their dimensional composition. *Patient Educ Couns* 2020;103:5–14.
- 8 Mead N, Bower P. Patient-centredness: a conceptual framework and review of the empirical literature. *Soc Sci Med* 2000;51:1087–110.
- 9 Cornwell J, Levenson R, Sonola L, et al. *Continuity of care for older hospital patients: a call for action*. The Kings Fund, 2012.
- 10 Parnell TA, Stichler JF, Barton AJ, et al. A concept analysis of health literacy. *Nurs Forum* 2019;54:315–27.
- 11 El-Aiti L, Sandman L, Munthe C. Person centered care and personalized medicine: Irreconcilable opposites or potential companions? *Health Care Anal* 2019;27:45–59.
- 12 Tveiten S, Knutsen IR. Empowering dialogues--the patients' perspective. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2011;25:333–40.
- 13 NICE guidelines. transition between inpatient hospital settings and community or care home settings for adults with social care needs, 2015. Available: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng27/chapter/Implementation-getting-started> [Accessed 20 May 2020].
- 14 Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services. *Report. No. 7 (2019–2020) to the Storting. National health and hospital plan 2020–2023*, 2020.
- 15 Tobiano G, Chaboyer W, Teasdale T, et al. Patient engagement in admission and discharge medication communication: a systematic mixed studies review. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2019;95:87–102.
- 16 Coulter A, Entwistle VA, Eccles A, et al. Personalised care planning for adults with chronic or long-term health conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;85.
- 17 Santana MJ, Manalili K, Jolley RJ, et al. How to practice person-centred care: a conceptual framework. *Health Expect* 2018;21:429–40.
- 18 Flink M, Hesselink G, Pijnenborg L, et al. The key actor: a qualitative study of patient participation in the handover process in Europe. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21:89–96.
- 19 Flink M, Öhlén G, Hansagi H, et al. Beliefs and experiences can influence patient participation in handover between primary and secondary care--a qualitative study of patient perspectives. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21 Suppl 1:i76–83.
- 20 Pileggi C, Caligiuri E, Nobile CGA, et al. Information about management of chronic drug therapies prescribed at hospital discharge: does it affect patients' knowledge and self-confidence?. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2018;18:105.
- 21 Krook M, Iwarzon M, Siouta E. The discharge Process-From a patient's perspective. *SAGE Open Nurs* 2020;6:2377960819900707.
- 22 Durocher E, Kinsella EA, Ellis C, et al. Contradictions in client-centred discharge planning: through the lens of relational autonomy. *Scand J Occup Ther* 2015;22:293–301.
- 23 Svensberg K, Trapnes E, Nguyen D, et al. Patients' perceptions of medicines information received at hospital discharge in Norway: a qualitative interview study. *Int J Clin Pharm* 2021;43:144–53.
- 24 Knight DA, Thompson D, Mathie E, et al. 'Seamless care? just a list would have helped!' older people and their carer's experiences of support with medication on discharge home from hospital. *Health Expect* 2013;16:277–91.
- 25 Eassey D, McLachlan AJ, Brien J-A, et al. "I have nine specialists. They need to swap notes!" Australian patients' perspectives of medication-related problems following discharge from hospital. *Health Expect* 2017;20:1114–20.
- 26 Bagge M, Norris P, Heydon S, et al. Older people's experiences of medicine changes on leaving Hospital. *Res Social Adm Pharm* 2014;10:791–800.
- 27 Foss C, Hofoss D. Elderly persons' experiences of participation in hospital discharge process. *Patient Educ Couns* 2011;85:68–73.
- 28 Siddiqui TG, Cheng S, Mellingsæter M, et al. "What should I do when I get home?" treatment plan discussion at discharge between specialist physicians and older in-patients: mixed method study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020;20:1002.
- 29 Flink M, Ekstedt M. Planning for the discharge, not for patient self-management at home - an observational and interview study of hospital discharge. *Int J Integr Care* 2017;17:1.
- 30 Ekdahl AW, Linderholm M, Hellström I, et al. 'Are decisions about discharge of elderly hospital patients mainly about freeing blocked beds?' a qualitative observational study. *BMJ Open* 2012;2. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002027. [Epub ahead of print: 19 Nov 2012].

- 31 Laugaland K, Aase K, Waring J. Hospital discharge of the elderly--an observational case study of functions, variability and performance-shaping factors. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;14:365.
- 32 Dyrstad DN, Laugaland KA, Storm M. An observational study of older patients' participation in hospital admission and discharge--exploring patient and next of kin perspectives. *J Clin Nurs* 2015;24:1693-706.
- 33 Fylan B, Marques I, Ismail H, et al. Gaps, traps, bridges and props: a mixed-methods study of resilience in the medicines management system for patients with heart failure at hospital discharge. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e023440.
- 34 Pollack AH, Backonja U, Miller AD, et al. Closing the gap: supporting patients' transition to self-management after hospitalization. *Proc SIGCHI Conf Hum Factor Comput Syst* 2016;2016:5324-36.
- 35 Cain CH, Neuwirth E, Bellows J, et al. Patient experiences of transitioning from hospital to home: an ethnographic quality improvement project. *J Hosp Med* 2012;7:382-7.
- 36 Lilleheie I, Debesay J, Bye A, et al. Experiences of elderly patients regarding participation in their hospital discharge: a qualitative metasummary. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e025789.
- 37 Hestevik CH, Molin M, Debesay J, et al. Older persons' experiences of adapting to daily life at home after hospital discharge: a qualitative metasummary. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2019;19:224.
- 38 Agner J, Braun KL. Patient empowerment: a critique of individualism and systematic review of patient perspectives. *Patient Educ Couns* 2018;101:2054-64.
- 39 Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Gray JA, et al. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ* 1996;312:71-2.
- 40 Rognan SE, Kälvermark Sporrang S, Bengtsson K, et al. Discharge processes and medicines communication from the patient perspective: a qualitative study at an internal medicines ward in Norway. *Health Expect* 2021. doi:10.1111/hex.13232. [Epub ahead of print: 24 Mar 2021].
- 41 Bowling A. Unstructured and structured observational studies. In: Bowling A, ed. *Research methods in health - Investigating health and health services*. Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Open University Press, 2002.
- 42 O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, et al. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 2014;89:1245-51.
- 43 Richards H, Emslie C. The 'doctor' or the 'girl from the University'? Considering the influence of professional roles on qualitative interviewing. *Fam Pract* 2000;17:71-5.
- 44 Brannick T, Coghlan D. In defense of being "native": the case for insider academic research. *Organ Res Methods* 2007;10:59-74.
- 45 Scullin C, Scott MG, Hogg A, et al. An innovative approach to integrated medicines management. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2007;13:781-8.
- 46 Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qual Health Res* 2005;15:1277-88.
- 47 QSR International Pty Ltd. *NVivo qualitative data analysis software, version 12*, 2019.
- 48 Malterud K. Systematic text condensation: a strategy for qualitative analysis. *Scand J Public Health* 2012;40:795-805.
- 49 Ness LR, Fusch P, Ness LR. Are we there yet? data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408-1416, 2015. Available: <https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.uio.no/docview/1721368991?accountid=14699> [Accessed 23 Jun 2020].
- 50 Gulbrandsen P, Clayman ML, Beach MC, et al. Shared decision-making as an existential journey: aiming for restored autonomous capacity. *Patient Educ Couns* 2016;99:1505-10.
- 51 Waring J, Marshall F, Bishop S. An ethnographic study of knowledge sharing across the boundaries between care processes, services and organisations: the contributions to 'safe' hospital discharge. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2014 Sep. (Health Services and Delivery Research, No. 2.29.) Chapter 2, Hospital discharge and patient safety: reviews of the literature. Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK259995/>
- 52 Marshall F. Connecting with Older People: Multiple Transitions in Same Place. In: Aase K, Waring J, eds. *Researching quality in care transitions international perspectives*. Cham, Switzerland: Cham: Palgrave Macmillan US, 2017.
- 53 Lehane E, McCarthy G. Intentional and unintentional medication non-adherence: a comprehensive framework for clinical research and practice? A discussion paper. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2007;44:1468-77.
- 54 Moore L, Britten N, Lydahl D, et al. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of person-centred care in different healthcare contexts. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2017;31:662-73.
- 55 Elstad JI. Educational inequalities in hospital care for mortally ill patients in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2018;46:74-82.
- 56 Easton P, Entwistle VA, Williams B. How the stigma of low literacy can impair patient-professional spoken interactions and affect health: insights from a qualitative investigation. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2013;13:319.
- 57 Mackert M, Mabry-Flynn A, Donovan EE, et al. Health literacy and perceptions of stigma. *J Health Commun* 2019;24:856-64.
- 58 Fredriksson M, Eriksson M, Tritter J. Who wants to be involved in health care decisions? comparing preferences for individual and collective involvement in England and Sweden. *BMC Public Health* 2017;18:18.
- 59 Redley B, McTier L, Botti M, et al. Patient participation in inpatient ward rounds on acute inpatient medical wards: a descriptive study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2019;28:15-23.
- 60 Kelly PA, Haidet P. Physician overestimation of patient literacy: a potential source of health care disparities. *Patient Educ Couns* 2007;66:119-22.
- 61 Mackenzie C. The importance of relational autonomy and capabilities for an ethics of vulnerability. In: Mackenzie C, Rogers W, Dodds S, eds. *Vulnerability. New essays in ethics and feminist philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- 62 Kvåle K, Bondevik M. What is important for patient centred care? A qualitative study about the perceptions of patients with cancer. *Scand J Caring Sci* 2008;22:582-9.
- 63 Kebede S. Ask patients "What matters to you?" rather than "What's the matter?". *BMJ* 2016;354:i4045.
- 64 Aboumatar HJ, Cooper LA. Contextualizing patient-centered care to fulfill its promise of better health outcomes: beyond who, what, and why. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;158:628-9.
- 65 Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by information power. *Qual Health Res* 2016;26:1753-60.

Medicines communication in hospital - the patient perspective

Protocol version no. 1 – 2018-10-12

The original protocol was written in Norwegian. In this translated version, elements considered not of central importance, i.e. the introduction and summary has been deleted.

Project participants

Project leader, Co-supervisor: Morten Mowé, associate professor, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo (UiO) and Head of the Medical Clinic, Oslo University Hospital. E-mail: mormow@ous-hf.no

PhD-candidate, responsible study pharmacist: Stine Eidhammer Rognan

Responsible for the research: Oslo University Hospital, Morten Mowé

Responsible for the data management: Oslo University Hospital, Morten Mowé

Other project members and collaborators:

- Liv Mathiesen, Main supervisor, Associate professor, Department of Pharmacy, UiO
- Sofia Källemark Sporrang, Co-supervisor, associate professor, Department of Pharmacy, University of Copenhagen
- Yvonne Andersson, co-supervisor, head of research and development, Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway
- Marianne Lea, Clinical Pharmacist, PhD-candidate
- Elin Trapnes, Clinical Pharmacist
- Anne Mette Njaastad, Senior Consultant, the Medical Clinic, Oslo University Hospital
- Berit Gallefoss Denstad, User representative, Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway
- Helene Berg Lie, Master's student in Pharmacy
- Kajså Bengtsson, Master's student in Pharmacy
- Kirsten Kilvik Viktil, Associate professor, Department of Pharmacy, UiOLisbeth Damlien, Clinical Pharmacist, PhD-candidate

Table of contents

Abbreviations 3

Hypothesis, aims and objectives 3

Methods 4

Milestones 9

Audit and inspection 9

Ethics 9

Budget 10

References..... 11

Appendices 11

Abbreviations

ATC	Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification System
HF	Health Trust
IMM	Integrated Medicines Management
IMS	Internal medical ward
OUS	Oslo University Hospital
PLO	Nursing and Care
REK	Regional Committees for medical and health research ethics
TSD	Services for sensitive data
UIO	University of Oslo

Hypothesis, aims and objectives

The aims and objectives are:

- Mapping the discharge process to identify factors for success and failure towards achieving seamless and safe drug care.
- Evaluating whether patient needs regarding medicine information at hospital discharge were met.

The hypothesis is that understanding the patients' journey through the discharge process, and the patient perspectives, can help to improve the discharge transitions and reduce the gap between different care levels.

Methods

- *Study design:*
This is a qualitative study, consisting of mostly unstructured observations with the addition of semi-structured interviews and medicines reconciliation.
- *Setting:*
The study will be conducted at the internal medicines ward, Indremedisinsk sengepost (IMS), OUS, Ullevål and in the patient's home or nursing home, 1-2 weeks after discharge. A pilot study will be conducted during the spring 2019. Inclusion to the main study will start during the fall 2019 and continue until saturation is achieved. Estimated duration of the main study is September 2019 - January 2020.
- *Inclusion criteria:*
Eligible patients are ≥18 years, home dwelling, have a residential address in Oslo, are responsible for their medicines administration prior to hospital admission, and expected to be discharged to their homes or a short-term nursing home department.
- *Exclusion criteria:* Pre-terminal or severe cognitively impaired patients are not eligible. Patients with planned transfer to and hence discharge from other wards.
- *Number of participants:*

Part 1: Observational study: The data collection will continue until saturation is achieved. The recruitment of participants will be purposive. Patients of various age, ethnicity and with various diseases will be asked to participate in the study. The PhD candidate will, together with the master's students, select eligible patients. Advice will be obtained from doctors or nurses at the ward. An experienced senior researcher (SKS) will be guiding the PhD-candidate in detailing the design of the study during the pilot period, and as required during the conduct of the study.

Part 2: Semi-structured interviews: The interviews will primarily take place at the patients' homes, 1-2 weeks after discharge. If patients are discharged to a short-term stay at a nursing home or with increased assistance from the home nursing service at home, any health care personnel will also be asked to participate in the interview, if necessary. As for the observational part, we will aim to assure the information power in the study sample, and the data collection will last until saturation is achieved.

Inclusion of patients to the pilot study will continue until necessary background information to design the study is obtained.
- *Procedures and training*

Medicines communication in hospital - the patient perspective version no. 1, 2018-10-12 Page 4 of 11

Observations and interviews will be performed by the PhD-candidate and master students in pharmacy. The PhD-candidate is an experienced clinical pharmacist familiar with the routines at the hospital and the patient population at the ward. The master students are familiar with drugs and will be provided with relevant training in aspects of clinical work before entering the field work. For example, the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway has a standardized procedure for training in medicines reconciliation.

All observers will be trained in observation- and interview methods by an experienced senior researcher. The PhD-candidate is experienced with clinical communication with patients about their medicines, and has in addition completed the course FRM5905V Clinical Pharmaceutical Work Methodology, which is a part of the experience-based master programme in clinical pharmacy at the University of Oslo. The PhD-candidate will complete a course in qualitative methods during the spring of 2019. The master's students will complete relevant research preparation courses during the spring of 2019.

Representatives from the internal medicine department as well as a user representative from the user committee at the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway have been involved in the design and planning of the studies.

A pilot study will be carried out for the observation study and the interview study in the spring of 2019.

- *Data collection:*

Part 1: The observational study will describe the hospital discharge process. The observations will focus on the patient and cover all events relevant for the medicines treatment, starting when the first tentative discharge date is set or 2-3 days before the tentative discharge date, continuing until the patient is discharged. Eligible patients will be purposively sampled to ensure quality and heterogeneity of the data. The assumed less complicated patient pathways (assumed short length of stay) are attempted to be included early in the study period. These patients will be followed by the observer throughout the hospital stay. The assumed most complicated courses (assumed long length of stay) will be included towards the end of the study period as the observer has gained more experience, e.g. about routines for discharge and events that are relevant to the drug treatment, and these patients are followed from 2-3 days before tentative discharge.

During the observations, the observer will be present and identifiable, but without any role in the social setting. The observer will only be observing the patient when there are health care personnel present, and the observer will otherwise not disturb the patient. The observer will observe what happens to the patient when the patient interact with health care personnel during their hospital stay, what is said, when and how. The observer may interact with patients if it is natural in the setting, e.g. if a patient initiate a conversation in the hallway which is not about the medical treatment in the hospital. In these situations, keywords from patient conversations will be registered. See the section about content of communication below.

Written informed consent will be obtained from:

Medicines communication in hospital - the patient perspective version no. 1, 2018-10-12 Page 5 of 11

- patients eligible for inclusion
- next of kin and/or healthcare professionals who assist the patient in medication management
- healthcare professionals at the internal medicines ward (will be obtained in advance of the study period)
- external healthcare professionals involved in the patients' medical treatment during the hospital stay (e.g. Infectious Disease Physician, Geriatric psychiatrist, orthopaedist, priest). If any of these do not consent, we will not observe their encounters with the patient

Each observer will keep her observations in field notes, including a diary of chronological events and her own reactions, feelings and opinions about what is happening to the patient. The field notes are comprised of both checklists and free text. Further details of an observational form will be developed during the pilot study. The focus in the observations may be more structured when approaching saturation of the data material is close.

Different types of data will be collected:

- Content of communication (verbal and non-verbal): Communication between patient and healthcare professionals, information or dialogue about medicines including information to the patient about his/her medical treatment. Focus will be centred on the patient and events relevant for the medical treatment.
- Descriptive data: Patient demography, description of contextual factors like behaviours, actions, activities and interactions with healthcare professionals (e.g. what happens, when and in what order, duration of conversations between patient and healthcare professionals). Sex, profession and, if relevant, discipline/specialization of the health care professionals will be registered.

The observers will transcribe the data consecutively to prevent memory bias, to make sure that all details and all reflections are registered. The observers will read each others transcripts and meet on a regular basis to debrief, discuss and hence assure the quality of the data. A pilot will be carried out during the spring of 2019, where registration forms, checklists and procedures will be developed.

Part 2: Semi-structured interviews with the patients already included in the observational study, will be conducted at the patients' homes or at the nursing home department 1-2 weeks after the hospital discharge. The interviews will be audiotaped if the patient consent to this. If the patient do not consent to audio recording, there will be taken notes during the interview. Consent is obtained for observation and for home visits using the same consent form (attached).

If the patient do not communicate in Norwegian or English, we aim to get assistance from a person who speaks the patient's native language to carry out the interview, or the interview will be carried out with the help of an interpreter. The interviews will focus on how the patients perceived the medicines information they received when they were discharged from the hospital. In the interviews, open-ended questions adapted to the individual patient will

primarily be used to explore different patient perspectives. The interview guide will contain predefined questions (see examples below) and for individual patients, keywords from the observational study will be added, for further detailed exploration.

The patient interviews will focus on:

- Which factors related to drug treatment matters the most and why
- How the discharge process was experienced
- Adherence and thoughts about the treatment that was planned when discharged from the hospital

The interviews will also consist of a medicines reconciliation that aims to capture how the patient actually use his/her medicines, misunderstandings and / or challenges experienced by the patient, and the results of the medicines reconciliation will be explored in detail in dialogue with the patient. The patients actual medicines use will be compared to the medicines list in the discharge summary and any information sent from the hospital to the home nurse services by nursing and care (Pleie og omsorgs (PLO)) – messages. If necessary, supplementary information can be provided from next of kin either participating in the interview or in a separate interview (additional consent). The medicines reconciliation will be conducted according to the Integrated Medicines Management (IMM) model adapted to the Norwegian setting.

The interview guide will be piloted during spring 2019.

- *Demographic data and measurement variables:*

The following demographic data and measurement variables are obtained from the EPJ, electronic medicines chart and any prescription card from a multi-dose dispensing pharmacy. The data will be registered for the study population as part of the inclusion to ensure heterogeneity in the study population:

- Age
- Sex
- Residential area in Oslo
- Cause of hospital admission
- Medicines list in the medical record at admission: Number of drugs, ATC-classification
- Diagnoses (ICD-10): Number, type and, if relevant, year of diagnosis.
- Date of hospital admission.
- Date of admission to the internal medicines ward
- Whether the patient were receiving medicines dispensed in a multi-dose package system prior to admission- Yes/No
- Level of care in medicines management before hospital admission (independent, partial independent with some assistance from next of kin or home nurse service)
- Whether the hospital admission was acute or planned
- Socio- economic background, level of education
- Ethnic background
- Cognitive function (form to be implemented at the internal medical ward)
- Frailty scale (form to be implemented at the internal medical ward)

If patients do not agree to participate in the study, gender, age and possible cause will be registered (e.g. male, 50 years old, did not want to participate).

The following data will be recorded during or at the time of hospital discharge:

- Medicines reconciliation observed performed during the hospital stay
- Date of hospital discharge
- Where the patient is discharged to
- Medicines list in the discharge summary: Number of drugs, ATC-classification
- Diagnoses (ICD-10) according to the discharge summary: Number, type and, if relevant, year of diagnosis.
- Medicines dispensed in a multi-dose package system - Yes/No
- Level of care in medicines management after hospital discharge (independent, partial independent with some assistance from next of kin or home nurse service)

- *Analysis*

Part 1: Observational study.

Different types of data will be analyzed.

- The communication content of the field notes will be systematically examined by conventional inductive content analysis, which is a useful method particularly when the theory and research literature on the phenomenon being studied is limited (1). After transcribing the content word for word, it will be read repeatedly so that the observers achieve a holistic and in-depth understanding of the content. The data material will be read word by word and coded into different categories that describe the observer's perception of the content of sentences or paragraphs. In the further process, overall themes will be developed that link the categories together. The observers will collaborate in the analysis to ensure quality, i.e. that the context is understood and that important observations are not lost.
- Descriptive data: Mapping of the discharge process, what happens, when and in what order. Time-ordered displays will be developed for this purpose (2). This tool stimulates the identification of what can lead to what and why. Quantitative data such as demography and waiting time will be summarized.

Part 2: Interviews will be recorded as audio files and afterwards transcribed word by word.

Analysis will be inductive with systematic text condensation and content analysis (2). In those cases where assistance are obtained from an interpreter to conduct the interview, the transcription is preferably performed by the interpreter. If the interview is conducted by a PhD student or master's student with the help of an interpreter, information from the patient passed on by the interpreter will be transcribed. Where it is the interpretation of what the patient conveys that is transcribed, efforts will be made to find an external interpreter to listen through the audio file in order to capture additional information from the patient. Such work will be remunerated on an hourly basis.

The interviewers will collaborate in the analysis to ensure quality, i.e. that the context is understood.

Furthermore, several separate analysis will be performed with data from the observational study, to identify any patterns across the interview- and observational method. Whether the

patients' need for information when discharged from hospital is satisfied and whether it leads to active patient participation based on the need, will be evaluated.

Any problems the patients face with the drug treatment (revealed by interview and medicines reconciliation) will be classified quantitatively and qualitatively, including the number of patients with discrepancies, the number of discrepancies and the type of discrepancy.

Milestones

	Dato
Completion of protocol including consent form	2018-11-12
Data Handler Agreement (Services for sensitive data – TSD) at the University of Oslo	2019-01-02
Application submitted to the Regional Committees for Medical Research Ethics - South East Norway (REC) and the privacy ombudsman at Oslo University hospital	2018-11-12
Research preparation courses and training for PhD students and master's students	Spring 2019
Piloting	Spring 2019
Inclusion to the main study	Sep. 2019 – Jan. 2020
Submission of master's theses (2 planned)	Spring 2020
Completion of data analysis	June 2020
Submission of articles (3 planned) for publication	Autumn 2020/ Spring 2021

During periods of droplet infection in the ward, inclusion may be slower. Progress in the inclusion will be reported every week to the main supervisor.

Audit and inspection

Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway may perform internal audit of the study.

Ethics

The hypothesis is that understanding the patients' journey through the discharge process, and the patient perspectives, can help to improve the discharge transitions and reduce the gap between different care levels. Communication between patients and healthcare professionals will be observed at the hospital, and patients will then be interviewed 1-2 weeks after discharge from hospital. Before inclusion of patients in the study, they will receive written information about the project and can decide for themselves whether they want to participate or not. It will be taken into account that it may be challenging to visit all patients at home as it may be some patients who does not want to be visited, or withdraw their consent. Some patients will be included in the study even if they only want to participate in the observational study, this can help ensure the information strength of the sample. Before observing health care personnel, they will receive written information about the project and can decide for themselves whether they want to participate or not.

It is well known that information transfer during transition of care is a risk area, and there is a need for greater focus on and knowledge about patient involvement. The purpose of the study is to map the discharge process to identify factors important for achieving seamless and patient-safe treatment, as well as to evaluate whether patients' need for information when discharged from

Medicines communication in hospital - the patient perspective version no. 1, 2018-10-12 Page 9 of 11

hospital is met. It is expected that the results from the project will be useful in further development and improvement of health care services for patients.

The observer and interviewer are pharmacy students or pharmacists not affiliated to the internal medicine department on a daily basis, and not involved in the overall assessments behind decisions regarding drug treatment. The observer and interviewer will have no active role in the interdisciplinary team of health care professionals, thus participation in the study will not contribute to any risk for the participants. In case of discovering potentially serious drug-related problems at the hospital, the information will be passed on to the project manager, Morten Mowé, who will make an assessment of what to do with this information. If the interviews reveal critical discrepancies in the patient's medication management at home, this information will be passed on to the home nursing or GP. Master's students will sign a declaration of confidentiality before starting the pilot study.

Privacy and information:

Patients will be included after informed written consent, see appendix for declaration of consent. The same applies to health personnel and any relatives. The attending physician will decide whether the patients are competent to give an informed consent when the observers are in doubt. After consent has been obtained, the patient / health personnel / relatives will be registered with a study number. The code list will be stored electronically in MedInsight. The participants will receive a copy of the consent form. The signed consent forms will be kept locked up in the hospital. The participants will be free to withdraw their consent at any time, without having to give any justification for this. The registered data will be deleted if a consent is withdrawn, as long as the data has not been included in the analysis.

All collected data will be treated confidentially and identifiable data will not be taken from the hospital. Completed transcripts from the observations will be stored immediately on Services for sensitive data (TSD) at the University of Oslo. The interviews will be audiotaped and the files will be uploaded to Services for sensitive data (TSD) at the University of Oslo, immediately after the interview. Audio files will be deleted after the interviews has been analysed. De-identified electronic research data will be processed in the analysis program NVivo on TSD. See attached draft agreement between OUS and UIO. The data will be compiled as de-identified data, with one study number per patient. The code list that connects patient identity to study number will be stored electronically in MedInsight and thus secured and separated from other data. The code list will be deleted no later than 10.01.2023. The signed consent form will be kept locked up in the hospital.

An application will be sent to REC. In accordance with procedures for research at OUS, a notification will also be sent to the privacy ombudsman at OUS.

Budget

The study is funded by the Hospital Pharmacies Enterprise, South Eastern Norway.

References

1. Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative health research*. 2005;15(9):1277-88.
2. Malterud K. *Kvalitative metoder i medisinsk forskning - en innføring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget; 2011.

Appendices

Written informed consent form

- Patient version
- Health care professional version (a copy can be provided on request)

Data handler agreement for storage of sensitive data (a copy can be provided on request)

Additional file 2

21 Items from the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (**SRQR**) - Essential for Complete, Transparent Reporting of Qualitative Research (1).

No.	Item	Description	Section of the manuscript which reports the information that meets the criteria of the checklist
1.	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.	Title page
2.	Abstract	Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.	Page 2
3.	Problem Formulation	Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement.	Introduction, page 3
4.	Purpose or research question	Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions.	Aim, page 4
5.	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., post-positivist, constructivist/interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale.	Approach, page 5
6.	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.	Data collection, page 6 Authors preunderstanding, page 7

7.	Context	Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale.	Setting, page 5
8.	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.	Sampling strategy, page 5 Data collection, page 6 Analysis, page 6-7
9.	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.	Data collection, page 6
10.	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.	Setting and sampling strategy, page 5 Data collection, page 6 Analysis, page 6-7
11.	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.	Data collection, page 6 Setting and sampling strategy, page 5 Additional file 3 Observational form Additional file 4 Interview guide
12.	Units of study	Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation.	Setting and sampling strategy, page 5 Analysis, page 6-7 Results, Table 1, Table 2, page 8
13.	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.	Data collection, page 6 Analysis, page 6-7
14.	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	Authors preunderstanding, page 7 Analysis, page 6-7

		approach; rationale.	
15.	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis,(e.g., member checking, triangulation, audit trail); rationale.	Setting and sampling strategy, page 5 Data collection, page 6 Authors preunderstanding, page 7 Analysis, page 6-7 Discussion, page 16
16.:	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.	Results, page 7-14 Discussion, page 15-17 Conclusion, page 17
17.	Links to empirical data	Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings.	Results, page 7-14
18.	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.	Discussion, page 15-17
19.	Limitations	Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	Discussion, page 15-17
20.	Conflicts of interest	Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed.	Discussion, page 15-17
21.	Funding	Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting.	Page 17

1. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. *Academic Medicine*. 2014;89(9):1245-51.

Additional file 3. Observational form

Incl.nr	Department/group	Bed	Observer (initials):	Date:	Page /
Relevant information electronic patient/medical record (E.g. new medicine, changed dose/adm.form/dosage/ time, discontinued. Changed patient condition, etc.)					
Start observation:		End observation:		Tentative discharge date:	
Encounter - type: <input type="checkbox"/> Measurements <input type="checkbox"/> Medicines adm. <input type="checkbox"/> Ward round <input type="checkbox"/> Meal		Hospital environment <input type="checkbox"/> Single-bed room <input type="checkbox"/> Meal <input type="checkbox"/> Facilitation, e.g. movement, hygiene <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone/calling <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	Written information about medicines at hospital discharge <input type="checkbox"/> Distributed <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed jointly	Health care personnel (oral and written consent) Prof. title, incl.nr, ♂/♀	
Part 1: Chronological observations; Actions, quotes patient/health care personnel (e.g. questions, use of medical terms), drawing of the setting. Part 2: Observer interpretations, reactions, feelings, opinions (environment and communication). <i>Remember to describe any consequence of observer presence!</i>					

Incl.nr	Department/group	Bed	Observer (initials):	Date:	Page /
<p>Part 1: Chronological observations; Actions, quotes patient/health care personnel (e.g. questions, use of medical terms), drawing of the setting.</p> <p>Part 2: Observer interpretations, reactions, feelings, opinions (environment and communication). <i>Remember to describe any consequence of observer presence!</i></p> <p>Cont.</p>					

Additional file 4**Interview guide****Introduction**

- ☐ Repetition of aim of study, voluntary participation and the opportunity to withdraw of consent. Audiotaping.
- ☐ Estimated time frame of the interview, breaks

Experiences of the hospital stay, discharge and the period post-discharge

- ☐ How did you experience the information at the hospital?
 - Did you receive information continuously regarding treatment/medicines?
 - How was the communication between you and the healthcare professionals?
 - How involved were you in making decisions?
 - What was good/not good?
- ☐ How did you experience being observed?
- ☐ How did you experience the hospital discharge?
 - What kind of information did you get?
 - Did you review/read written information together with health professionals?
 - Were some information only provided as oral information?
 - In what extent did you find the information sufficient?
- ☐ How did you experience the information about medicines at the hospital?
 - What information did you get about new medicines ?
 - Who provided you with information?
 - When did you start taking your new medications? Why not?
- ☐ Beliefs about medicines
 - What was the most important aspect related to the drug treatment at the hospital?
 - What are your thoughts about medicines in general? What does medicines mean to you? Positive/negative (e.g. side effects, addiction) experiences of medicines?
 - What effect(s) did you expect of the medicines, and what effect(s) have you experienced?
- ☐ How have you been after hospital discharge?
 - Did you feel ready for discharge?
 - What challenges did you experience, if any?
 - What is the plan further (e.g. medical treatment)?

Medicines reconciliation conducted according to the IMM-model¹**End of interview**

- ☐ Something more to add?
- ☐ Opportunity to stay in touch, e.g. to add or request more information.
- ☐ Thank you so much for your time

1: Scullin C, Scott MG, Hogg A, McElroy JC. An innovative approach to integrated medicines management. *J Eval Clin Pract.* 2007;13(5):781-8.