

1 Personalizing supportive healthcare for 2 patients with immunological disorders

3 A qualitative study in clinical practice
4

5 *Short title: Personalizing supportive healthcare in immunologic disorders*
6

7 Tessa S. Folkertsma^{1,2,3*}, Reinhard Bos², Robert M. Vodegel³, Sjaak Bloem⁴, Aad R. Liefveld⁵, Greetje J.

8 Tack¹
9

10 1. Department of Gastroenterology, Medisch Centrum Leeuwarden, MCL, Medical Center

11 Leeuwarden, Henri Dunantweg 2, 8934 AD, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

12 2. Department of Rheumatology, Medisch Centrum Leeuwarden, MCL, Medical Center Leeuwarden,

13 Henri Dunantweg 2, 8934 AD, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

14 3. Department of Dermatology, Medisch Centrum Leeuwarden, MCL, Medical Center Leeuwarden,

15 Henri Dunantweg 2, 8934 AD, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

16 4. Center for Marketing & Supply Chain Management, Nyenrode Business University, Straatweg 25

17 3621 BG, Breukelen, The Netherlands

18 5. Link2Trials, Neptunusstraat 16, 1223 HL, Hilversum, The Netherlands
19

20 *Corresponding author: Tessa S Folkertsma

21 E-mail: tessa.folkertsma@mcl.nl
22

23 Abstract

24 Current insights to personalize supportive care for patients with immunological disorders, especially
25 in the context of medical treatments, remain inadequate. Delivering and guiding supportive care
26 unquestionably contributes to a higher quality of life and better overall healthcare. The 'Subjective
27 Health Experience (SHE) Model' provides a general framework, comprising four segments, to
28 differentiate supportive healthcare in a quick and practical approach. In this report both health care
29 workers and patients tailored the unique needs of patients with immunological disorders to improve
30 their supportive care.

31 Employing qualitative methods, group discussions and individual interviews were conducted with 19
32 healthcare professionals and 18 patients suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis/Spondylarthritis,
33 Inflammatory Bowel Disease (Crohn's disease and Ulcerative colitis), and Psoriasis/Hidradenitis
34 Suppurativa. The aim was to ascertain nuanced insights into the behaviour, questions, and needs of
35 patients with six common immunological conditions guided by the SHE-model, thereby refining the
36 personalized supportive care framework.

37 A detailed description was made for patients with immunological disorders per SHE-model segment.
38 Based on these insights, it was determined for each segment **'WHAT'** kind of supportive care is
39 needed and **'HOW'** it should be offered. Notably, patients emphasized the qualitative aspects of
40 their interactions with healthcare professionals (attention, acknowledgment, and empathetic
41 communication), contrasting with professionals' focus on the treatment plan. This led to a strategic
42 allocation of supportive care interventions across patient segments.

43 This study has significantly advanced our understanding of appropriate supportive healthcare for
44 patients with immunological disorders from the perspective of the SHE-model. These findings not
45 only enrich the existing literature but also equip healthcare professionals with a concrete guide for
46 enhancement of supportive care, as the SHE-model is easy to perform in daily clinical care.

- 47 Attention, acknowledgment, and listening comprise the foundational elements for offering and
- 48 guiding supportive care.

49 Introduction

50 The quality of life (QoL) of individuals with immunological disorders is not only significantly impacted
51 by physical and biomedical complications, but also by the psychological and psychosocial challenges
52 of these conditions. Disease specific complications include joint deformities, uveitis [1],
53 cardiovascular problems, and osteoporosis for Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) and Spondylarthritis (SpA)
54 [2], malnutrition [3,4], colorectal cancer [5,6], stenosis [7], and fistulas [8] for Inflammatory Bowel
55 Disease (IBD; Cohn’s disease and Ulcerative colitis) and, arthritis [9], cardiovascular diseases [10],
56 and secondary bacterial infections for Psoriasis (PsO) and Hidradenitis Suppurativa (HS) [11].
57 Psychological issues are often overlapping for the disorders, such as depression, anxiety,
58 stigmatization and social withdrawal [2,11,12]

59 In addition to appropriate medical treatment, it is essential to consider how individuals experience
60 their own health [13]. Incorporating these experiences with biomedical perspectives can lead to
61 numerous advantages. It can streamline diagnosis, refine treatment plans, enhance patient
62 adherence to therapeutic regimens, and improve patient-reported satisfaction levels [14].
63 Furthermore, insights into health perception can be used to tailor supportive strategies, ensuring
64 they resonate with the unique needs of each patient [15].

65 Contemporary healthcare paradigms are progressively gravitating towards the concept of ‘tailored
66 care’ – the right supportive care, at the right time, in the right place. This shift can be attributed to
67 several developments, including the higher healthcare demand due to increased prevalence of
68 chronic (immunological) conditions [16-18]. In addition, the demand for healthcare is becoming
69 more challenging to meet due to healthcare personnel shortages [19]. Within this context and in
70 light of the aforementioned impact on QoL, it is crucial for the treatment of immunological disorders
71 to integrate tailored care, to deploy resources efficiently, and actively engage patients in their care
72 processes, capitalizing on their proactive contributions.

73 Bloem and Stalpers conceptualized a model that offers insights into the subjective health experience
74 (SHE) of patients and their associated needs [15]. These needs define the appropriate healthcare
75 interventions that can be utilized alongside conventional medical treatments in the context of
76 tailored care. Bloem and Stalpers define SHE as: "An individual's experience of physical and mental
77 functioning while living his life the way he wants to, within the actual constraints and limitations of
78 individual existence." [15, p. 8]. Two psychological determinants, namely acceptance and perceived
79 control, are intrinsically associated with SHE. A heightened level of acceptance, reflecting the degree
80 to which patients can integrate their health status into their daily life, and control, illustrating the
81 extent to which patients perceive opportunities to improve their health condition, augments the
82 positivity of health perception. Acceptance and control, both measured using three questions, form
83 the foundation for a segmentation model that prescribes who necessitates specific interventions and
84 when, establishing a framework to initiate tailored care (Fig 1).

85 This SHE-model is inherently dynamic: health perceptions, acceptance, and perceived control can
86 change over time due to a plethora of factors. Consequently, appropriate care modalities should
87 exhibit adaptability over time.

88 – Insert Fig 1 –

89
90 *Fig 1: SHE-model based on Bloem, S. & Stalpers [15]*

91
92 Several studies have been conducted utilizing the SHE-model. For instance, the segments within this
93 model have been further differentiated based on demographic and socio-economic variables [13],
94 and in relation to vitality within older individuals [20]. In addition, health perceptions have been
95 mapped across diverse disease domains [21], and the empirical relationship between health
96 perception and health behaviour has been established [22]. Furthermore, in two distinct studies
97 (cross-sectional and longitudinal), the model was validated for an IBD cohort [23,24].

98 While the SHE-model offers a guide for tailored care, it has not yet been adopted to cater to the
99 distinctive needs of patients diagnosed with immunological disorders of various professional
100 disciplines. We hypothesize that the needs for supportive care in this group of diseases will be
101 comparable to each other as they have overlap in pathogenesis and treatment they encompass all
102 lifelong chronic diseases with impact on social life and work capacity. Thus, this qualitative study
103 aims to ascertain nuanced insights into the behaviour, questions (challenges), and specific needs of
104 patients with six common immunological conditions guided by the SHE-model, thereby refining the
105 personalized supportive care framework. It is hypothesized that the empirical outcomes derived
106 from this research study will provide guidance to healthcare professionals in hospital settings to
107 further enhance and more efficiently integrate this care into daily clinical practice.

108

109 Method

110 This study is part of an extensive research project aiming to offer and monitor more personalized
111 care related to immunological diseases and treatments based on Patient Reported Outcome
112 Measures (PROMs). Additionally, it sought to enhance collaboration among the departments of
113 gastro-enterology, rheumatology, and dermatology. A proposal for this research was submitted to
114 the local Medical Ethics Committee at the Medical Centre Leeuwarden in May 2020. The proposal
115 was approved and classified as not subject to the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act
116 (nonWMO in Dutch). The recruitment period for this study was between May 1st 2020 and April 18th
117 2022.

118

119 Study design

120 Collaborative discussions were initiated with both healthcare professionals and patients from three
121 different disciplines, namely gastro-enterology, rheumatology, and dermatology, from The Medical
122 Centre Leeuwarden, a prominent regional hospital in The Netherlands.

123 Both the healthcare professionals and patients with an immunological condition characterized the
124 behaviour, questions (challenges), and specific needs of patients from the different segments of the
125 SHE-model. For the patient groups, discussions also delved deeper into their disease perceptions.
126 With both the healthcare professionals and the patients, an inventory was drawn up of the types of
127 support offered by the hospital treatment teams. These modalities were subsequently allocated to
128 one of the study's four predefined segments.

129 [Participants and procedure](#)

130 A total of nineteen healthcare professionals across three specialized teams participated in the
131 research: an RA/SpA team comprised of three physicians and five nurses; an IBD team consisting of
132 one physician and five nurses; and a PsO/HS team made up of one physician and four nurses. Length
133 of service and gender varied among the participants.

134 Three groups of patients diagnosed with an immunological condition were interviewed. The RA/SpA
135 group consisted of four patients diagnosed with RA and two with SpA. The IBD group included three
136 patients with Crohn's disease and four with Ulcerative Colitis. Finally, the PsO/HS group
137 encompassed five patients with PsO and two with HS. Overall, eighteen participants were
138 interviewed, of which ten were female and eight were male. The duration of their conditions ranged
139 from two to fifty years, with participant ages varying between twenty-two and seventy-four years.

140 Group discussions were convened with all three of the healthcare professional teams, the RA/SpA
141 patient group and the IBD patient group. The PsO/HS patient group was engaged in individualized
142 interviews via Microsoft TEAMS (a logistical shift necessitated by the residual constraints of the
143 COVID-19 pandemic, which prohibited in-person hospital interactions at the time). The discussions
144 with healthcare professionals were executed first.

145 All patient participants provided explicit written authorization, through the written signing of an
146 'informed consent' form, allowing for the anonymized utilization of their interview data to enhance

<p>Assigning support to segments (previous descriptions were visible)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of support is typically suited for which segment? A group discussion was conducted to determine this. 	<p>Consensus was achieved within the group based on discussion regarding the allocation of support across various segments.</p>
---	---

165

166 Table 2: Structure of interview and output for patients with immunological disorders

<p>Top-of-Mind characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What comes to mind when you think about your [condition] and health? Outcome was documented on flip charts. • Select the three most significant words for you and describe what they mean in your daily life. This was an individual task, followed by a group discussion. <p>Health Ladder (Visual ladder with 11 Steps, brief explanation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe an individual at the bottom and top of their health ladder. What does the person need to ascend the ladder? What does the hospital provide? This was discussed collectively. <p>Explanation of segmentation model (short video) + Brief description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each segment (visual provided with a brief description based on input from healthcare professionals), what services does the MCL offer for this individual? This was an individual task, followed by group discussion. <p>Note: In TEAM interviews, words were typed and displayed on the screen; the video was not shown.</p>	<p>Output:</p> <p>Reflection on what the condition meant for the individual in their daily life; the aspects that played a role in this.</p> <p>Insights into behaviour, questions, and needs; what was required; what was offered. (Note: High on the ladder corresponds with segment 1; low on the ladder corresponds with segment 4)</p> <p>Insights into forms of support per segment.</p>
---	--

167

168 [Analytical approach](#)

169 Interview transcripts were systematically analysed using the matrix method as proposed by
 170 Groenland to identify meaningful patterns [25]. Initially, a matrix was devised, designating rows for
 171 healthcare professionals and patients diagnosed with immunological disorders, while columns
 172 represented specific interview questions. Direct participant responses were transcribed and
 173 populated within this matrix.

174 In a subsequent phase, a thematic matrix was established to categorize and consolidate themes
 175 across various interview questions. Through quantitative tallying, predominant themes were
 176 differentiated, simultaneously elucidating the variances and commonalities both within and
 177 between participant groups.

178 This comprehensive analysis of the behaviours, questions, and needs specific to patients with
 179 immunological disorders, guided how tailored care strategies (provided by the hospital) could be
 180 distributed across the segments (also illustrated by Averill [26]).

181

182 Results

183

184 Behavioural patterns, questions, and needs

185 The four segments of the SHE-model were subdivided into the categories: Cognition and behaviour,
 186 questions and dilemmas, and specific needs, based on the findings of the structured interviews with
 187 both the healthcare professional teams and individuals with an immunological condition (RA/SpA,
 188 IBD, or PsO/HS; outlined in Table 3). The results showed a considerable overlap both within and
 189 between participant groups and were therefore combined into one table. Relationships between the
 190 three characteristics, signifying a higher level of mutual relevance, are depicted in the table using
 191 dashed lines.

192

193 Table 3: SHE-segment characteristics based on discussions with both healthcare professionals and
 194 patients (RA/SpA, IBD, PsO/HS)

Cognition and behaviour	Questions and dilemmas	Specific needs
Segment 1		
Attaches a great importance to factual information ----- Keeps informed	“What are reliable sources for information?”	“I need certainty” A desire for validation of one’s own approach
Keeps up with new developments regarding the condition -----	“What new developments are relevant to me?”	

Prepares for healthcare visits	"What options in diagnostics and treatment am I unaware of?"	Shared decision-making
Copes easily with setbacks	"How can I manage or deal with the fluctuating course of my condition?"	Perception of receiving attention and being listened to by healthcare providers when needed
Segment 2		
Seeks guidance to better cope with the condition	"How can I gain control?"	"I need structure" A need for support to gain control over the situation Arranging matters (themselves) with support from others
Attempts to prepare for consultations	"Am I doing the right things?"	Perception of receiving attention and being listened to by healthcare providers
Consults multiple healthcare professionals	"What (lifestyle) adjustments will help me manage my condition?"	Comprehensive overview of disease progression, treatment and support possibilities.
Open attitude towards the treatment team	"Am I doing enough?"	
Segment 3		
Questions why this happens to them specifically	"How can I learn to live with this?"	"I need tranquility"
Wants to keep things the way they are	"How can I (re)organize my life?"	Support for coping with disease and self-image – active role for healthcare professional
Tends to blame themselves	"How do I avoid social isolation?"	
Struggles with shame for their illness	"How can I best cope with others' reactions?"	Support for family and friends in the disease process
Will not directly show emotions to healthcare providers	"How can I discuss it with others?"	Examples of others with the same disorder
Primarily seeks support from family and friends	"How do I maintain an (intimate) relation with my partner?"	Need someone who listens
Segment 4		
Has no options to break out of their situation	"How can I learn to live with this condition?"	"I need perspective"
Let's everything (preferably) sink in for a moment		
Does not yet decide between treatment options, but does want help	"What is the next step?"	Small concrete tasks and simple advice
Enters into discussions with healthcare providers, 'under pressure from others'	"Who can be trusted?"	Receiving attention and being listened to by healthcare providers
Can ask a lot of attention from healthcare professionals	"What exactly can be done?"	Receiving guidance and direction, step by step – active role of health care professional
Pessimistic Blames other people	"Is this never going to pass?"	

195

196 Legend: Dashed lines are used to indicate relationships between the three characteristics.

197

198 In segment 1, the key cognition and behaviour characteristic is their coping with the consequences

199 of their chronic inflammatory disease. These patients display a high degree of openness when

200 discussing their conditions with others (healthcare professionals, loved ones) and deal with

201 comments regarding their disease in a proper and sensible manner. Overall, they attempt, whether
202 with success or difficulty, to integrate the condition into their lives and engage in activities that align
203 with their capabilities. An intrinsic motivation to remain well-informed is evident in their proactive
204 acquisition of (novel) information pertaining to their conditions. They pose (critical) questions to
205 both themselves and healthcare professionals. Furthermore, they actively obtain information from
206 online sources to bring to their consultations. They wish to be actively involved regarding decisions
207 about treatment and support. This group identifies with the concepts of ownership and self-
208 management, and they seek external validation from healthcare professionals and loved ones to
209 affirm their adaptive approach to managing their conditions.

210 In the second segment, patients exhibit a positive attitude towards their condition, aiming to
211 optimize their well-being actively, yet continually searching for guidance to deal with the disease in a
212 better way. Similarly to those in segment 1, these patients try to integrate their conditions and
213 potential symptoms into their lives as well as possible. However, they frequently lack an overview of
214 possible interventions. This group more frequently questions whether they are doing the right things
215 to improve their quality of life. They are very willing to seek and accept assistance from others.
216 Providing structured support and guidance are paramount in aiding these patients to manage their
217 conditions effectively.

218 The third segment involves patients who cannot accept their disease and are not able to adapt to
219 their condition. This segment predominantly comprising patients who have recently been diagnosed
220 or whose circumstances have recently deteriorated. These respondents display a tendency to seek
221 support from involved loved ones, although often suffering with feelings of shame. These patients
222 harbour questions primarily concerning the management of their altered situation, both in relation
223 to themselves and their environment. Immediate assistance in coping with the condition and self-
224 perception, with the aim of getting into balance, is crucial for them.

225 In the fourth segment, was depicted by the respondents as patients who have relinquished hope.
226 They have no perspective of how they can cope with the perceived impact of their disease and

227 improve their QoL. Pervasive pain, fatigue, and other symptoms are significant impediments in their
228 lives. They tend to withdraw from their social environment, driven by feelings of helplessness and
229 the burden of shame. Managing comments, whether well-intentioned or not, becomes a challenge
230 for them. This withdrawal results in more frequent feelings of isolation, misunderstanding, and
231 melancholy. Their predominantly inert disposition poses challenges in motivating them to take
232 proactive measures. Central to their concerns is the question of 'what's next?'. This question is
233 particularly significant when they are faced with numerous lifestyle guidelines to adhere to. In light
234 of these challenges, incremental progress through small tasks and guidance may lead to a renewed
235 perspective. Engaging in activities, witnessing and experiencing results, and thus potentially
236 regaining a sense of purpose are key to moving forward for patients from this segment.

237

238 Overall, the segment characteristics across the six immunological disorders displayed considerable
239 overlap. Despite the apparent distinctions between these conditions, notable similarities exist in
240 patients' challenges, resulting in similar behaviours, questions, and needs. For instance, all patients
241 consistently mentioned experiencing pain, while fatigue was reported by both RA/SpA and IBD
242 patients. Pain and fatigue greatly impact daily activities, including home responsibilities, work, and
243 social interactions. Furthermore, patients from all disorders struggle with feelings of shame, though
244 its manifestation varies. For instance, reluctance to ask other people for help (e.g., RA/SpA),
245 embarrassment due to frequent and unexpected need for visiting the toilet and confronted by faecal
246 incontinence (e.g., IBD); shame stemming from feeling filthy and feeling perceived as such by others
247 (e.g., PsO/HS).

248

249 Tailored care

250 In Table 4, a comprehensive overview is presented, delineating the various forms of hospital-
251 provided support for each segment of the SHE-model, as identified and categorized by healthcare
252 professionals and patients (RA/SpA, IBD, or PsO/HS). It should be noted that the types of support

253 discussed in the interviews were explicitly (and logically) related to the specific immunological
 254 disorders, but were generalized in the overview (except in cases where the form of support was
 255 uniquely applicable to a particular condition). Furthermore, during the discourse, at the initiation of
 256 the moderator, additional criteria were elucidated to refine the categorization of supportive care
 257 modalities. The study participants delineated between the ‘WHAT’, referring to the specific needs of
 258 patients diagnosed with immunological disorders, and the ‘HOW’, the methodological approach of
 259 providing the supportive care. This led to the conceptualization of a structured framework that
 260 categorizes the types of supportive care offered by healthcare professionals (as highlighted in the
 261 bold text in Table 4), alongside the optimal methods tailored to each SHE-segment (as indicated in
 262 the non-bolded text in the middle column, and validated by checkmarks in the rightmost column of
 263 Table 4).

264 Table 4: Tailored care framework based on discussions with both healthcare professionals and
 265 patients (RA/SpA, IBD, PsO/HS).

Category	Supportive intervention	SHE-segment			
Consult with healthcare professional	Receiving recognition and trust	1	2	3	4
	- Professional adapts to the situation	√	√		
	○ The individual knows how they feel and takes the initiative on what to do	√			
	○ Providing an overview when necessary		√		
	- Professional offers tranquillity and perspective			√	√
	○ Assistance in acceptance and in relearning one's body and mind			√	
	○ Sketching a clear timeline regarding the progression of treatment and support				√
	Offering attention and a listening ear				
	- Always maintain a connection	√	√		
	○ Easy access to contact (can be remote)	√	√		
○ Offering affirmation: "Keep it up"	√				
○ Continuously emphasizing that help and support are available		√			
- Being present			√	√	
○ Being open, showing understanding (empathy and compassion) for the individual			√		
○ Taking complaints seriously and invest time				√	
Discussion with	Discussion	1	2	3	4

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As an ally ○ As a motivator <p>Patients' association</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raising awareness (reliable source) - Discussing possibilities (e.g., peers) 	√	√	√	√
Digital support (Also see information transfer)		1	2	3	4
	Applications – programs				
	- Offering, e.g., app to coach patients at home	√	√		
	- Offering movement (Dutch TV shows for offering physical exercise)	√	√		
	- Discussing, offering, along with the caregiver			√	√
Podcasts					
- Offering	√	√			
- Discussing, offering, along with caregiver			√	√	
Promoting lifestyle and therapy adherence (nutrition, movement, smoking and drinking, pregnancy, sun, vaccination)	Support mostly by nurse, referral if necessary	1	2	3	4
	- Highlighting importance and providing an overview of rules and programs	√			
	- Mentioning, automate (new) behaviour by offering rules and programs		√		
	- Providing and explicitly discussing rules and programs			√	
	- Explicitly guiding and offering aftercare of programs				√

266

267 Legend: **bold** – mainly focused on ‘WHAT’ is offered, not bold – mainly focused on ‘HOW’ it is

268 offered; numbers in right column refer to segments.

269

270 The participants, comprising both healthcare professionals and individual patients, occasionally

271 found it challenging or non-intuitive to allocate specified forms of support to one or multiple

272 segments. In initial assessments, respondents from both cohorts frequently indicated that

273 universally relevant information is required for all segments, however, associations between the

274 manner of information provision and specific patient segments were spontaneously highlighted by

275 some respondents. For instance, offering information upon an individual's explicit request was

276 generally attributed to patients in segment 1, tailoring and structuring of information were deemed

277 more suitable for patients falling under segment 2 and a more intensive engagement in discussing

278 the available information was perceived as particularly beneficial for patients categorized within

279 segments 3 and 4.

280 Furthermore, participants proposed that the distribution of information could either be furnished

281 for the individual to review independently at home, or be interactively discussed with the individual

282 during a clinical consultation. Additional variations included the potential segmentation of the

283 information into discrete structured components, allocating more or less time during consultations
284 for discussing this information, and the selection of appropriate communication channels both prior
285 to and during the consultation. These nuanced insights provided respondents with further guidance
286 on how to tailor supportive care interventions across different patient segments.

287 During the discussions, particularly among healthcare professionals, it became evident that the
288 degree of an individual's acceptance of their health condition fundamentally influences the
289 preferred strategy for supportive care (the 'HOW'). Patients who are further along in accepting their
290 medical condition (segment 1 and 2) are more responsive to a reactive care approach, as opposed to
291 those with a lower level of acceptance (segment 3 and 4), who notably benefit from a proactive
292 model of care.

293 The high-acceptance cohort demonstrated a tendency toward self-initiative and greater autonomy
294 in managing their care needs. They often independently coordinate their healthcare and engage in a
295 more reciprocal relationship with healthcare providers. For these patients, shared decision-making
296 emerges as a logical and effective collaborative care strategy. In contrast, the low-acceptance group,
297 exhibits a lack of initiative, necessitating external guidance for organizing appropriate care and with
298 decision-making. It is imperative to gain insights into their unique care preferences. Utilizing these
299 insights, healthcare professionals are better equipped to offer a curated set of options, facilitating a
300 process we call 'guided decision-making'.

301

302 In addition, during discussions with healthcare professionals, it emerged that patients who are at a
303 lower level of acceptance with regard to their health conditions (segments 3 and 4) experience
304 greater difficulty in integrating their disorder into their life. Consequently, participants emphasized
305 that prior discussing treatment modalities, considerable focus should be allocated to exploring the
306 inherent implications of the disorder for the individual in question. The process surrounding grief,
307 acceptance, and active involvement is universally experienced by patients, irrespective of their

308 specific condition. Yet, this pivotal process often remains inadequately assessed by healthcare
309 professionals, who tend to prioritize the quantifiable aspects of disease activity during consultations.
310 In the process of identifying suitable care for each segment, patients with immunological disorders
311 particularly focused on the nature of 'contact' with healthcare professionals (i.e., WHAT is needed?).
312 The unanimous consensus among the respondents was that 'recognition' serves as an indispensable
313 element. Recognition fosters the establishment of trust, creating the groundwork for a sustainable,
314 long-term professional relationship. There exists a perpetual need to rely on professionals for
315 varying forms of assistance and support—ranging from treatment and medication to discussions
316 addressing physical and psychological issues. Over 50% of the respondents of the patients groups
317 accentuated that this personalized recognition, which honours their intrinsic identity, facilitates
318 mutual comprehension, thereby enhancing the overall quality of the healthcare they receive.
319 Several illustrative examples were cited by the respondents, stemming from their personal
320 experiences and unique medical conditions. These examples included trust-based consultations with
321 gastroenterologists concerning pregnancy while using medication, re-evaluations of treatment
322 protocols with rheumatologists due to increasing fatigue and diminished occupational performance,
323 and candid discussions with dermatologists about the emotional toll of visible skin lesions, especially
324 during summer months. Across all these scenarios, the principles of 'recognition' and 'trust' in
325 healthcare professionals emerged as pivotal factors enabling efficacious healthcare provision.
326 A number of patients emphasized their perception of 'vulnerability', attributable to their 'limited
327 functional capabilities' and the consequent 'reliance on external assistance'. Moreover, participants
328 identified an additional layer of 'vulnerability' arising from their (perceived) inferior status relative to
329 healthcare providers. This perception was reported to be particularly prominent during
330 engagements with physicians as compared to nurses, thereby impeding patients in talking
331 completely openly during consultations. An essential element for attaining recognition, as
332 underscored predominantly by patients with immunological disorders, centres on the healthcare
333 professional's capacity for 'non-judgmental' listening. Such an approach fosters the essential level of

334 patient-centric attention and establishes listening as a ‘foundational precondition for achieving
335 empathic understanding’.

336 These dialogues and insights contributed to a nuanced differentiation of healthcare service delivery
337 strategies (HOW to implement this) across the segments (Table 4).

338 In the context of support facilitated by third parties, healthcare professionals exclusively
339 differentiated among various communication channels employed during the referral process.

340 Specifically, written referrals were predominant in patient segments 1 through 3, while telephonic
341 consultations were reserved for segment 4, as outlined in Table 2. Moreover, healthcare
342 professionals delineated nuanced roles for caregivers of patients afflicted with immunological
343 conditions. In segment 1, caregivers act as 'equal partners,' providing affirmation and
344 encouragement, whereas in segment 2 they serve as 'supporters,' helping patients adhere to
345 appointments and acting as external commitments. In segment 3, caregivers play the role of
346 'empathizers' who understand and engage in discussions, and in segment 4, they function as
347 'motivators' that facilitate incremental progress. During the consultations, caregivers should be
348 accordingly educated and guided on this aspect.

349 Lastly, healthcare professionals in particular, noted the limited availability of digital support tools
350 (data collected before COVID-19 pandemic), suggesting a need for their development, possibly on a
351 hospital-wide scale.

352

353 Discussion

354 Drawing upon empirical insights into the behavioural patterns, questions, and specific needs of
355 patients afflicted with immunological disorders, segments within the SHE-model were allocated for
356 this cohort (Table 3). Therapeutic interventions from multidisciplinary healthcare teams were
357 allocated across these segments, focusing on both 'WHAT' is offered and 'HOW' it is delivered (Table
358 4).

359 Patients notably prioritize 'receiving attention' and 'active listening' from medical professionals.
360 These aspects are intrinsically linked to patient recognition, a concept that encompasses cognitive,
361 emotional, and behavioural dimensions. In scientific literature, attention and active listening are
362 frequently cited as pivotal indicators of the quality of the interaction between healthcare
363 professionals and end-users [27-29]. For instance, it has been evidenced that attention and active
364 listening contribute to a multitude of favourable outcomes, including improved patient guidance,
365 heightened patient motivation, reduced frequency of healthcare service utilization, and elevated
366 levels of patient satisfaction [30-32]. While the importance of 'attention' is commonly emphasized,
367 the dimension of 'listening', as identified by study participants, is often comparatively
368 underemphasized. This includes aspects such as unbiased listening and refraining from proposing
369 immediate solutions. Rogers allocated specific focus on these dimensions in his therapeutic
370 interactions and formulated targeted methodologies to address them [33]. Van de Pol
371 operationalized this concept through the development of a 'listening thermometer', a pragmatic
372 instrument designed to facilitate the transition from the act of listening to the state of
373 acknowledgment [34]. This tool has demonstrated potential for straightforward applicability within a
374 clinical setting.

375 Participants, both healthcare professionals and patients, frequently encountered challenges when
376 attempting to categorize distinct forms of support across the segments. However, the dialogues
377 during the study generated innovative approaches to differentiation, such as contrasting the
378 mechanisms of 'providing' and 'discussing' information with patients. This offered participants new
379 insights, that could be utilized as tools for more precise allocation of forms of support. Future
380 research could benefit from a comprehensive list of such distinguishing mechanisms, which could
381 subsequently be presented to participants when tasked with allocating different forms of support to
382 the segments. Interestingly, the utilization of digital forms of support was seldom mentioned by the
383 participants of all groups. This may be attributed to limited availability (this study was conducted
384 partially pre-COVID-19) and lack of awareness among participants. As digital technology becomes

385 increasingly important within the framework of tailored care, it will be crucial for innovation
386 departments to focus on this area.

387 All study participants exhibited a comprehensive understanding of the segmentation model and
388 demonstrated its applicability in practice. This model will offer healthcare professionals directional
389 insights for discussing various forms of support with patients. These discussions could range from
390 'guided decisions', where options align with the patients pre-established set of preferences, to
391 'shared decision-making', in which end-users exhibit greater initiative. Notably, the model is
392 designed to be flexible rather than prescriptive; it accommodates the possibility for both healthcare
393 providers and end-users to override its segmentation criteria when deemed necessary. This ensures
394 that adherence to algorithmic recommendations does not become overly rigid, thus maintaining the
395 clinical judgment and individualized care central to effective healthcare provision.

396

397 [Strengths and Limitations](#)

398 One of the key strengths of this study is its ecological validity, which lies in the involvement of both
399 healthcare professionals (physicians and nurses) as well as patients suffering from six distinct
400 immunological disorders. This study provides a framework, based on behaviour, questions, and
401 healthcare needs, offering a valuable resource for both inspiration and evaluative metrics.

402 Conversely, the study exhibits some limitations. Primarily, the evaluation is confined to the
403 healthcare services currently offered by three treatment teams in one peripheral healthcare
404 institution. While this was the study's original aim, the findings may not universally extend to other
405 medical teams or healthcare settings. Thus, additional or innovative initiatives not examined here
406 may potentially better meet the healthcare needs of the patient population studied.

407 Moreover, the study does not explore the qualitative aspects of the different forms of patient
408 support offered. While this was not the research focus, the quality of such support would be a
409 determinant of the overall quality of patient care and guidance.

410 Furthermore, the aforementioned 'vulnerability'— stemming from patients' perceived inferiority to
411 healthcare providers—may not only inhibit open dialogue during consultations but could also
412 influence their responses during this study's interviews.

413

414 [Practical implications](#)

415 The further operationalization of the SHE-model demonstrates that forms of support can be
416 differentiated into appropriate care in a relatively straightforward manner. By integrating this model
417 into the hospital's Electronic Health Records (EHR), patients can receive more tailored guidance
418 based on their levels of acceptance and control. The process can be monitored in real-time. Since
419 subjective experiences and their determinants can vary, it is essential to measure these at regular
420 intervals. The EHR should include a list of available support forms and a feature to record who
421 receives what type of support. Over time, evaluations can be conducted based on this real-world
422 data. Importantly, clear dashboards should be developed for both healthcare professionals and
423 patients. In this manner, care can be optimized based on data, thereby enhancing the patient's
424 perception of health and overall quality of life. This serves as the foundation for efficient,
425 appropriate care.

426 Further development and implementation of digital tools are essential. A recent study has also
427 proven the validity, applicability and value of the SHE-model in the clinical care environment through
428 manual procedures, but concluded that to achieve consistency and maximize effect, digital tools are
429 needed [35]. Innovation departments within the hospital can play a pivotal role in this, possibly
430 across various medical specialties.

431 This study has been executed in a clinical care/practice environment, but the suggestions for and the
432 value of tailored care are also valid for the clinical studies in clinical research. A clinical study may be
433 less complex (monopharmacy versus polypharmacy) and more controlled due to the strict study
434 protocol, but in essence it still is about a healthcare professional and a patient working together to
435 bring the treatment of a condition to a successful closure. On average and across all conditions

436 clinical studies tend to suffer from a steady 25% early drop-out rate, which is an extreme form of
437 non-adherence. A recent review shows that almost 70% of the protocol deviations can be linked to
438 non-adherent behaviour of the patient [36]. In clinical studies early drop-out and protocol deviations
439 lead to extended timelines, higher costs, lower efficacy, and missing clinical datasets. Tailored
440 support based on the SHE model of patients during clinical studies may help to make patient
441 adherence better and these studies more efficient and cost effective.

442

443 [Future Research](#)

444 Future research should be targeted toward exploring a broader range of clinical domains. This will
445 provide an opportunity to delineate any disease-specific differences or trends across varied
446 healthcare contexts. Furthermore, focus should be on understanding the dynamic nature of disease
447 processes (progress of conditions and their treatment), examining how patient behaviour and needs
448 evolve over time and what implications this has for healthcare provision. Additionally, gaining
449 insights into the effectiveness of healthcare interventions is vital. This will involve determining which
450 approaches are most effective, which are less so, and what modifications could lead to better
451 outcomes.

452 Furthermore, patients with new onset chronic immunological diseases all undergo processes as
453 sorrow, understanding, acceptance, and lifestyle changes. Ultimately, using a general approach the
454 SHE-model could facilitate adequate supportive treatment for patients grouped on segmentation,
455 irrespective of their type of immunologic disease.

456

457 [Conclusion](#)

458 Currently, detection of specific needs or type of approach for patient specific support is largely
459 pending on personal sensitivity of the health care professional. This study has used the SHE-model to
460 recognize and understand the personal need for supportive care for people with immunological
461 conditions. Interestingly, this was general applicable to the six different diseases.

462 The findings led to the differentiation of multiple forms of supportive care across the SHE-segments,
463 thus providing healthcare professionals evidence-based guidelines to tailor individualized treatment
464 approaches. The core elements of effective supportive care identified in this study are attention,
465 acknowledgment, and active listening, which are important factors in the provision and
466 management of patient-centric, appropriate care.

467

468 Acknowledgements

469 The authors would like to acknowledge the support of all staff at the participating facilities and also
470 the participants who engaged in this project. Special thanks are extended to Damien S.E. Broekharst
471 for his invaluable critical feedback that greatly enhanced the quality of this work.

472

473 References

- 474 [1] Becker MD, Adamus G, Davey MP, Rosenbaum JT. The role of T cells in autoimmune uveitis.
475 Ocular Immunology and Inflammation 2000 -01-01;8(2):93-100. doi:10.1076/0927-
476 3948(200006)821-OFT093.
- 477 [2] Bullock J, Rizvi SAA, Saleh AM, Ahmed SS, Do DP, Ansari RA, et al. Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Brief
478 Overview of the Treatment. Med Princ Pract 2018;27(6):501-507. doi:10.1159/000493390.
- 479 [3] Donnellan CF, Yann LH, Lal S. Nutritional management of Crohn's disease. Therap Adv
480 Gastroenterol 2013 -05;6(3):231-242. doi:10.1177/1756283X13477715.
- 481 [4] Goh J, O'Morain CA. Review article: nutrition and adult inflammatory bowel disease. Aliment
482 Pharmacol Ther 2003 -02;17(3):307-320. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2036.2003.01482.x.
- 483 [5] Eaden JA, Abrams KR, Mayberry JF. The risk of colorectal cancer in ulcerative colitis: a meta-
484 analysis. Gut 2001 -04;48(4):526-535. doi:10.1136/gut.48.4.526.

- 485 [6] Lutgens, M. W. M. D., Vleggaar FP, Schipper MEI, Stokkers PCF, van der Woude, C. J., Hommes
486 DW, et al. High frequency of early colorectal cancer in inflammatory bowel disease. Gut 2008 -
487 09;57(9):1246-1251. doi:10.1136/gut.2007.143453.
- 488 [7] Johnson, J. C., Geesala, R., Zhang, K., Lin, Y. M., M'Koma, A. E., & Shi, X. Z. (2023). Smooth muscle
489 dysfunction in the pre-inflammation site in stenotic Crohn's-like colitis: implication of mechanical
490 stress in bowel dysfunction in gut inflammation. *Frontiers in physiology*, 14, 1215900.
491 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2023.1215900>
- 492 [8] Tan Z, Zhu S, Liu C, Meng Y, Li J, Zhang J, et al. Causal Link between Inflammatory Bowel Disease
493 and Fistula: Evidence from Mendelian Randomization Study. *J Clin Med* 2023 March 24,;12(7):2482.
494 doi:10.3390/jcm12072482.
- 495 [9] Sankowski AJ, Łebkowska UM, Ćwikła J, Walecka I, Walecki J. Psoriatic arthritis. *Pol J Radiol*
496 2013;78(1):7-17.
- 497 [10] Ghazizadeh R, Shimizu H, Tosa M, Ghazizadeh M. Pathogenic Mechanisms Shared between
498 Psoriasis and Cardiovascular Disease. *Int J Med Sci* 2010 August 19,;7(5):284-289.
- 499 [11] Zachary MB, Hood CR, Windell E, Vercruyse GA. Hidradenitis Suppurativa: Radical Cure in a
500 Patient with a Malignant Course. *The American Surgeon™* 2016;82(12):371-373.
501 doi:10.1177/000313481608201216.
- 502 [12] Tarar ZI, Zafar MU, Farooq U, Ghous G, Aslam A, Inayat F, et al. Burden of depression and
503 anxiety among patients with inflammatory bowel disease: results of a nationwide analysis. *Int J*
504 *Colorectal Dis* 2022 -02;37(2):313-321. doi:10.1007/s00384-021-04056-9.
- 505 [13] Bloem S, Stalpers J, Groenland EAG, van Montfort K, van Raaij WF, de Rooij K. Segmentation of
506 health-care consumers: psychological determinants of subjective health and other person-related
507 variables. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020 -08-08;20(1):726. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05560-4.

- 508 [14] J. G. Bloem. 'Beleving als medicijn' (Experience as a medicine: the development of a general
509 subjective health instrument – in Dutch with English summary). Nyenrode Business Universiteit;
510 2008.
- 511 [15] Bloem S, Stalpers J. Subjective Experienced Health as a Driver of Health Care Behavior.
512 Nyenrode Research Paper Series 2012 July 9,;12(01). doi:10.2139/ssrn.2102513.
- 513 [16] Mou Y, Li F, Xu Y, Jin X, Dong S, Xia J. Global trends in the incidence of psoriasis from 1990 to
514 2019. *Eur J Dermatol* 2022 -04-01;32(2):207-213. doi:10.1684/ejd.2022.4245.
- 515 [17] Kontola K, Oksanen P, Huhtala H, Jussila A. Increasing Incidence of Inflammatory Bowel Disease,
516 with Greatest Change Among the Elderly: A Nationwide Study in Finland, 2000-2020. *J Crohns Colitis*
517 2023 -05-03;17(5):706-711. doi:10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjac177.
- 518 [18] Black R, Cross M, Haile L, Culbreth G, Steinmetz J, Hagins H, et al. Global, regional, and national
519 burden of rheumatoid arthritis, 1990-2020, and projections to 2050: a systematic analysis of the
520 Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet Rheumatol* 2023 -10;5(10):e594-e610.
521 doi:10.1016/S2665-9913(23)00211-4.
- 522 [19] Bridges J, Griffiths P, Oliver E, Pickering RM. Hospital nurse staffing and staff-patient
523 interactions: an observational study. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2019 -09;28(9):706-713. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-
524 2018-008948.
- 525 [20] Broekharst DSE, Bloem S, Blok M, Raatgever M, Hanzen N, de Vette, Jasmien J. E. Determining
526 the Appropriate Support for Older Adults with Different Levels of Vitality and Health-Related Quality
527 of Life: An Explanatory Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2023 -06-05;20(11):6052.
528 doi:10.3390/ijerph20116052.
- 529 [21] Broekharst DSE, Bloem S, Groenland EAG, van Raaij WF, van Agthoven M. Differences between
530 expert reported and patient reported burden of disease rankings. *Sci Rep* 2022 January 18,;12(1):1-
531 10. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-04070-5.

- 532 [22] Broekharst DSE, Bloem S. Complementing expected utility with experienced utility in health
533 economic evaluation: a quantitative study. Submitted.
- 534 [23] van Erp LW, Thomas PWA, Groenen MJM, Bloem S, Russel, M. G. V. M., Römken TEH, et al.
535 P548 External validation and consistency in time of patient segmentation based on disease
536 acceptance and perceived control in Inflammatory Bowel Disease. Journal of Crohn's and Colitis
537 2022 January,;16(Supplement_1):i495–i496. doi:10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjab232.675.
- 538 [24] van Erp LW, van Gerven J, Bloem S, Groenen MJM, Wahab PJ. Acceptance and Perceived Control
539 are Independently Associated With Quality of Life in Inflammatory Bowel Disease: Introduction of a
540 New Segmentation Model. J Crohns Colitis 2021 -11-08;15(11):1837-1845. doi:10.1093/ecco-
541 jcc/jjab082.
- 542 [25] Groenland E. Employing the Matrix Method as a Tool for the Analysis of Qualitative Research
543 Data in the Business Domain. Nyenrode Research Paper Series 2014 September 12,.
544 doi:10.2139/ssrn.2495330.
- 545 [26] Averill JB. Matrix analysis as a complementary analytic strategy in qualitative inquiry. Qual
546 Health Res 2002 -07;12(6):855-866. doi:10.1177/104973230201200611.
- 547 [27] Piven ML, Ammarell N, Lekan-Rutledge D, Utley-Smith Q, Corazzini KN, Colon-Emeric CS, et al.
548 PAYING ATTENTION: A Leap Toward Quality Care. Director 2007;15(1):58-63.
- 549 [28] Trzeciak S, Mazzarelli A, Booker C. Compassionomics: The revolutionary scientific evidence that
550 caring makes a difference. : Studer Group Pensacola, FL; 2019.
- 551 [29] Jahromi VK, Tabatabaee SS, Abdar ZE, Rajabi M. Active listening: The key of successful
552 communication in hospital managers. Electron Physician 2016 March 25,;8(3):2123-2128.
553 doi:10.19082/2123.


- 554 [30] Wanzer M, Booth-Butterfield M, Gruber K. Perceptions of Health Care Providers'
555 Communication: Relationships Between Patient-Centered Communication and Satisfaction. Health
556 communication 2004 -02-01;16:363-83. doi:10.1207/S15327027HC1603_6.
- 557 [31] Van Dulmen AM, Bensing JM. Health promoting effects of the physician-patient encounter.
558 Psychology, Health & Medicine 2002 -08-01;7(3):289-300. doi:10.1080/13548500220139421.
- 559 [32] King G. Central yet overlooked: engaged and person-centred listening in rehabilitation and
560 healthcare conversations. Disability and Rehabilitation 2022 -11-20;44(24):7664-7676.
561 doi:10.1080/09638288.2021.1982026.
- 562 [33] Rogers CR, Farson RE. Active listening. : Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago
563 Chicago, IL; 1957.
- 564 [34] Pol Hvd. Basisboek luisteren en spreken Helpen voor professionals. Ede, The Netherlands:
565 Vanbinnenuit B.V.; 2014.
- 566 [35] Broekharst DSE, Bervoets D. Providing tailored medication counseling to hematology patients: a
567 pilot project . submitted.
- 568 [36] Jalgaonkar SV, Bhide SS, Tripathi RK, Shetty YC, Marathe PA, Katkar J, et al. An Audit of Protocol
569 Deviations Submitted to an Institutional Ethics Committee of a Tertiary Care Hospital. PLOS ONE
570 2016 6 jan.;11(1):e0146334. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0146334.

571

572 Abbreviations

573	EHR	Electronic Health Records
574	HS	Hidradenitis Supperativa
575	IBD	Inflammatory Bowel Disease
576	nonWMO	Not subject to the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act

577	PROMs	Patient Reported Outcome Measures
578	PsO	Psoriasis
579	QoL	Quality of Life
580	RA	Rheumatoid Arthritis
581	SHE	Subjective Health Experience
582	SpA	Spondylarthritis
583		



Figure