

Evaluating Patient Information Prescriptions in Different Service Environments

Introduction

- Patient satisfaction correlates strongly with how satisfied they are with the ease of getting information from their providers regarding their medical condition
- Providers typically do not have enough time to fulfill all of their patients' information needs

One solution

- Introduce librarians trained and experienced in consumer health information services into the relationship between patient and provider
- Offer information services
- Evaluate impact of those services

Research Hypothesis

- Provision of IRx will improve
 - Patient satisfaction
 - Health outcomes
 - Patient – provider communication
 - Efficiencies of care

Specific Aim 1

To deliver information prescriptions in multiple clinical environments

Does the use of results of IRx differ across clinical environments?

Specific Aim 2

To evaluate impact on patients

What is the effectiveness of IRx on individual patients?

Specific Aim 3

To evaluate impact on providers

What are their perceptions of it?

Specific Aim 4

To evaluate the impact of the program as a whole

Does the IRx service make an impact on the overall perception of quality of care by patients?

Background & Significance

- IOM “Crossing the Quality Chasm”: emphasis on patient information
- Pew Foundation 2001 Internet Project: 56% of adults using Internet; 57% of those had gone online to get medical information

Background & Significance

- Assisting individuals find information is a traditional library function
 - NLM/NNLM has supported development of consumer health information services
- Complement Patient Education Program
- Availability does not ensure actually receipt

Background & Significance: Information Seeking Models

- ASK (Belkin et al)
 - Recognition of gap in knowledge
 - Information sought/provided
 - May be iterative process

Background & Significance: 2 Models

- The Health Belief Model
 - Threat perception Beliefs
 - Perceived susceptibility
 - Anticipated severity of consequences
 - Behavior Evaluation Beliefs
 - Benefits or efficacy of recommended health behavior
 - Costs or barriers
 - Cues to Action trigger health behavior (IRx is a ‘cue’)

Background & Significance

Other Studies

- Patient Judgement of Hospital Quality (PJHQ) (Rubin et al)
 - Information Subscale – what it is
 - Instructions for tests/operations
 - Information: tests, treatments, what to expect
 - Provisions for safety and security
 - Involvement of family and friends
 - Informing family & friends
 - Information Subscale --Correlation with overall quality

Background & Significance

Other Studies

Information as contributor to patient satisfaction

- Loblaw et al: Oncology patients
- Finkelstein: Obstetric patients

Assessing IRx Results

- ASK Model
- Health Belief Model
- PJHQ
- Press, Ganey Patient Survey

Preliminary Findings

- Clinical Trials Information
- HIV Information Services Maternity Center East, Baltimore
- Information Prescription Johns Hopkins Inpatient Pediatric Unit

Methodology

- Randomized Controlled Study
- Two high frequency disease entities:
 - Newly diagnosed breast cancer (adult women)
 - Acute Lymphocytic Leukemia (ALL) (pediatric)
- Study initiated with first outpatient visit

Methodology

- All patients
 - Receive letter from providers describing the study and expressing support for it
 - All randomized
 - Receive standard of care
- Participants
 - Consented
 - Given envelope to be opened by physician at conclusion of visit containing group designation

Methodology

- Control group
 - Sent to research assistant
 - complete information satisfaction questionnaire
 - Follow-up questionnaire 2 weeks after visit

Methodology

- Information Services (intervention) Group
 - Sent to librarian working in partnership with nurse who
 - assess literacy and
 - offer information services including follow-up availability of same librarian/nurse to answer questions
 - Teach criteria for evaluating quality of information found independently on the Internet
 - Complete satisfaction questionnaire
 - Follow-up questionnaire 2 weeks after visit