medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Patient and family engagement interventions in primary care patient safety: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Yan Pang (MSc)[1,2,#,*] & Anna Szücs (MD)[#3,7], Ignacio Ricci Cabello (PhD)[4], Jaheeda Gangannagaripalli (PhD)[5], Lay Hoon Goh (MD, PhD)[3], Foon Leng Leong (MSc)[1], Li Fan Zhou (MSc)[6], Jose M. Valderas (MD, PhD)[1,3,8]

[1]Department of Family Medicine, National University Health System, Singapore
[2]Alice Lee Centre for Nursing Studies, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore
[3]Department of Family Medicine, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore
[4]Balearic Islands Health Research Institute (IdISBa) & CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
[5]NIHR ARC GM /Healthy Ageing research group, School of Health Sciences, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
[6]Department of Statistics & Data Science, National University of Singapore, Singapore
[7]Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands
[8]Centre for Research in Health Systems Performance, National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore

[#] These authors contributed to the work equally

* **Corresponding author**:

Ms. Yan Pang

1E Kent Ridge Road, Singapore 119228
Family Medicine, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine , Level 9 Tower Block

Email: e0011744@u.nus.edu

Tel: +65 6772 3205

Manuscript word count: 2,893 words

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

Importance: Engaging patients and their families has been proposed and promoted as a key strategy for improving patient safety of health systems. However, little is known about the use of this approach in the primary care settings.

Objective: This systematic review and meta-analysis assessed the effectiveness of interventions promoting patient and family engagement for patient safety in primary care based on randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

Data Sources: Five electronic databases (MEDLINE, CINAHL, Embase, Web of Science, and CENTRAL) were searched from inception to February 2023 with key words structured in four blocks (patient and family engagement; patient safety; primary care; randomised controlled trial).

Study Selection: Definition of patient safety included adverse events and non-recommended practices. Two independent study team members screened each record, with discrepancies resolved by consensus.

Data Extraction and Synthesis: Reporting followed PRISMA standards and included risk of bias and level of certainty assessments. For studies reporting on similar safety outcomes, results were combined into meta-analyses using multi-level random-effects models in case of moderate/substantial heterogeneity ($30\% \leq I^2 \leq 75\%$), and fixed-effect models when heterogeneity was low ($I^2 \leq 30\%$).

Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s): Expected primary study outcomes were adverse events, non-recommended medical practices, and medical errors. Interventions were considered of interest, if they prompted patients and/or families to take actions, focused on patient education about engagement, or had a significant patient engagement component if they were multifaceted interventions. Interventions were rated based on increasing degrees of patient/family engagement as “Inform about engagement”, “Empower”, and “Partner/Integrate”.

Results: Sixteen records were identified, among which eight completed RCTs. No intervention reached the highest engagement level. RCTs primarily targeted medication safety outcomes, with meta-analyses showing no significant effects on adverse drug events (OR=0.73, 95%CI [0.46,1.15]) and medication appropriateness using categorical (OR=0.97, 95%CI [0.73,1.17]) and continuous outcome variables (MD=0.56, 95%CI [-0.61, 1.72]). Overall risk of bias was low and the certainty of evidence ranged from moderate to high for most completed studies.

Conclusion and Relevance: Patient and family engagement strategies in primary care show inconclusive results based on extant randomised controlled evidence. They should delve into more comprehensive levels of engagement and address more diverse patient safety outcomes.

Key words: Patient involvement; patient engagement; family involvement; family engagement; patient safety; primary care; family medicine; randomized controlled trial.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Key points

- **Question:** Is there randomised controlled evidence supporting the use of patient and family engagement interventions in primary care patient safety?

- **Findings:** Randomised controlled interventions targeting patient safety through patient and family engagement are scarce in primary care, mostly focus on medication safety, and stay at low to intermediate levels of patient and family engagement. Although their combined effectiveness did not reach significance in meta-analyses, favourable results were reported for several patient safety outcomes.

- **Meaning:** Patient and family engagement interventions for patient safety in primary care show inconclusive results based on the randomised controlled evidence at hand, yet their scarcity and relatively low level of patient/family engagement underscores the need to further test and refine such approaches in all patient safety domains.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1 Introduction

Patient safety has gained momentum in the last decades, with patient safety strategies being integrated into the agendas of healthcare organizations worldwide (1). Nevertheless, the development of strategies and interventions to improve patient safety in healthcare delivery has by and large been confined to hospital care (2, 3). As the delivery of care within community settings relies more heavily on patients and their families (4), making them well-placed to identify errors or potential harm risks, strategies targeting patient and family engagement hold particular relevance in primary and community care (5, 6).

Patient and family engagement strategies go beyond raising awareness about care safety and can encompass partnerships between patients/families and healthcare professionals aimed at preventing or mitigating adverse events (1). Even though such strategies were already considered a pillar of patient safety in the landmark report of the Institute of Medicine in 1999, *To Err is Human* (7), only more recently was their importance reemphasized by the World Health Organisation's Declaration of Astana (8) and the designation of "Engaging patients for patient safety" as the theme for the 2023 World Patient Safety Day (9). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development has recently estimated that effective patient involvement could potentially diminish harm by up to 15% in ambulatory care, leading to significant cost savings for the healthcare system (10). Primary care is an optimal setting to implement such strategies because of the sustained relationship among care providers, patients, and families that is traditionally at its root (11).

Specific interventions, such as face-to-face coaching sessions in older adults (12), family carer support in dementia (13), and the utilization of eHealth tools for reporting adverse drug effects (14), have demonstrated efficacy in engaging patients and families in primary care patient safety. Yet, some authors viewed the implementation of these strategies as challenging (2), with the majority of studies focused on medication safety (14-16). Additionally, numerous patient safety strategies that involve patient/family engagement including patient-provider partnerships (17, 18), patient involvement in decision-making (19), decision coaching (20), patient access to medical records (21), and patient-mediated interventions (22), remain underexplored in primary care. Consequently, it remains uncertain which patient and family

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

engagement interventions are reliably effective in primary care and for which patient safety outcomes (23).

The present systematic review and meta-analysis aims to integrate extant randomised controlled evidence regarding patient and family engagement interventions targeting patient safety outcomes in primary care.

2 Methods

We conducted a systematic review following the PRISMA guidelines. The search protocol was preregistered on PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42023397495).

We used Coulter's definition of patient engagement (24): "*a set of reciprocal tasks between patients, healthcare professionals, and healthcare organizations working together to promote and support active patient and public involvement in health and healthcare and to strengthen their influence on healthcare decisions, at both the individual and the collective level*" (25) and extended it to include patients' families. Patient safety was defined as "*a health care discipline that aims to prevent and reduce risks, errors and harm that occur to patients during provision of health care*" (26).

We included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster-randomised trials that recruited participants in primary care settings, such as private practices, family medicine clinics, and community/ambulatory care settings associated with general practice. To be eligible, interventions needed to (i) prompt patients and/or families to take actions in the context of their care; (ii) focus on patient/family education about engagement (e.g., informing about red flags to be signalled to providers); or (iii) have patient/family engagement as a component of a complex intervention, as long as it was reported on separately and involved comparable resources to other components. We only considered safety-related outcomes, such as adverse events leading to increased morbidity/mortality or risk of harm and non-recommended medical practices, such as inappropriate prescriptions. We relied on the authors' definitions of these terms, given their varying definitions in the literature We excluded non-English language studies, review papers, and conference abstracts, trials of secondary or tertiary healthcare and specialist outpatient care, interventions exclusively involving

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

healthcare providers or policymakers, and outcomes pertaining to quality of care but not explicitly to patient safety.

Five electronic databases were searched for potentially eligible studies, including MEDLINE Ovid, CINAHL EBSCO, Embase Ovid, Web of Science Core Collection, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library. We also performed reference tracking to check for additional eligible records. The search strategy encompassed four blocks: patient and family engagement, patient safety, primary care, and randomised controlled trials (see Supplemental Tables S1 to S5 for the complete search strategy).

Article screening and data extraction were performed by two independent team members for each article, with discrepancies resolved through consensus meetings. Data extraction followed the Cochrane data collection guidelines (27) and risk of bias assessment employed the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool version 2 (28). Certainty of evidence was appraised following the GRADE approach (29).

Records reporting on pilot and full-scale RCTs were grouped by outcomes (continuous versus categorical outcomes) and conceptual similarity (inappropriate prescriptions, side effects, others). For groups containing two or more studies, results were combined in meta-analyses using R's *metafor* (30) and *meta* (31) packages. In alignment with Cochrane guidelines (32), the longest follow-up time was used. Random-effects models following the DerSimonian and Laird method were built for groups where $30\% \leq I^2 \leq 75\%$, indicating moderate to substantial heterogeneity according to the Cochrane guidelines (33), whereas fixed-effects models following the Mantel-Haenszel method were built for groups with no to negligible heterogeneity ($I^2 \leq 30\%$). In the event any group displayed considerable heterogeneity ($I^2 \geq 75\%$), it was not combined into a meta-analysis. For categorical outcomes, the analysis employed the natural logarithm of odds ratios and corresponding variance to estimate pooled odds ratios. Meta-analysis of continuous outcomes was reported as mean difference in scores (MD).

Records unsuitable to be combined by meta-analysis were summarised through narrative synthesis. We employed an adapted version of the engagement framework developed by Kim and colleagues (34) to appraise the level of engagement of patients/families in each intervention (Table 1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

3 Results

3.1 Study selection and general characteristics

The systematic search yielded a total of 4,773 records, of which 3,137 remained after deduplication and 173 after full text retrieval (Figure 1). A final set of 16 records were included (Table 2), of which eight were completed RCTs. Raw outcome data was not reported for one study (35), which had to be excluded from the meta-analysis part after two unsuccessful attempts to contact the authors by email.

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

All included records were published between 2001 and 2021 (Table 2). Eight records presented completed studies, of which five were cluster Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) and three were standard RCTs. Of the remaining eight records, six were RCT protocols, and two were trial registration records.

Seven records from the United States, two from Germany, two from France, two from Spain (both reporting on the same project), one each from, respectively, Canada the United Kingdom, and Australia. The authors' country of affiliation matched where projects were carried out for all completed RCTs.

The follow-up duration across RCTs ranged from two weeks to two years, and the number of randomized participants varied, with sample sizes ranging from 100 to 1,601 participants.

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

3.2 Outcome and intervention characteristics

Patient safety outcomes examined were predominantly adverse drug events (n = 8; three completed RCTs) and assessments of medication appropriateness (n = 8; six completed RCTs) (Table 2). One RCT protocol (36) listed both outcomes. Avoidable hospitalizations were reported by two records, of which no completed RCTs (37, 38).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The included 16 records described 12 types of interventions (Table 2). In terms of levels of patient and family engagement, most interventions remained at the *Inform about engagement* level (n=8), a few were at the *Empower* level (n=4), and none reached the *Partner or Integrate* level (Figure 2). There were proportionally more patient engagement interventions reaching Level 2 among study protocols and registrations (2/6, 33.3%) than among completed RCTs (2/8, 25%).

At the *Inform about engagement* level, most interventions (5/8, 62.5%) involved the provision of information to patients or their families to increase their understanding of health management. Patients partook in discussions with pharmacists about medication appropriateness and management (39), completed medication risk assessment forms were asked for feedback regarding safety outcomes during consultations (37,40), were asked about medication intake with or without the aid of a computer assistant (41, 42), or were provided information through video or brochures that served as basis for discussion with their GPs (36,43-45). At the *Empower* level, interventions included educational initiatives on safety deprescribing (45), online platforms fostering communication between patients and GPs regarding drug safety (46), motivational/cognitive-behavioural therapy aimed at reducing reliance on opioids (47), and psychoeducational support promoting polypharmacy patients' understanding of their medication (48).

[FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Two interventions described in three records included family members as participants: one involved education and activation strategies for patients and their families to promote deprescribing (36), while two records describing the same intervention reported the use of videos and brochures to promote communication between parents and general practitioners regarding antibiotic misuse in children (43,49).

3.3 Risk of bias assessment

Five RCTs demonstrated a relatively low overall risk of bias (Supplemental Figure 1). Two studies (40, 45) raised some concern, whereas one RCT (48) was assessed as having a high overall risk of bias.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

3.4 Results of individual studies

Whereas most trial registrations and study protocols were either published within the previous two years or have already been followed by a publication on a corresponding RCT, none were found for one trial registration (47) and one published protocol (46) despite having been published eight to six years ago.

Of the eight completed RCTs, improvements were reported in all of those focusing on adverse drug events (all at Level 1 engagement; 40, 44, 48). Among completed RCTs focusing on medication appropriateness, only one out of four found a significant positive effect (Level 2 engagement; 38), whereas three other RCTs, all at Level 1 engagement, did not find significant effects (41,43,50). A single RCT, at Level 1 engagement, investigated medication discrepancy correction (47) and reported no significant changes following the intervention. Of note, however, intervention and outcome in this study were not fully aligned, as intervention consisted in patient and family activation and education about the value of deprescribing whereas the patient safety outcome was the correction of medication discrepancies.

3.5 Impact on specific outcomes

We conducted three separate meta-analyses to analyse the outcomes related to adverse drug events and medication appropriateness, which combined evidence from six out of eight completed RCTs (Figure 3). For medication appropriateness, the analysis was separated in categorical outcomes for studies reporting presence vs absence of inappropriate prescriptions and continuous outcomes for studies using the Medication Appropriateness Index. One study by Muth 2016 reported both measures and was therefore included in both analyses.

The meta-analysis on adverse drug events (Figure 3, upper panel) did not include one cluster RCT on the topic (46), as it was promoting self-reporting of adverse drug events (with more reported adverse drug events considered more favourable) whereas the two other studies assessed adverse drug events, with more events considered less favourable (40, 48). In the combined analysis, substantial heterogeneity was observed ($I^2 = 63\%$) and the combined effect was non-significant (OR = 0.72, 95%CI [0.46, 1.15], $p = 0.178$). The certainty of the evidence for this meta-analysis was assessed as very low (Supplemental Table S6). Domains of concern during level of certainty

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

assessment included study design, indirectness resulting from reported proxy events, and imprecision associated with wide confidence intervals.

The meta-analysis of the three studies reporting on medication appropriateness using the Medication Appropriateness Index Score (39, 41, 51; Figure 3, middle panel) found moderate heterogeneity (I^2 = 39%) and a non-significant mean difference of Medication Appropriateness Index score (MD = 0.56, 95%CI [-0.61, 1.72], p = 0.350). The certainty of evidence for this meta-analysis was rated as moderate (Supplemental Table 1). The downgrading of the level of evidence pertained to imprecision (broad confidence intervals).

The meta-analysis of categorically measured medication appropriateness (count of inappropriate prescriptions; Figure 3, lower panel) including two studies (43, 51) with low heterogeneity (I^2 = 0%) was also non-significant (OR = 0.97, 95%CI [0.73, 1.17], p = 0.514). The certainty of the evidence of this meta-analysis was high (Supplemental Table S6).

Medication discrepancy correction also had a moderate level of certainty based on the single study investigating this outcome (Supplemental Table S6).

Ultimately, none of the combined effect of interventions yielded significant results, although trends suggested beneficial effects for all outcomes considered.

[FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE]

4 Discussion

The present review identified 16 interventions aimed at promoting patient and family engagement in the context of patient safety within primary care settings. The scope of patient and family engagement remained limited, with none of these interventions offering patients and families the opportunity to influence level of overall care. All but one record focused on medication safety as an outcome. The meta-analyses conducted did not yield statistically significant combined effects, although approximately half of the completed RCTs reported modest to moderate positive effects of patient and family engagement interventions individually.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The lack of interventions at the global care level aligns with findings in broader healthcare settings finding no studies that have achieved the integration of patients as full care team members (34). The observed lack of effectiveness in certain interventions might also be attributed to inadequate statistical power, which could be associated with insufficient follow-up durations or small sample sizes. This limitation might have been particularly pronounced in studies investigating relatively infrequent patient safety outcomes, such as falls. Additionally, the intervention had a considerable overlap with standard of care. Many of them offered one-time consultations or written information, which, while potentially useful in identifying certain existing safety issues, may be insufficient or too short-term to provide more important shifts in the mindsets or behaviours of patients and their families.

The diversity of the interventions was limited, and except for medication reconciliation, the evidence-based strategies of patient and family engagement recommended by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (52) were not investigated. Examples of such engagement strategies include being prepared to being engaged (patients and families encouraged to prepare for their appointments), teach-back (asking the patient/family to explain the instructions in their own words), and warm handoff (in-person handoff conducted in front of the patient).

Further, family involvement in the reported interventions remained limited to only three studies, two of which occurred in a paediatric setting (43, 49). Although the incorporation of family members introduces complexities in terms of study design, trials can be adapted to accommodate the needs of both patients and families, e.g., by providing separate study information materials or using modified surveys for family members. Meanwhile, family engagement remains a valuable resource in routine clinical practice, where research has demonstrated its potential to enhance communication between patients and providers, as evidenced by longer consultation times and patients taking a more active role during consultations (50).

Our review underscores the dearth of research into safety outcomes in primary care beyond the scope of medication safety. In particular, errors linked to other aspects of primary care delivery, such as communication errors or errors associated with care management may be important to target (7). Such errors occur at a high frequency (53), being estimated at 4 out of every 1000 primary care encounters (54).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The current review is the first to provide a comprehensive overview of randomised controlled interventions targeting patient and family engagement in primary care patient safety. It benefits from a comprehensive approach, including not only completed RCTs but also trial registrations and protocols, and a rigorous methodology, adhering to the Cochrane Collaboration guidelines at each step.

Nonetheless, this work has several limitations. Despite the search strategy being based on existing systematic reviews on patient safety and having been refined with a university librarian's guidance, it may have omitted keywords relevant to patient safety outcomes different from medication safety. It has been pointed out by other authors that varying definitions of adverse events in primary care may lead to an underrepresentation of less commonly recognised or documented adverse events in the literature (55). Similarly, the absence of a universally recognised definition of patient engagement may have resulted in the potential exclusion of pertinent records due to terminological variations. Our search strategy, restricted to English-language, peer-reviewed publications on RCTs, may have omitted relevant records in other languages or on studies with less resource-expensive designs.

Overall, patient and family engagement is underutilized but shows promise. Investing efforts to bring such interventions to higher engagement levels and broader applications could make an impactful difference in primary care patient safety. There is also a compelling need to consider the inclusion of family members into the patient safety framework in all primary care settings, not only paediatrics.

5 Conclusions

Despite the potential of patient and family engagement in enhancing patient safety in primary care, there is a notable scarcity of studies, with the available evidence falling short of demonstrating unequivocal effectiveness. To extend interventions beyond health promotion and education about medication safety, future research may need to think outside of the box of traditional engagement approaches. Partnering up with patients and families during research design can be a relevant first step in this regard.

6 Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

7 Funding

This study was funded by the Technology and Compassion: improving patient outcomes through data analytics and patients´ voice in Primary Care. Funds from the National Medical Research Council (NMRC) Clinical Research Coordinator Funding were allocated to sustain the remuneration of both YP and FLL.

8 Role of the funder/sponsor

The funding entities played no part in shaping or executing the study, gathering, overseeing, analyzing, or interpreting the data, preparing, reviewing, or endorsing the manuscript, nor in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

References

1. WHO. Global Patient Safety Action Plan 2021-2030 [online]. 2021. https://www.who.int/teams/integrated-health-services/patient-safety/policy/global-patient-safety-action-plan (accessed 01 December 2023).

2. Kuriakose R, Aggarwal A, Sohi RK, Goel R, Rashmi N, Gambhir RS. Patient safety in primary and outpatient health care. Journal of family medicine and primary care. 2020;9(1):7.

3. Marchon SG, Mendes Junior WV. Patient safety in primary health care: a systematic review. Cadernos de saúde pública. 2014;30:1815-35.

4. Smith M, Saunders R, Stuckhardt L, McGinnis JM. Engaging patients, families, and communities. Best care at lower cost: The path to continuously learning health care in America: National Academies Press (US); 2013.

5. Schenk EC, Bryant RA, Van Son CR, Odom-Maryon T. Perspectives on patient and family engagement with reduction in harm: the forgotten voice. Journal of nursing care quality. 2019;34(1):73-9.

6. Domer G, Gallagher TM, Shahabzada S, Sotherland J, Paul EN, Kumar K-N, et al. Patient safety: preventing patient harm and building capacity for patient safety. Contemporary Topics in Patient Safety-Volume 1: IntechOpen; 2021.

7. Donaldson MS. An overview of to err is human: re-emphasizing the message of patient safety. 2011.

8. WHO. Global Conference on Primary Health Care [online]. 2018. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HIS-SDS-2018.61 (accessed 01 November 2023).

9. WHO. World Patient Safety Day 2023: Engaging Patients for Patient Safety Advocacy Brief [online]. 2023. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/375011/9789240081987-eng.pdf (accessed 08 January 2024).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

12. Wetzels R, Harmsen M, Van Weel C, Grol R, Wensing M. Interventions for improving older patients' involvement in primary care episodes. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2007(1).

13. Powell C, Tomlinson J, Quinn C, Fylan B. Interventions for self-management of medicines for community-dwelling people with dementia and mild cognitive impairment and their family carers: a systematic review. Age and Ageing. 2022;51(5):afac089.

14. Lancaster K, Abuzour A, Khaira M, Mathers A, Chan A, Bui V, et al. The use and effects of electronic health tools for patient self-monitoring and reporting of outcomes following medication use: systematic review. Journal of medical Internet research. 2018;20(12):e294.

15. Coxeter P, Del Mar CB, McGregor L, Beller EM, Hoffmann TC. Interventions to facilitate shared decision making to address antibiotic use for acute respiratory infections in primary care. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2015(11).

16. O'Sullivan JW, Harvey RT, Glasziou PP, McCullough A. Written information for patients (or parents of child patients) to reduce the use of antibiotics for acute upper respiratory tract infections in primary care. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2016(11).

17. Lowe D, Ryan R, Schonfeld L, Merner B, Walsh L, Graham-Wisener L, et al. Effects of consumers and health providers working in partnership on health services planning, delivery and evaluation. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2021(9).

18. Sharma AE, Knox M, Mleczko VL, Olayiwola JN. The impact of patient advisors on healthcare outcomes: a systematic review. BMC health services research. 2017;17:1-14.

19. Butterworth JE, Hays R, McDonagh ST, Richards SH, Bower P, Campbell J. Interventions for involving older patients with multi‐morbidity in decision‐making during primary care consultations. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2019(10).

20. Jull J, Köpke S, Smith M, Carley M, Finderup J, Rahn AC, et al. Decision coaching for people making healthcare decisions. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2021(11).

21. Davis Giardina T, Menon S, Parrish DE, Sittig DF, Singh H. Patient access to medical records and healthcare outcomes: a systematic review. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association. 2014;21(4):737-41.

22. Fønhus MS, Dalsbø TK, Johansen M, Fretheim A, Skirbekk H, Flottorp SA. Patient‐mediated interventions to improve professional practice. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018(9).

23. Park M, Giap T-T-T. Patient and family engagement as a potential approach for improving patient safety: A systematic review. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2020;76(1):62-80.

24. WHO. Technical series on safer primary care: World Health Organization; 2017.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

25. Coulter A. Patient engagement—what works? The Journal of ambulatory care management. 2012;35(2):80-9.

26. WHO. The conceptual framework for the international classification for patient safety Geneva [online]. 2009. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/the-conceptual-framework-for-the-international-classification-for-patient-safety-(icps) (accessed 01 December 2023).

27. Cochrane. Chochrane training for Data collection form (for RCTs) [online]. 2021. https://training.cochrane.org/data-collection-form-rcts (acessed on 01 November 2023).

28. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. bmj. 2019;366.

29. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schünemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2011;64(4):380-2.

30. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of statistical software. 2010;36:1-48.

31. Schwarzer, G. (2007). meta: An R package for meta-analysis. R news, 7(3), 40-45.

32. Cochrane. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [online]. 2011. https://handbook-51.cochrane.org/chapter_9/9_3_4_repeated_observations_on_participants.htm (accessed 30 November 2023).

33. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Version 6.1). Chichester, UK: The Cochrane Collaboration; 2020.

34. Kim JM, Suarez-Cuervo C, Berger Z, Lee J, Gayleard J, Rosenberg C, et al. Evaluation of patient and family engagement strategies to improve medication safety. The Patient-Patient-Centered Outcomes Research. 2018;11:193-206.

35. O'Connor PJ, Sperl-Hillen J, Johnson PE, Rush WA, Crain AL. Customized feedback to patients and providers failed to improve safety or quality of diabetes care: a randomized trial. Diabetes Care. 2009;32(7):1158-63.

36. Bayliss E, Shetterly S, Drace M, Norton J, Green A, Reeve E, et al. The OPTIMIZE patient-and family-centered, primary care-based deprescribing intervention for older adults with dementia or mild cognitive impairment and multiple chronic conditions: study protocol for a pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2020;21:1-13.

37. Serrano-Ripoll MJ, Ripoll J, Llobera J, Valderas JM, Pastor-Moreno G, de Labry Lima AO, et al. Development and evaluation of an intervention based on the provision of patient feedback to improve patient safety in Spanish primary healthcare centres: study protocol. BMJ open. 2019;9(12):e031367.

38. NCT. Improving Patient Safety in Spanish Primary Care (PC) Centres (SinergiAPS): Clinical trial gov [online]. 2019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03837912?term=NCT03837912&draw=2&rank=1 (accessed 10 June 2023).

39. Syafhan NF, Al Azzam S, Williams SD, Wilson W, Brady J, Lawrence P, et al. General practitioner practice-based pharmacist input to medicines optimisation in the UK: pragmatic, multicenter, randomised, controlled trial. Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice. 2021;14:1-15.

40. Pit SW, Byles JE, Henry DA, Holt L, Hansen V, Bowman DA. A Quality Use of Medicines program for general practitioners and older people: a cluster randomised controlled trial. Medical Journal of Australia. 2007;187(1):23-30.

41. Muth C, Uhlmann L, Haefeli WE, Rochon J, van den Akker M, Perera R, et al. Effectiveness of a complex intervention on Prioritising Multimedication in Multimorbidity (PRIMUM) in primary care: results of a pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ open. 2018;8(2):e017740.

42. Mangin D, Lamarche L, Agarwal G, Banh HL, Dore Brown N, Cassels A, et al. Team approach to polypharmacy evaluation and reduction: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. Trials. 2021;22(1):1-15.

43. Goggin K, Hurley EA, Lee BR, Bradley-Ewing A, Bickford C, Pina K, et al. Let's Talk About Antibiotics: a randomised trial of two interventions to reduce antibiotic misuse. BMJ open. 2022;12(11):e049258.

44. Buchet-Poyau K, Occelli P, Touzet S, Langlois-Jacques C, Figon S, Dubois J-P, et al. Improving patient self-reporting of antihypertensive adverse drug events in primary care: a stepped wedge cluster randomised trial. BMC Family Practice. 2021;22(1):165.

45. Fried TR, Niehoff KM, Street RL, Charpentier PA, Rajeevan N, Miller PL, et al. Effect of the tool to reduce inappropriate medications on medication communication and deprescribing. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2017;65(10):2265-71.

46. Bailey SC, Paasche-Orlow MK, Adams WG, Brokenshire SA, Hickson RP, Oramasionwu CU, et al. The electronic medication complete communication (EMC2) study: Rationale and methods for a randomized controlled trial of a strategy to promote medication safety in ambulatory care. Contemporary clinical trials. 2016;51:72-7.

47. NCT. Primary Care Intervention to Reduce Prescription Opioid Overdoses (POST) [online]. 2015. https://classic.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02464410?term=NCT02464410&draw=2&rank=1 (accessed 10 June 2023).

48. Jameson JP, VanNoord GR. Pharmacotherapy consultation on polypharmacy patients in ambulatory care. Annals of Pharmacotherapy. 2001;35(7-8):835-40.

49. Goggin K, Bradley-Ewing A, Myers AL, Lee BR, Hurley EA, Delay KB, et al. Protocol for a randomised trial of higher versus lower intensity patient–provider communication interventions to reduce antibiotic misuse in two paediatric ambulatory clinics in the USA. BMJ open. 2018;8(5):e020981.

50. Wolff JL, Clayman ML, Rabins P, Cook MA, Roter DL. An exploration of patient and family engagement in routine primary care visits. Health Expectations. 2015;18(2):188-98.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

51. Muth C, Harder S, Uhlmann L, Rochon J, Fullerton B, Güthlin C, et al. Pilot study to test the feasibility of a trial design and complex intervention on PRIoritising MUltimedication in Multimorbidity in general practices (PRIMUMpilot). BMJ open. 2016;6(7):e011613.

52. Smith K, Baker K, Wesley D, Zipperer L, Clark MD, Hanneke CR, et al. Guide to Improving Patient Safety in Primary Care Settings by Engaging Patients and Families. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Published online. 2017.

53. Harrison R, Walton M, Manias E, Smith–Merry J, Kelly P, Iedema R, et al. The missing evidence: a systematic review of patients' experiences of adverse events in health care. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2015;27(6):424-42.

54. Michel P, Brami J, Chanelière M, Kret M, Mosnier A, Dupie I, et al. Patient safety incidents are common in primary care: A national prospective active incident reporting survey. PLoS One. 2017;12(2):e0165455.

55. Garzón González, G., Alonso Safont, T., Zamarrón Fraile, E., Cañada Dorado, A., Luaces Gayan, A., Conejos Míquel, D., ... & Mediavilla Herrera, I. (2023). Is primary care a patient-safe setting? Prevalence, severity, nature, and causes of adverse events: numerous and mostly avoidable. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *35*(2), mzad019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1: Levels of patient and family engagement

Levels		Definitions	Level of impact
Level 1	Inform about engagement	Patients receiving information (e.g., booklets) to learn about their health and increase communication with their care team	Patient's individual level of care
Level 2	Empower	Patients acquiring new skills and/or tools to engage with care team	
Level 3	Partner/Integrate	Patients involved in decision-making as collaborators, consultants, or team members	Overall clinical care

Note. Framework adapted from Kim et al. 2017 and encompassing three levels of engagement ordered with respect to increasing patient and family involvement. While patients or families' involvement impacts individual care at Levels 1 and 2, their involvement at level 3 aims to influence patients' overall care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Study characteristics

Author, year	Type of record	Country/setting	Interventions[a] and their level of patient/family engagement	Study groups (n per group; control intervention)	Patient safety outcome[b]	Follow-up timepoints/follow-up duration	Results pertaining to patient/family engagement in patient safety	Outcome statistics
Outcome: adverse drug events (ADE)								
Bailey, S. C., et al. (2016)	Cluster RCT protocol	USA/ambulatory care	Electronic medication communication tool to facilitate communication between patients and physicians about drug safety *Level 2: Empower*	I: 480 C: 480 Standard care	ADE Medications: 69 higher-risk medications selected (not listed specifically)	Baseline, 4 weeks & 3 months / 3 months	NA	N=960
Bayliss, E. A., et al. (2020)[c]	Cluster RCT protocol	USA/primary care clinics	Short, automated information sheet to prompt discussion with GP about medication discrepancies *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 1814 C: 1857 Waitlist control	Specific ADE (falls, haemorrhagic events, and hypoglycaemic events); Potential inappropriate medicine Medications: benzodiazepines, opiates, and antipsychotics	6 months, 12 months / 2 years	NA	N=3671
Mangin, D., et al. (2021)	RCT protocol	Canada/primary care clinics	Patients asked about medication intake and related problems *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 180 C:180 Waitlist control	Fall and other serious adverse events Medications: not specified	Baseline, 6 months / 6 months	NA	N=360
Keriel-Gascou, M., et al. (2013)[d]	Cluster RCT protocol	France/general practitioner clinics	Interactive patient booklet as support for discussion with GP *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 546 C: 549 Standard care	Increase in patient reporting of ADE Medications: Antihypertensive drugs (drug names were not provided)	3 months / 3 months	Increase in reporting of adverse drug events	No. of patients reported ADEs: I:57/546; C:34/549. OR=3.9 95% CI [1.4-11.2], p=0.01, aOR=3.5, 95%CI [1.2-10.1], p=0.02
Buchet-Poyau, K., et al. (2021)[d]	Cluster RCT							
Jameson, J. P. and G. R. VanNoord (2001)	RCT	USA/physician practice clinics	Assessment of polypharmacy patients' understanding of medications & psychoeducation *Level 2: Empower*	I: 179 C:161 Standard care	ADE: combination of 18 symptoms commonly attributed to ADEs Medications: β-blocker, Warfarin, Steroid inhaler, Levothyroxine, Lithium, Allopurino, Flurazepam, Glipizide	Baseline, 6 months / 6 months	Improvement of symptoms attributed to ADEs	No. of patients reported symptoms improvement: I:67/179, C:58/161, p=0.24

Pit, S. W., et al. (2007)	Cluster RCT	Australia/general practices	Patients completing medication risk assessment with their doctor *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 452 C: 397 Completed a Medication Risk Assessment forms but did not pass to GPs	Specific ADEs: slipped, tripped or stumbled OR falls OR fainted, felt weak or dizzy[e] Medications: Benzodiazepines, NSAIDs (including COX-2 inhibitors), Thiazide diuretics	Baseline, 4 months, 12 months / 12 months	Decrease in reported fall events in the intervention group.	No. of patients reported fall events at 12 months: I:70/397, C:94/352. COR (95%CI):0.57 (0.40–0.81) p=0.0036; AOR (95% CI):0.61 (0.41–0.91) p=0.02
Outcome: medication appropriateness								
Goggin, K., et al. (2018)[f,g]	Cluster RCT protocol	USA/private practice outpatient clinics	Video & brochure for parents on antibiotic misuse in children & encouraged to discuss issues with GP *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 697 C: 904 Lower intensity intervention group and usual care	Patients receiving an inappropriate antibiotic prescription Medications: Amoxicillin Cefdinir, cefpodoxime, ceftriaxone, cefuroxime, clindamycin, cefprozil, azithromycin, Cephalexin	2 weeks / 2 weeks	Intervention has no impact on inappropriate prescription	No. of patients received inappropriate prescription: I: 54/697, C: 85/904, adjusted OR 0.99; 95% CI 0.52 to 1.89, p=0.98
Goggin, K., et al. (2022)[f,g]	Cluster RCT							
Muth, C., et al. (2016)[h]	Cluster RCT	Germany/general practices	Computer-assisted discussion with patient on medication intake & polypharmacy evaluation/reduction *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 50 C:50 Standard care	Medication appropriateness *Assessed continuously, with the Medication Appropriateness Index as well as categorically* Medications: not specified	Baseline, 6 weeks, 3 months / 3 months	Intervention has no impact on inappropriate prescription nor medication appropriateness	No. of Inappropriate prescriptions per group (%) at 3 months: I: 107/392(27.2); C: 99/371(26.7) Changes of MAI score at 3 months: I: M(SD) 0.7(5.45) n=46; C: M(SD) -0.2(5.17) n=47; ICC/ICCadj: 0.030/0.039 p=0.460
Muth, C., et al. (2018)[h]	Cluster RCT			I: 252 C:253 Standard care		Baseline, 6 months, 9 months / 9 months	Intervention has no impact on medication appropriateness	MAI score at 9 months: I: M(SD) 4.8 (5.2) n=238; C: T2: M(SD) 3.9 (4.9) n=228; ICC/ICCadj: 0.000/0.00
Syafhan, N. F., et al. (2021)	RCT	UK/general practices	Polypharmacy patients involved in discuss with pharmacist about medication	I: 181 C: 175 Standard care	Medication appropriateness *Assessed continuously, with the Medication Appropriateness Index*	Baseline, 6 months/ 6 months	Improvement of Medication Appropriateness Index scores.	Changes of Medication Appropriateness Index score at 6 months: I: M(SD) 2.4 (4.8) n=63;

			appropriateness and management *Level 1: Inform about engagement*		Medications: consisted of a list of 102 classes of medications			C: M(SD) 0.0(4.0) n=60; p=0.879
Outcome: other outcomes								
Nct(2015)	RCT trial registration	USA/primary care clinic	Motivational & cognitive behavioural therapy on reducing reliance on opioids *Level 2: Empower*	I: 225 C: 225 Enhance usual care (provides educational content related to the biology of pain response and an overview of pain conditions usual care)	Patients with non-fatal overdose experiences or level of oversedation as an opioid side effect Medications: Opioid/ Morphine	Baseline, 3,6,12 months / 12 months	NA	N=450
Nct (2019)[i]	Cluster RCT trial registration	Spain/primary care centres	Patients asked to give feedback about experiences and outcomes related to patient safety *Level 1: Inform about engagement*	I: 624 C: 624 Control group will receive the feedback reports at the end of the study	Avoidable hospitalisation Medications: not specified	Baseline, 12 months / 12 months	NA	N=1248
Serrano-Ripoll, M. J., et al. (2019)[i]	Cluster RCT protocol							
Fried, T. R., et al. (2017)	RCT	USA/primary care clinics	Education & activation of patients & families about value of deprescribing *Level 2: Empower*	I: 64 C: 64 Standard care	Patients with medication discrepancy correction Medications: not specified	Baseline, 3 months / 3 months	The intervention has no effect on medication discrepancy correction	No. of patients with medication discrepancies correction: I: 46/64; C: 7/32; p=0.42

Legend. RCT: randomized controlled trial; ADE: adverse drug event; GP: General Practitioner; MAI: medication appropriateness index; I: intervention; C: control

[a] Only patients and/or family engagement were extracted from broader interventions, as most also involved general practitioners, pharmacists or other healthcare professionals.

[b] Only patient safety results were extracted from all reported outcomes.

[d,f,h,i] Studies used the same intervention.

[e] Falls were chosen as the outcome to include in the meta-analysis, as they were deemed the most severe ADE from all those reported.

[g&c] Studies interventions involved parent-child dyads and both patients and family members respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1 PRISMA Chart summarising the screening process



Note. Under "Reasons for exclusion", some records met more than one exclusion criteria and were therefore counted in several categories.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2: Interventions classified by level of patient and family engagement



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3: Meta-analyses of RCTs and cluster RCTs included in the review

Outcome: adverse drug events assessed categorically

Study	Log OR	SE	Weight	OR	95% CI
Jameson et al. 2001	−0.0605	0.2254	45.7%	0.94	[0.61; 1.46]
Pit et al. 2007	−0.5318	0.1785	54.3%	0.59	[0.41; 0.83]
Random effects model			**100.0%**	**0.73**	**[0.46; 1.15]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 63%, τ^2 = 0.070
Test for overall effect: z=−1.35, P=0.178



Outcome: medication appropriateness assessed with the Medication Appropriateness Index (MAI)

Study	MD	SE	Weight	95% CI
Muth et al. 2016	1.100	1.192	20.3%	[−1.24; 3.44]
Muth et al. 2018	0.900	0.468	65.9%	[−0.02; 1.82]
Syafhan et al. 2021	−1.900	1.499	13.8%	[−4.84; 1.04]
Random effects model			**100.0%**	**[−0.61; 1.72]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 39%, τ^2 = 0.32
Test for overall effect: z=0.93, P=0.35



Outcome: medication appropriateness assessed categorically

Study	Log OR	SE	Weight	OR	95% CI
Goggin 2022	−0.2117	0.1818	44.6%	0.81	[0.57; 1.16]
Muth et al. 2016	0.0275	0.1632	55.4%	1.03	[0.75; 1.42]
Common effect model			**100.0%**	**0.97**	**[0.73; 1.17]**

Heterogeneity: I^2 = 0%, τ^2 = 0
Test for overall effect: z=−0.65, P=0.51



SUPPLEMENT FOR *Patient and family engagement interventions in primary care patient safety: a systematic review and meta-analysis*

Complete search strategy

Supplemental Table S1 - Ovid MEDLINE

concepts		search terms as run	hits	source of search terms	change from original	reason
concept 1 primary care	1	exp General Practice/ or exp Ambulatory Care/ or exp Primary Health Care/ or (((primary or community) adj2 (care? or health$ or service?)) or (ambulatory adj2 (care or service))).tw.	5E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015 https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmu052		
	2	exp general practitioners/ or exp physicians, family/ or exp physicians, primary care/ or GP?.tw. or ((general adj1 (practitioner? or physician? or doctor?)) or (family adj1 (practitioner? or physician? or doctor? or nurse?)) or (primary adj1 physician?) or (community adj1 (practitioner? or physician? or doctor? or nurse? or provider?)) or (ambulatory adj1 (practitioner? or physician? or doctor? or nurs$3 or provider?))).tw.	2E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
	3	exp community health centers/ or ((general or family or primary or community or ambulatory) adj1 (center? or centre? or practice?)).tw.	73551	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
	4	(AMERICAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN or AM FAM PHYSICIAN or "Am. Fam. Physician" or ANNALS OF FAMILY MEDICINE or ANN FAM MED or "Ann. Fam. Med" or Atencion Primaria or ATEN PRIM or "Aten. Prim." or BMC Family Practice or "BMC Fam. Pract." or BRITISH JOURNAL OF GENERAL PRACTICE or "Br. J. Gen. Pract." or BRIT J GEN PRACT or CANADIAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN or "Can. Fam. Phys." or CAN FAM PHYSICIAN or FAMILY MEDICINE or "Fam. Med" or "FAM MED." or FAMILY PRACTICE or "Fam. Pr." or "FAM PRACT." or Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine or "J. Am. Board Fam. Med." or J AM BOARD FAM MED or JOURNAL OF FAMILY PRACTICE or "J. Fam. Pract." or "J FAM PRACTICE." or "PRIMARY CARE." or SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE or "Scand. J. Prim. Health Care" or PRIMARY CARE or Australian Family Physician or "Aust. Fam. Physician" or AUST FAM PHYSICIAN or Australian Journal of Primary Health or "Aust. J. Prim. Health" or AUST J PRIM HEALTH or European Journal of General Practice or "Eur. J. Gen. Pract." or npj Primary Care Respiratory Medicine or "NPJ Prim. Care Respir. Med." or "PHYSICIAN AND SPORTSMEDICINE" or Phys Sportsmed or Primary Care Diabetes or Prim Care Diabetes or Atencion Primaria or "Aten. Primaria." or "Primary Health Care Research and Development" or Prim Health Care Res Dev).jn.	82523	Ricci-Cabello 2015 & our own additions		
	5	1 or 2 or 3 or 4	7E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
concept 2 patient safety	6	exp Safety Management/ or exp Patient Safety/ or exp Patient Harm/ or exp Medical Errors/ or patient safety.tw. or safety culture.tw. or (safe$2 adj2 (practice? or management?)).tw. or (st.fs. and (safe or safety).tw.)	2E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015 additions based on the team's ongoing scoping review on patient and family engagement in patient safety		
	7	(((adverse? or preventable?) adj1 (event? or effect? or reaction? or outcome?)) or (safe$2 adj1 (event? or effect?))).tw.	5E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015	original term: (((adverse? or preventable?) adj1 (event? or effect? or reaction? or outcome?)) or (safet$3 adj1 (event? or effect?))).tw. (456387 hits)	to include "safe", "safer", ...; did not make sense to have three letters after "safet"; this change did not influence the number of hits
	8	harm$3.tw.	2E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015	original term: harm$2.tw. (80249 hits)	to include "harmful"
	9	exp Iatrogenic Disease/ or iatrog$.tw.	1E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015	changed iatrogenic to iatrog$	to include alternative endings of this word
	10	exp Medical Errors/ or ((medica$ or diagnos$ or therapeutic$ or administrat$ or dispensing? or prescri$ or clinical) adj1 (error? or mistake? or fault?)).tw.	1E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
	11	exp Malpractice/ or malpractice?.tw. or negligen$.tw. or misconduct$.tw. or neglect$.tw.	1E+05	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
	12	("Quality & safety in health care" or Qual Saf Health Care or International Journal for Quality in Health Care or IJQHC).jn. and safe$2.mp.	1023	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
	13	6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12	1E+06	Ricci-Cabello 2015		
concept 3 patient & family engagement	14	exp Family/ or exp Patients/ or exp Interpersonal Relations/ or exp Health Education/ or exp Patient Acceptance of Health Care/ or exp Patient Care Team/	1E+06	Mackintosh et al. Interventions to increase patient and family involvement in escalation of care for acute life-threatening illness in community health and hospital settings. *Cochrane*		

				Database of Systematic Reviews 2020, Issue 12. Art. No.: CD012829. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012829.pub2		
	15	exp Community Participation/ or exp Patient Education as Topic/	1E+05	Hall J, Peat M, Birks Y, et al. Effectiveness of interventions designed to promote patient involvement to enhance safety: a systematic review Qual Saf Health Care (2010). https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2009.032748	1. We changed Family (this term only) and Patients (this term only) to Family (explode on all trees) and Patients (explode on all trees) 2. We did not include Decision Making (this term only); Decision Support Techniques (this term only); Health Facilities (explode on all trees); Critical Care (this term only); Critical Illness (this term only)	1. We wanted to include Mesh terms beneath Family (e.g., Family Support); we are only interested in Outpatients for this review 2. these terms were not relevant for our topic, which is different than the source paper's topic
	16	((patient$ or consumer$ or famil$ or relative$ or parent$ or child$ or women$ or carer$ or care?giver$ or care giver$ or advocate$ or public or lay or people or user$ or citizen$) adj5 (activat$ or involv$ or initiat$ or engag$ or participat$ or contribut$ or collaborat$ or role$ or cooperat$ or assist$ or champion$ or advoc$ or help-seek$ or view$ or attitude$ or role$ or contribut$ or engage$ or opinion$ or report$ or signal$ or consult$ or conducting or conducted)).tw.	2E+06	Mackintosh 2020 Hall 2010 our own additions additions based on the team's ongoing scoping review on patient and family engagement in patient safety		
	17	partner$3.tw.	2E+05	Mackintosh 2020	We did not use the last part of this search term in the Mackintosh 2020 article search (in red): (((patient* or consumer* or family or families or relative* or parent* or child* or partner* or women* or carer* or caregiver* or advocate*) N5 (activat* or involv* or initiat* or engag* or participat* or contribut* or collaborat* or role or cooperat* or assist* or champion* or advoc* or help-seek*) N5 (deteriorat* or escalat* or "life threatening" or life-threatening or critical or emergenc* or complication* or "warning signs" or "danger signs" or adverse))):ti,ab,kw	irrelevant to our topic
	18	14 or 15 or 16 or 17	3E+06		separated this term from the previous entry	partner; partnering can be both a noun and a verb
concept 4 randomized - controlled trial	19	(controlled clinical trial or randomized controlled trial).pt. or (randomi?ed and controlled and trial).tw.	8E+05	Combines: [1] filter with the highest f- score to detect randomized controlled trials according to this publication: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7524635/ - Nwosu et al. 1998 and [2] PubMed filter "Narrow filter for randomized clinical trials" (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/help/#clinical-study-categories-bibliography) extended to British spelling	randomized has been changed to randomi?ed	extend search term to British spelling
Concepts 1, 2, and 3 combined	20	5 and 13 and 18	13494			
All concepts combined	**21**	**20 and 19**	**1340**			

Supplemental Table S2 - Embase

concepts		search terms as run
concept 1 primary care	1	General Practice'/exp OR 'Ambulatory Care'/exp OR 'Primary Health Care'/exp OR (((primary OR community) NEAR/2 (care? OR health* OR service?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/2 (care OR service))):ab,ti
	2	general practitioners'/exp OR 'physicians, family'/exp OR 'physicians, primary care'/exp OR GP?:ab,ti OR ((general NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor?)) OR (family NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse?)) OR (primary NEAR/1 physician?) OR (community NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse? OR provider?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurs* OR provider?))):ab,ti
	3	community health centers'/exp OR ((general OR family OR primary OR community OR ambulatory) NEAR/1 (center? OR centre? OR practice?)):ab,ti
	4	('AMERICAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN' OR 'AM FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'Am. Fam. Physician' OR 'ANNALS OF FAMILY MEDICINE' OR 'ANN FAM MED' OR 'Ann. Fam. Med' OR 'Atencion Primaria' OR 'ATEN PRIM' OR 'Aten. Prim.' OR 'BMC Family Practice' OR 'BMC Fam. Pract.' OR 'BRITISH JOURNAL OF GENERAL PRACTICE' OR 'Br. J. Gen. Pract.' OR 'BRIT J GEN PRACT' OR 'CANADIAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN' OR 'Can. Fam. Phys.' OR 'CAN FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'FAMILY MEDICINE' OR 'Fam. Med' OR 'FAM MED.' OR 'FAMILY PRACTICE' OR 'Fam. Pr.' OR 'FAM PRACT.' OR 'Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine' OR 'J. Am. Board Fam. Med.' OR 'J AM BOARD FAM MED' OR 'JOURNAL OF FAMILY PRACTICE' OR 'J. Fam. Pract.' OR 'J FAM PRACTICE.' OR 'PRIMARY CARE.' OR 'SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE' OR 'Scand. J. Prim. Health Care' OR 'PRIMARY CARE' OR 'Australian Family Physician' OR 'Aust. Fam. Physician' OR 'AUST FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'Australian Journal of Primary Health' OR 'Aust. J. Prim. Health' OR 'AUST J PRIM HEALTH' OR 'European Journal of General Practice' OR 'Eur. J. Gen. Pract.' OR 'npj Primary Care Respiratory Medicine' OR 'NPJ Prim. Care Respir. Med.' OR 'PHYSICIAN AND SPORTSMEDICINE' OR 'Phys Sportsmed' OR 'Primary Care Diabetes' OR 'Prim Care Diabetes' OR 'Aten. Primaria.' OR 'Primary Health Care Research AND Development' OR 'Prim Health Care Res Dev')/jt
	5	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4
concept 2 patient safety	6	Safety Management'/exp OR 'Patient Safety'/exp OR 'Patient Harm'/exp OR 'Medical Errors'/exp OR 'patient safety':ab,ti OR 'safety culture':ab,ti OR (safe* NEAR/2 (practice? OR management?)):ab,ti
	7	(((adverse? OR preventable?) NEAR/1 (event? OR effect? OR reaction? OR outcome?)) OR (safe* NEAR/1 (event? OR effect?))):ab,ti
	8	harm*:ab,ti
	9	Iatrogenic Disease'/exp OR iatrog*:ab,ti
	10	Medical Errors'/exp OR ((medica* OR diagnos* OR therapeutic* OR administrat* OR dispensing? OR prescri* OR clinical) NEAR/1 (error? OR mistake? OR fault?)):ab,ti
	11	Malpractice'/exp OR malpractice?:ab,ti OR negligen*:ab,ti OR misconduct*:ab,ti OR neglect*:ab,ti
	12	('Quality & safety in health care' OR 'Qual Saf Health Care' OR 'International Journal for Quality in Health Care' OR IJQHC)/jt AND safe*:ab,ti
	13	6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12
concept 3 patient & family engagement	14	family'/exp OR 'patients'/exp OR 'interpersonal relations'/exp OR 'health education'/exp OR 'patient acceptance of health care'/exp OR 'patient care team'/exp
	15	Community Participation'/exp OR 'Patient Education as Topic'/exp
	16	((patient* OR consumer* OR famil* OR relative* OR parent* OR child* OR women* OR carer* OR care?giver* OR 'care giver' OR 'care givers' OR advocate* OR public OR lay OR people OR user* OR citizen*) NEAR/5 (activat* OR involv* OR initiat* OR engag* OR participat* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR assist* OR champion* OR advoc* OR help?seek* OR view* OR attitude* OR role* OR contribut* OR engage* OR opinion* OR report* OR signal* OR consult* OR conducting OR conducted)):ab,ti
	17	partner*:ab,ti
	18	14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
concept 4 randomized-controlled trial	19	('controlled clinical trial' OR 'randomized controlled trial'):pt OR (randomi?ed AND controlled AND trial):ab,ti
Concepts 1, 2, and 3 combined	20	5 AND 13 AND 18
All concepts combined	**21**	**20 AND 19**

Supplemental Table S3 - Web of Science

concepts		search terms as run
concept 1 primary care	1	TS=(((primary OR community) NEAR/2 (care? OR health* OR service?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/2 (care OR service)))
	2	TS=(GP OR GPs OR (general NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor?)) OR (family NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse?)) OR (primary NEAR/1 physician?) OR (community NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse? OR provider?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurs* OR provider?)))
	3	TS=((general OR family OR primary OR community OR ambulatory) NEAR/1 (center? OR centre? OR practice?))
	4	SO=(('AMERICAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN' OR 'AM FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'Am. Fam. Physician' OR 'ANNALS OF FAMILY MEDICINE' OR 'ANN FAM MED' OR 'Ann. Fam. Med' OR 'Atencion Primaria' OR 'ATEN PRIM' OR 'Aten. Prim.' OR 'BMC Family Practice' OR 'BMC Fam. Pract.' OR 'BRITISH JOURNAL OF GENERAL PRACTICE' OR 'Br. J. Gen. Pract.' OR 'BRIT J GEN PRACT' OR 'CANADIAN FAMILY PHYSICIAN' OR 'Can. Fam. Phys.' OR 'CAN FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'FAMILY MEDICINE' OR 'Fam. Med' OR 'FAM MED.' OR 'FAMILY PRACTICE' OR 'Fam. Pr.' OR 'FAM PRACT.' OR 'Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine' OR 'J. Am. Board Fam. Med.' OR 'J AM BOARD FAM MED' OR 'JOURNAL OF FAMILY PRACTICE' OR 'J. Fam. Pract.' OR 'J FAM PRACTICE.' OR 'PRIMARY CARE.' OR 'SCANDINAVIAN JOURNAL OF PRIMARY HEALTH CARE' OR 'Scand. J. Prim. Health Care' OR 'PRIMARY CARE' OR 'Australian Family Physician' OR 'Aust. Fam. Physician' OR 'AUST FAM PHYSICIAN' OR 'Australian Journal of Primary Health' OR 'Aust. J. Prim. Health' OR 'AUST J PRIM HEALTH' OR 'European Journal of General Practice' OR 'Eur. J. Gen. Pract.' OR 'npj Primary Care Respiratory Medicine' OR 'NPJ Prim. Care Respir. Med.' OR 'PHYSICIAN AND SPORTSMEDICINE' OR 'Phys Sportsmed' OR 'Primary Care Diabetes' OR 'Prim Care Diabetes' OR 'Aten. Primaria.' OR 'Primary Health Care Research AND Development' OR 'Prim Health Care Res Dev'))
	5	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4
concept 2 patient safety	6	TS=(patient safety OR safety culture OR (safe* NEAR/2 (practice? OR management?)))
	7	TS=(((adverse? OR preventable?) NEAR/1 (event? OR effect? OR reaction? OR outcome?)) OR (safe* NEAR/1
	8	TS=harm*
	9	TS= iatrog*
	10	TS=(((medica* OR diagnos* OR therapeutic* OR administrat* OR dispensing? OR prescri* OR clinical) NEAR/1 (error? OR mistake? OR fault?)))
	11	TS=(malpractice?:ab,ti OR negligen$:ab,ti OR misconduct$:ab,ti OR neglect$)
	12	SO=('Quality & safety in health care' OR Qual Saf Health Care OR International Journal for Quality in Health Care OR IJQHC) AND TS=safe*
	13	6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12
concept 3 patient & family engagement	14	*Mesh terms - not applicable*
	15	*Mesh terms - not applicable*
	16	TS=((patient* OR consumer* OR famil* OR relative* OR parent* OR child* OR women* OR carer* OR care?giver* OR advocate* OR public OR lay OR people OR user* OR citizen*) NEAR/5 (activat* OR involv* OR initiat* OR engag* OR participat* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR assist* OR champion* OR advoc* OR help?seek* OR view* OR attitude* OR role* OR contribut* OR engage* OR opinion* OR report* OR signal* OR consult* OR conducting OR conducted))
	17	TS=partner*
	18	14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
concept 4 randomized-controlled trial	19	TS=(('controlled clinical trial' OR 'randomized controlled trial') OR (randomi?ed AND controlled AND trial))
Concepts 1, 2, and 3 combined	20	5 AND 13 AND 18
All concepts combined	**21**	**20 AND 19**

concepts		search terms as run
concept 1 primary care	1	[mh "General Practice"] OR [mh "Ambulatory Care"] OR [mh "Primary Health Care"] OR (((primary OR community) NEAR/2 (care? OR health* OR service?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/2 (care OR service))):ab,ti
	2	[mh "general practitioners"] OR [mh "physicians, family"] OR [mh "physicians, primary care"] OR GP?:ab,ti OR ((general NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor?)) OR (family NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse?)) OR (primary NEAR/1 physician?) OR (community NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurse? OR provider?)) OR (ambulatory NEAR/1 (practitioner? OR physician? OR doctor? OR nurs* OR provider?))):ab,ti
	3	[mh "community health centers"] OR ((general OR family OR primary OR community OR ambulatory) NEAR/1 (center? OR centre? OR practice?)):ab,ti
	4	*not applicable*
	5	1 OR 2 OR 3
concept 2 patient safety	6	[mh "Safety Management"] OR [mh "Patient Safety"] OR [mh "Patient Harm"] OR [mh "Medical Errors"] OR "patient safety":ab,ti OR "safety culture":ab,ti OR (safe* NEAR/2 (practice? OR management?)):ab,ti
	7	(((adverse? OR preventable?) NEAR/1 (event? OR effect? OR reaction? OR outcome?)) OR (safe* NEAR/1 (event? OR effect?))):ab,ti
	8	harm*:ab,ti
	9	[mh "Iatrogenic Disease"] OR iatrog*:ab,ti
	10	[mh "Medical Errors"] OR ((medica* OR diagnos* OR therapeutic* OR administrat* OR dispensing? OR prescri* OR clinical) NEAR/1 (error? OR mistake? OR fault?)):ab,ti
	11	[mh "Malpractice"] OR malpractice?:ab,ti OR negligen*:ab,ti OR misconduct*:ab,ti OR neglect*:ab,ti
	12	*not applicable*
	13	6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12
concept 3 patient & family engagement	14	[mh "family"] OR [mh "patients"] OR [mh "interpersonal relations"] OR [mh "health education"] OR [mh "patient acceptance of health care"] OR [mh "patient care team"]
	15	[mh "Community Participation"] OR [mh "Patient Education as Topic"]
	16	((patient* OR consumer* OR famil* OR relative* OR parent* OR child* OR women* OR carer* OR care?giver* OR "care giver" OR "care givers" OR advocate* OR public OR lay OR people OR user* OR citizen*) NEAR/5 (activat* OR involv* OR initiat* OR engag* OR participat* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR assist* OR champion* OR advoc* OR help?seek* OR view* OR attitude* OR role* OR contribut* OR engage* OR opinion* OR report* OR signal* OR consult* OR conducting OR conducted)):ab,ti
	17	partner*:ab,ti
	18	14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
concept 4 randomized-controlled trial	19	("controlled clinical trial" OR "randomized controlled trial").pt. OR (randomi?ed AND controlled AND trial):ab,ti
Concepts 1, 2, and 3 combined	20	5 AND 13 AND 18
All concepts combined	**21**	**20 AND 19**

Supplemental Table S4 - Cochrane

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Table S5 - CINHAL

concepts		**search terms as run**
concept 1 primary care	1	MH "General Practice+" OR MH "Ambulatory Care+" OR MH "Primary Health Care+" OR (((primary OR community) N2 (care# OR health* OR service#)) OR (ambulatory N2 (care OR service))):ab,ti
	2	MH "general practitioners+" OR MH "physicians, family+" OR MH "physicians, primary care+" OR GP#:ab,ti OR ((general N1 (practitioner# OR physician# OR doctor#)) OR (family N1 (practitioner# OR physician# OR doctor# OR nurse#)) OR (primary N1 physician#) OR (community N1 (practitioner# OR physician# OR doctor# OR nurse# OR provider#)) OR (ambulatory N1 (practitioner# OR physician# OR doctor# OR nurs* OR provider#))):ab,ti
	3	MH "community health centers+" OR ((general OR family OR primary OR community OR ambulatory) N1 (center# OR centre# OR practice#)):ab,ti
	4	*not applicable*
	5	1 OR 2 OR 3
concept 2 patient safety	6	MH "Safety Management+" OR MH "Patient Safety+" OR MH "Patient Harm+" OR MH "Medical Errors+" OR "patient safety":ab,ti OR "safety culture":ab,ti OR (safe* N2 (practice? OR management#)):ab,ti
	7	(((adverse# OR preventable#) N1 (event# OR effect# OR reaction# OR outcome#)) OR (safe* N1 (event# OR effect#))):ab,ti
	8	harm*:ab,ti
	9	MH "Iatrogenic Disease+" OR iatrog*:ab,ti
	10	MH "Medical Errors+" OR ((medica* OR diagnos* OR therapeutic* OR administrat* OR dispensing# OR prescri* OR clinical) N1 (error# OR mistake# OR fault#)):ab,ti
	11	MH "Malpractice+" OR malpractice#:ab,ti OR negligen*:ab,ti OR misconduct*:ab,ti OR neglect*:ab,ti
	12	*not applicable*
	13	6 OR 7 OR 8 OR 9 OR 10 OR 11 OR 12
concept 3 patient & family engagement	14	MH "family+" OR MH "patients+" OR MH "interpersonal relations+" OR MH "health education+" OR MH "patient acceptance of health care+" OR MH "patient care team+"
	15	MH "Community Participation+" OR MH "Patient Education as Topic+"
	16	((patient* OR consumer* OR famil* OR relative* OR parent* OR child* OR women* OR carer* OR care#giver* OR "care giver" OR "care givers" OR advocate* OR public OR lay OR people OR user* OR citizen*) N5 (activat* OR involv* OR initiat* OR engag* OR participat* OR collaborat* OR cooperat* OR assist* OR champion* OR advoc* OR help#seek* OR view* OR attitude* OR role* OR contribut* OR engage* OR opinion* OR report* OR signal* OR consult* OR conducting OR conducted)):ab,ti
	17	partner*:ab,ti
	18	14 OR 15 OR 16 OR 17
concept 4 randomized-controlled trial	19	("controlled clinical trial" OR "randomized controlled trial").pt. OR (randomi?ed AND controlled AND trial):ab,ti
Concepts 1, 2, and 3 combined	20	5 AND 13 AND 18
All concepts combined	**21**	**20 AND 19**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Figure 1: Risk of bias assessment of included cluster RCTs and RCTs



Note. Concerns regarding risk of bias primarily arose due to either significant deviations from the intended interventions or the presence of missing outcome data.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Table S6： Patient and family engagement compared to standard of care to improve patient safety

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		Certainty
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	patient involvement	usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
Adverse drug events (follow-up: median 6 months)											
2[1,2]	randomised trials	serious[a]	not serious	serious[b]	serious[c]	none	194/1122 (17.3%)	186/1062 (17.5%)	**OR 0.7261** (0.4584 to 1.1503)	**42 fewer per 1000** (from 86 fewer to 21 more)	⊕◯◯◯ Very low
Medication appropriateness											
Inappropriate prescription (number of patients receiving an inappropriate prescription) (follow-up: mean 8 weeks)											
2[3,4]	randomised trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	161/1090 (14.8%)	184/1275 (14.4%)	**OR 0.9231** (0.7261 to 1.1735)	**10 fewer per 1000** (from 35 fewer to 21 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ High
Medication appropriateness index (MAI score) (follow-up: median 6 months)											
3[3,5,6]	randomised trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious[c]	none	347	335	-	MD **0 0.56** (0.61 lower to 1.72 higher)	⊕⊕⊕◯ Moderate
Medication discrepancy correction (follow-up: mean 3 months)											

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		Certainty
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	patient involvement	usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
1[7]	randomised trials	serious[d]	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	No differences between intervention and control patients in the number of medications prescribed at ninety days or in the number of TRIM-related recommendations implemented However, over three times as many patients who received the intervention had correction of medication reconciliation errors as those who did not (48.4% versus 14.3%, p < .001)				⊕⊕⊕◯ Moderate

CI: confidence interval; **MD:** mean difference; **OR:** odds ratio

Explanations

a. Pit 2007 presents some concerns due to deviations from the intended interventions and missing outcome data. Jameson 2001 presents a high risk of bias due to deviations from the intended intervention.

b. Falls reported as a proxy of adverse drug events in Pit 2007

c. Wide confidence intervals

d. Some concerns due to deviations from the intended intervention

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.29.23300648; this version posted May 6, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References for Supplemental Table S6 (evidence certainty assessment):

1. Pit, S. W., Byles, J. E., Henry, D. A., Holt, L., Hansen, V., Bowman, D. A.. A Quality Use of Medicines program for general practitioners and older people: a cluster randomised controlled trial. Med J Aust; Jul 2 2007.

2. Jameson, J. P., VanNoord, G. R.. Pharmacotherapy consultation on polypharmacy patients in ambulatory care. Ann Pharmacother; Jul-Aug 2001.

3. Muth, C., Harder, S., Uhlmann, L., Rochon, J., Fullerton, B., Güthlin, C., Erler, A., Beyer, M., van den Akker, M., Perera, R., Knottnerus, A., Valderas, J. M., Gerlach, F. M., Haefeli, W. E.. Pilot study to test the feasibility of a trial design and complex intervention on PRIoritising MUltimedication in Multimorbidity in general practices (PRIMUMpilot). BMJ Open; Jul 25 2016.

4. Goggin, K., Hurley, E. A., Lee, B. R., Bradley-Ewing, A., Bickford, C., Pina, K., Donis de Miranda, E., Yu, D., Weltmer, K., Linnemayr, S., Butler, C. C., Newland, J. G., Myers, A. L.. Let's Talk About Antibiotics: a randomised trial of two interventions to reduce antibiotic misuse. BMJ Open; Nov 21 2022.

5. Syafhan, N. F., Al Azzam, S., Williams, S. D., Wilson, W., Brady, J., Lawrence, P., McCrudden, M., Ahmed, M., Scott, M. G., Fleming, G., Hogg, A., Scullin, C., Horne, R., Ahir, H., McElnay, J. C.. General practitioner practice-based pharmacist input to medicines optimisation in the UK: pragmatic, multicenter, randomised, controlled trial. J Pharm Policy Pract; Jan 4 2021.

6. Muth, C., Uhlmann, L., Haefeli, W. E., Rochon, J., van den Akker, M., Perera, R., Güthlin, C., Beyer, M., Oswald, F., Valderas, J. M., Knottnerus, J. A., Gerlach, F. M., Harder, S.. Effectiveness of a complex intervention on Prioritising Multimedication in Multimorbidity (PRIMUM) in primary care: results of a pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open; Feb 24 2018.

7. Fried, T. R., Niehoff, K. M., Street, R. L., Charpentier, P. A., Rajeevan, N., Miller, P. L., Goldstein, M. K., O'Leary, J. R., Fenton, B. T.. Effect of the Tool to Reduce Inappropriate Medications on Medication Communication and Deprescribing. J Am Geriatr Soc; Oct 2017.