Title: Implementing electronic patient-reported outcome measures in psychiatric urgent care

Authors: Amber Bailey, MHS[1], Emily Berich-Anastasio, MPH, LGPC[1], Andrew Ready[1], Alexander Maclay[1], Matthew Payne[1], Robert J. Schloesser, MD [1,2]

Institutional Affiliations: [1]Sheppard Pratt, Baltimore, Maryland, USA; [2] University of Maryland, Department of Psychiatry, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

Abstract

Background: Patient-reported outcomes (PRO) have been shown to improve screening and assessment across health care. However, overall implementation of PROs is low in mental health care. Research on PRO implementation in psychiatric urgent care settings is particularly limited. This mixed-methods study analyzes the implementation of electronic PROs (ePROs) in two psychiatric urgent care clinics.

Methods: This study examined ePRO implementation at two Maryland clinics with an average 6,000 patients treated annually. These clinics offer “walk-in” services for patients seeking immediate assessment for mental health conditions and referral to appropriate follow-up care. We used the Learning Evaluation (LE) and RE-AIM frameworks to guide and evaluate the implementation of PROs into administrative and clinical workflows using an ePRO system. Stakeholder feedback informed rapid iteration cycles, driving the development and deployment of technical and procedural modifications. Quantitative data were organized using RE-AIM metrics and analyzed through descriptive statistics and regression analyses. Qualitative data, derived from stakeholder feedback, were analyzed using deductive coding, inductive coding, and sentiment analysis.

Results: 22,610 care episodes were analyzed for the study. Annual ePRO completion increased from 9% in 2021 to 44% in 2023, averaging 63% post-implementation. ePRO completion varied across clinics and was lower among males, Black patients, and those with neurocognitive or substance use disorders, but higher for anxiety, ADHD, and insomnia diagnoses. Adoption increased in 2023, with 17% of care episodes including ePRO data in provider notes, averaging 59% post-implementation. Six iterative modifications were implemented, assisting with ePRO completion and documentation to varying degrees. Qualitative analyses revealed administrative, clinical, and technological factors associated with ePRO implementation and completion rates, as well as an overall positive sentiment towards ePROs.

Conclusion: This study integrated ePROs into psychiatric urgent care workflows using rapid iteration and continuous feedback to sustain processes. Representing the largest known ePRO implementation in this setting, the findings suggest that stakeholder-driven, iterative strategies, informed by stakeholder feedback, can integrate ePROs in fast-paced clinical environments and inform future quality improvement efforts.

Keywords: patient-reported outcomes, psychiatry, mental health, psychiatric urgent care, PROMIS, electronic patient-reported outcomes, RE-AIM, Learning Evaluation, implementation

Contributions to the Literature

- Our findings contribute to gaps in the literature about PRO implementation in psychiatric urgent care, providing new knowledge about barriers and facilitators within iterative implementation frameworks.
- While research supports patient-reported outcomes (PROs) as effective in mental health treatment when used, multiple barriers have limited their implementation in psychiatric urgent care settings. Continuous communication and feedback about PROs can help clinicians and staff with implementation.
- Using established implementation and evaluation frameworks, we were able to identify and overcome individual and organizational barriers of PRO implementation in psychiatric urgent care.

List of Abbreviations

CMS	Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
DMAR	Data Management, Analytics, & Reporting
EHR	Electronic Health Record
EMR	Electronic Medical Record
ePRO	Electronic Patient-Reported Outcome
FRAME	Framework for Reporting Adaptations and Modifications-Enhanced
HL7	Health Level 7

ICD	International Classification of Diseases
LCPC	Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor
LCSW	Licensed Clinical Social Worker
LE	Learning Evaluation
PDSA	Plan-Do-Study-Act
PoCRI	Point-of-Care Research & Innovation
PROMIS	Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System
PRO	Patient-Reported Outcome
PUC	Psychiatric Urgent Care
QPP	Quality Payment Program
QR	Quick-Response
RE-AIM	Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, Maintenance
REDCap	Research Electronic Data Capture
SMS	Short Message Service

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This project was undertaken as a Quality Improvement/Evidence-Based Practice Initiative at Sheppard Pratt, and as such was not formally supervised by the Sheppard Pratt Institutional Review Board.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

No external funding sources supported this study.

Authors' contributions

AB managed and reviewed the pilot and implementation phases of the intervention, analyzed ePRO data and qualitative feedback, and was the lead contributor in writing the manuscript. EAB managed and reviewed the pilot and implementation phases of the intervention, assisted with reviewing ePRO data, and assisted with editing the manuscript. AR and AM provided data management and assisted with writing the “Methods” section of the manuscript. MP supervised data management. RS supervised all phases of the intervention and data analysis. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank the urgent care supervisor, Lynn Stefanowicz, for her assistance with scheduling ePRO meetings and supervising the urgent care staff on ePRO workflows. We thank the urgent care managers, Sharnice Coleman and Kristi Fleming, and their teams for their continuous feedback, efforts to encourage support for ePRO implementation, and communication with patients about ePROs. We thank the urgent care clinical supervisor, Dr. Laura Eskander, for providing feedback about clinically relevant ePROs and assisting with ePRO Adoption among urgent care clinicians.

1. Background

Patient-reported outcomes (PRO) have demonstrated efficacy in mental health care, contributing to improved outcomes (1), improved patient functioning (2), and increased treatment satisfaction (1,3,4) when used. PROs are also effective in screening for depression and anxiety across medical fields (5–7), improving management of mental health care (8). Furthermore, the integration of PROs into clinical practice has been shown to support clinical decision-making (3,9), improve patient-provider communication, and strengthen therapeutic alliance (10).

The value of PROs as a method of quality improvement has been endorsed by many professional organizations, which have also developed resources to facilitate PRO integration into healthcare systems, including the American Psychiatric Association (11), the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI) (12), the National Committee for Quality Assurance (13), and the Joint Commission (14).

Despite these endorsements, significant barriers to implementing PROs in mental health care persist at individual and organizational levels. Response burden and data privacy are key patient-level concerns (15), while clinicians face time constraints and report uncertainty about clinical utility (16,17). In fact, over 80% of psychiatrists and 60% of master's- and doctoral-level clinicians do not routinely use PROs in their clinical practice (18,19). Additional organizational challenges, such as high staff turnover and inadequate training, further hinder integration into clinical practice (20).

The rising incidence of mental health conditions, increasing emergency department visits (21,22), and growing demand for accessible walk-in psychiatric services for underserved populations (23) underscore the need for efficient tools like PROs to enhance clinical decision-making, streamline workflows, and improve patient data collection and utilization.

However, there is limited evidence on effective implementation of PROs in psychiatric emergency, urgent care, or walk-in settings. Psychiatric urgent care, unlike outpatient or

inpatient settings, relies on rapid assessment and referral because of high clinical acuity. With limited time as a barrier for assessment, ePRO integration in psychiatric urgent care is uniquely challenging. Concerns persist about how diverse patient populations utilizing emergency services (24) will receive (25), respond to (26), and understand PROs (27). Electronic PROs (ePROs) can address some of these barriers by reducing completion time (28), offering multiple delivery formats (26), enabling rapid data integration into electronic medical records (EMRs) (29), and allowing PRO completion before clinical encounters (30).

To address the barriers and maximize the value of PRO implementation in psychiatric urgent care, a structured approach guided by implementation science frameworks is necessary. Frameworks such as Learning Evaluation and RE-AIM provide systematic methodologies for implementing and evaluating ePROs.

The Learning Evaluation framework employs Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles to facilitate continuous quality improvement by collecting and analyzing data, evaluating contextual factors, and generating transferable insights (31).

The RE-AIM framework can complement Learning Evaluation through established assessment of the performance of interventions across five key dimensions: Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance (31,32). “Reach” refers to the proportion of the target population engaged by the intervention, while “Effectiveness” measures the intervention's outcomes. “Adoption” evaluates the level of organizational participation, “Implementation” assesses factors such as the resource needs (cost) and scalability of the intervention, and “Maintenance” examines the sustainability of the intervention over time. By focusing on real-world applicability, RE-AIM is particularly useful for addressing the contextual challenges specific to different industries and organizations (33).

This study used the Learning Evaluation and RE-AIM frameworks to develop and evaluate a standardized implementation process and methodology for an ePRO intervention in psychiatric urgent care. The primary objective of this study was to identify the barriers and

facilitators influencing the implementation of ePROs. The secondary objective was to utilize this knowledge to rapidly develop and apply modifications that resolve challenges and amplify facilitators in real-world clinical settings.

2. Methods

2.1 Setting

The ePRO intervention was implemented from August 2021 to December 2023 at two psychiatric urgent care (PUC) clinics operated by Sheppard Pratt, a large, private, non-profit mental health service provider in the United States. Designated as Location B and Location T, both clinics are located in central Maryland, collectively serving approximately 6,000 patients annually. Location B (Howard County) was newly established shortly before the study period, while Location T (Baltimore County) has been operational for many years.

Both clinics provide immediate walk-in psychiatric assessments and facilitate referrals to appropriate care levels through a multidisciplinary team (psychiatrists, psychiatry residents, nurse practitioners, social workers, counselors). Patients aged five years or older were eligible for evaluation and participation in the ePRO intervention.

An ePRO implementation team (one director, two project coordinators) oversaw the intervention and was supported by a digital services team (one director, two senior data engineers, three junior data engineers) responsible for the ePRO system's technical development and maintenance (Supplementary Table 1). Feedback was gathered from three administrative managers and two clinical managers on the urgent care team (Supplementary Table 2). Implementation and reporting adhered to the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) guidelines (34).

2.2 Intervention

Figure 1 illustrates the clinical workflow of the ePRO intervention, which consisted of five components: deploy, collect, track, review, and document (35). A custom health IT application (see Section 2.4 Technology) was used to collect, score, and transfer results of ePROs into the

EMR. Automated notifications, triggered by HL7 registration and scheduling events, were sent via email or SMS/text, with on-demand deployment facilitated by quick-response (QR) codes or direct links (Supplementary Figure 1a). Clinical and administrative staff could monitor ePRO deployment and completion in real time via dashboards accessible on health system workstations and through the EMR.

Completion of an ePRO generated a score report that was transmitted to the EMR within three minutes. Clinicians could review these ePRO score reports in the EMR and include them in service notes; item-level data were available on the ePRO dashboard. The total number of completed ePROs was tracked as the “Reach” metric for implementation (i.e., the ratio of patients with completed ePROs to all admitted patients). To quantify 'Adoption' (i.e., the degree to which clinicians incorporated ePROs into their workflow), the number of ePRO reports populated into service notes was measured relative to the total number of completed ePROs.

Patients aged 12 and older completed ePROs independently; parent-proxy reports were used for younger children (36). The ePRO battery, developed collaboratively by the ePRO implementation team and urgent care clinical managers, included PROMIS instruments for their brevity and broad applicability, as well as supplemental screeners for alcohol use (37), tobacco use, elder abuse (38), and fall risk (Supplementary Table 3). Spanish-language options were provided through an on-screen language selector (Supplementary Figure 1b).

2.3 Implementation Frameworks and Metrics

The implementation process followed the Learning Evaluation (LE) framework (31), while the RE-AIM framework (32) guided evaluation of intervention outcomes. Contextual factors influencing implementation were documented during governance meetings and used to inform iterative improvements through Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles.

The ePRO implementation team facilitated weekly governance meetings to review stakeholder feedback, RE-AIM metrics, and overall progress. Monthly site-specific governance meetings, which included urgent care team members and representatives from relevant

stakeholder groups (e.g., clinicians, administrative staff), addressed site-specific barriers, facilitators, and recommended improvements. Figure 2 illustrates the monthly site governance process for identifying barriers, setting implementation goals, and tracking action items (39).

Modifications to the ePRO intervention were guided by SMART criteria (40) and documented using the Framework for Reporting Adaptations and Modifications-Enhanced (FRAME) (41). During the “act” phase of PDSA, these modifications were translated into user stories based on agile principles (42), defining features from an end-user perspective (43). The “plan” phase of PDSA involved refining the requirements of the user stories during dedicated blocks termed “discovery”. The “do” phase of PDSA marked the completion of user story requirements during two week sprint cycles.

2.4 Technology

The ePRO intervention’s IT infrastructure integrated open-source tools (e.g., REDCap, R, R Shiny, Drupal) with Sheppard Pratt’s electronic health record (EHR). Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) was used for ePRO-related data management, including assessments, scoring, support tickets, meeting transcripts, and system modifications. REDCap’s secure, web-based platform features an intuitive interface, audit trails, automated export procedures, and interoperability with external sources (44,45).

R was employed for statistical analysis and data visualizations (46), while R Shiny facilitated the creation of interactive dashboards (47). Drupal managed user access to dashboards and collection of support tickets (48). Docker images hosted submodules, including a Node.js HL7 ingestion client and R Shiny dashboards for ePRO data collection. These components were coordinated via MySQL databases and automated ePRO deployment through Python scripts that dispatched email or SMS/text notifications. Real-time, event-based interfaces using the HL7 standard enabled automated ePRO deployment, and custom document-based integrations facilitated reporting of ePRO data into the EMR.

2.5 Data Sources

Demographic data, registration, and scheduling information were extracted from the hospital's revenue cycle management system (AthenaIDX, AthenaHealth Inc., Boston, MA).

Diagnostic data were extracted from the EMR (Sunrise, Altera Digital Health Inc., San Jose, CA). Subject matter experts, including a licensed mental health clinician (EAB) and a board-certified psychiatrist (RJS), grouped International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes into clinically relevant categories based on DSM-5 chapters (see Supplementary Table 4).

Additional data included system logs for ePRO metrics ("Reach", "Adoption") and stakeholder feedback collected during governance meetings and support tickets. All meeting documentation was stored in a feedback database ("study" phase of PDSA), which included meeting transcripts, modification tracking, implementation outcomes, and process data, ensuring transparency and accountability.

2.6 Statistical Methods

A mixed-methods approach was used to evaluate "Reach", "Adoption", "Implementation", and "Maintenance" of the ePRO intervention (Table 1). Quantitative data (e.g., frequency, mean, standard deviation) were analyzed using descriptive statistics and logistic regression. Interpretations of the logistic regression were calculated and presented based on effect size reporting criteria (49). Due to a small sample size (n = 6), data from patients identifying as "Other" sex were excluded from regression analysis. Each "care episode" was defined as a distinct admission period for an individual at one of the urgent care clinics.

Qualitative analysis encompassed thematic coding of stakeholder feedback from the feedback database using deductive (by date, stakeholder, resolution status (if applicable), barriers and facilitators to implementation) and inductive methods (development and refinement of themes) (50). User sentiment was analyzed with the Sentimentr package, which calculates sentence-level polarity based on valence shifters (51). Descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation) and hypothesis testing (Welch's T-Test, ANOVA) were performed on sentiment data.

All patient data were de-identified prior to analysis to protect privacy. No patients were excluded from completing ePROs. For qualitative analyses, a “patient” was defined as an individual receiving treatment.

3. Results

3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative analysis examined ***ePRO completion*** (“Reach”), ***ePRO documentation*** (“Adoption”), the time and resources required to aggregate feedback and implement system modifications (“Implementation") as well as the stability of ePRO implementation metrics (“Maintenance").

3.1.1 Reach

22,610 care episodes were admitted to either urgent care location, with over 54,000 diagnostic entries recorded for said care episodes. Throughout the implementation period, 5,383 care episodes completed ePROs across the admitted care episodes (24%). The mean number of admissions per patient was 1.3 (SD = 0.76). ePRO completion rates showed a significant upward trend over time (R^2 = 0.834413, p = <0.0001), peaking at 73% for both locations combined (Figure 3). Monthly completion rates for the locations are detailed in Tables 2a-2c. The mean time to complete ePROs was 50 seconds (*SD* = 18.1 seconds, range = 30–108 seconds). Post-implementation is discussed in “3.1.4 Maintenance”.

Most care episodes were adult patients aged 18 - 64 years old (57%), female (57%), and identifying as White race (53%) (Table 3a). The mean age of patients was 28 years (*SD* = 17). Location T accounted for a larger proportion of admissions (64%) compared to Location B (36%), though demographic distributions were similar between locations. However, there was a 27% decrease in the odds of care episodes at Location T completing ePROs compared to Location B (Table 3a). This trend was consistent across all age groups: adults (28% decreased odds), geriatric (37% decreased odds), pediatric (26% decreased odds), proxy-report (20% decreased odds) (Table 3b).

Among adults, care episodes identified as male, Black or Other race exhibited 18%, 17%, and 20% decreased odds of completing ePROs, respectively, compared to care episodes identified as female or White race (Table 3b). For pediatric care episodes, those identified as Asian race had 36% decreased odds of completing ePROs compared to care episodes identified as White race (Table 3b). For proxy-report care episodes, those identified as Other race had 31% decreased odds of completing ePROs compared to care episodes identified as White race (Table 3b).

The EMR contained a total of 54,302 diagnostic entries for the admitted care episodes, with an average of 2.2 (*SD* = 1.1) diagnoses per episode. The most frequent diagnoses were in the categories for depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, and alcohol/substance use disorders (Table 4). Care episodes with neurocognitive disorders, alcohol/substance use disorders, and psychosis/schizophrenia spectrum/delusional disorders had significantly decreased odds of completing ePROs (Table 4). Conversely, care episodes with ADHD, anxiety disorders, autism spectrum disorder (ASD), cluster B personality disorders, insomnia, OCD, and those with no psychiatric diagnosis listed (No Dx Listed) showed significantly higher odds of completing ePROs (Table 4).

3.1.2 Adoption

In 2023, 17% (700 / 4068) of care episodes had their completed ePRO report populated in an EMR service note by a provider, with a significant increase over the year (R^2 = 0.878688, P = < 0.0001) (Table 5, Figure 4). ePRO documentation was associated with 22 of the 60 unique providers assigned to care episodes: 11 nurse practitioners (629 care episodes documented), 6 psychiatry residents (20 care episodes documented), 3 psychiatrists (34 care episodes documented), 1 licensed clinical professional counselor (LCPC) (20 care episodes documented), and 1 licensed clinical social worker (LCSW) (7 care episodes documented). No records of ePRO documentation were found for 2021 for either location; 2022 had only 20 records. Post-implementation is discussed in “3.1.4 Maintenance”.

3.1.3 Implementation

Throughout the implementation period, ten 30-minute site governance meetings, two training sessions (30 minutes each) in 2021 and 2022, and two 1-hour onsite observation sessions in April 2022 were completed with urgent care staff. One 1:1 clinical provider meeting was completed in March 2022. Two location specific administrative review meetings were completed (Location T in May 2023; Location B in June 2023). In total, approximately 9.5 hours (or 570 minutes) were spent meeting with or training the urgent care team.

5 support tickets were submitted: three by the administrative lead (November 2022, January 2023, July 2023), one by a Location T administrator (June 2023), and one by a Location B administrator (May 2023).

6 modifications to the ePRO system were completed to improve ePRO completion and documentation (Table 6, Figure 5).

3.1.4 Maintenance

Following the introduction of SMS/text notifications and "quick registration," completion rates remained above 50% through the implementation period, averaging 63% (SD = 7%, range = 54%–75%) in the post-implementation period (Figure 5).

Post-implementation documentation averaged at 59% (SD = 17%, range = 27%–79%), associated with 34 of the 41 unique providers assigned to care episodes: 18 nurse practitioners (1972 care episodes documented), 6 LCSWs (317 care episodes documented), 6 psychiatry residents (50 care episodes documented), 2 psychiatrists (27 care episodes documented), 1 psychiatry fellow (2 care episodes documented), and 1 LCPC (124 care episodes documented) (Figure 4).

3.2 Qualitative Analysis

Analysis of the feedback database identified key themes—administrative processes, clinical adoption, time, technology, training, and accessibility—that provided insights into the RE-AIM dimensions. A total of 53 comments (or complete items of dialogue) and audit notes

were collected, resulting in 137 sentences for sentiment analysis. Barriers to ePRO implementation were more frequently mentioned (32 comments) than facilitators (21 comments). The most common themes were administrative process (28 comments) and clinical adoption (12 comments). Supplementary Table 5 provides examples of these themes.

3.2.1 Sentiment

Overall, 26 sentences expressed negative sentiment (sentiment < 0), 37 sentences were neutral (sentiment = 0), and 74 conveyed positive sentiment (sentiment > 0). The average sentiment was 0.10 (SD = 0.24, range = -0.56–0.82), indicating a slight positive sentiment. After adjusting for neutral biases, the weighted sentiment scores were 0.13, indicating a small increase in positive sentiment.

Lowest sentence sentiment (*sentiment* = -0.56) occurred in October 2021, reflecting concerns about clinical utility (Theme - Clinical Adoption). Highest sentence sentiment (*sentiment* = 0.82) occurred in June 2023, reflecting positive feedback on workflow adaptations (Mod #6 in Figure 5) (Theme - Administrative Process).

Monthly mean sentiment trends showed an overall positive trajectory (Figure 6), with no significant differences by date ($F(20, 116) = 1.01$, $p = 0.45$).

Comments about facilitators were significantly more positive ($M = 0.18$, $SD = 0.22$) than comments about barriers ($M = 0.04$, $SD = 0.24$), $t(120) = 3.45$, $p = 0.001$. The theme technology had the lowest mean sentiment ($M = -0.08$, $SD = 0.14$) while the theme administrative process had the highest ($M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.22$). No significant differences were found among the comment themes, $F(10, 126) = 1.03$, $p = 0.42$.

3.2.2 Reach

Location B's minimal ePRO completion in 2021 was attributed to its recent opening and delayed integration of ePRO procedures. An overall decline in early 2022 was linked to the resumption of in-person visits under COVID-19 protocols; staff were not informing patients about ePRO emails or providing tablets at this time (Figure 3, Tables 3a-3b). Additionally, limited

engagement with the ePRO team between May and August 2022 hindered staff training opportunities (Theme - Administrative Process). A training session completed in August 2022 increased completion rates by September 2022 (Figure 3, Table 2b) (Theme - Training). Despite these efforts, staff revealed the presence of communication gaps between them and patients regarding the availability of Spanish translations and patient assistance, which they assumed may have contributed to lower completion rates (Theme - Accessibility).

The introduction of "quick registration" in October 2022 streamlined admissions, reduced ePRO notification delays (time from admission to receipt of ePRO link via SMS/text or email) from approx. 15 minutes to approx. 3-5 minutes, and thereby increased time for ePRO completion in the waiting room (Mod #6 in Figure 5) (Theme - Time).

SMS/text notifications further improved completion in 2023, though a technical issue discovered in March prevented notifications from being sent and reduced completion rates. Once resolved by May, completion rates increased from 6% in April to 59% by June (Table 2c, Mod #5 in Figure 5) (Theme - Technology). Staff feedback highlighted the effectiveness of SMS/text notifications, with over 50% of ePROs in 2023 completed via SMS/text (Theme - Technology).

3.2.3 Adoption

Documentation was minimal in 2021 and 2022 due to initial concerns about the clinical utility of ePROs and added documentation burden. However, once ePROs were aligned with clinically relevant measures (i.e. substance use screener) and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Quality Payment Program (QPP) metrics (52–59) (Table 7), documentation rates increased (Figure 4). Towards the end of the intervention, clinical leads noted minimal documentation burden and began requesting reports of clinician ePRO documentation (Theme - Clinical Adoption).

3.2.4 Implementation

ePRO implementation was attributed to efficient administrative processes and clinician engagement. Location B's consistent use of "quick registration" throughout 2023 resulted in higher completion rates compared to Location T, which had concerns about patient burden from completing an additional, albeit brief, contact (e.g. name, date of birth, email, cell phone) registration form. After observing completion rates at Location B, Location T began "quick registration" by late 2023 and showed improved completion rates (Mod #6 in Figure 5) (Theme - Administrative Process).

Clinician interest increased after QPP metrics (Table 7) were integrated to increase alignment of ePROs with clinical goals. By aligning ePROs with QPP metrics, clinicians no longer needed to complete additional QPP documentation in the EMR; instead, they could review the ePRO data, which automatically completed any necessary QPP documentation. This resulted in increased ePRO completion and documentation over time (Figure 4, Mod #4 in Figure 5) (Theme - Clinical Adoption). Technological enhancements, including location filtering on the ePRO dashboard and SMS notifications, increased access and completion rates further (Mod #3 and Mod #5 in Figure 5) (Theme - Technology).

3.2.5 Maintenance

Ongoing maintenance of ePRO processes involved regular check-ins by lead administrators ensuring consistent use of “quick registration”. Fast notifications facilitated by “quick registration” allowed administrators to address patient queries promptly, preventing delays in admissions (Theme - Administrative Process). Completion rates remained above 50% through 2023, aided by SMS and email notifications (Mod #6, Figure 5, Theme - Technology).

Post-implementation, overall ePRO completion averaged 63%, driven by consistent ePRO training integrated into workflows and onboarding (Figure 3). Clinician-led training on ePRO documentation also improved post-implementation documentation rates (Figure 4) (Theme - Training).

Minimal guidance was required from the ePRO implementation team post-implementation, with monthly governance meetings confirming staff confidence in completing ePRO workflows and training new hires. By August 2024, administrators revealed a few challenges that impacted post-implementation ePRO completion: staffing fluctuations (e.g. limited coverage during evening and weekend shifts, staff transitioning to or covering work in other clinics), technology limitations (e.g. WiFi connectivity issues, outdated tablet software), and patient-centered factors (e.g. an increase in patients with limited technology capabilities). Despite these challenges, combined ePRO completion remained above 50% (Figure 3).

4. Discussion

This study examined the implementation of electronic patient-reported outcomes (ePROs) in psychiatric urgent care, employing the Learning Evaluation framework to guide implementation, while using the RE-AIM framework to evaluate the intervention's performance. Our results demonstrate the feasibility of integrating ePROs into psychiatric urgent care workflows and highlight the impact of targeted modifications developed by identifying key facilitators and barriers through an iterative feedback process.

To our knowledge, this is the largest reported implementation effort of ePROs in a speciality psychiatric urgent care setting, a contrast to previous studies on ePRO implementation in mental health care in inpatient and outpatient settings with smaller study samples (60,61).

4.1 ePRO Completion and Patient Demographics

Our findings revealed that ePRO completion was associated with specific demographic and operational factors. Patients aged 18–64, identifying as female, and White had higher ePRO completion rates (Tables 3a and 3b). This is consistent with existing literature reporting similar trends across healthcare settings (62,63). However, we did not observe significantly lower completion rates among Black adolescents and children (Table 3b), which contrasts with previously documented disparities (64–66). This difference may be attributed to the increased

use of SMS/text notifications, which likely improved accessibility for younger patients. Prior studies have shown that by 2023, approximately 95% of adolescents aged 13–17, including 94% of Black and 95% of White adolescents, owned smartphones (67). The widespread access to mobile technology may have facilitated higher ePRO completion rates, particularly via SMS, with over 50% of ePRO completions in 2023 achieved through this modality.

Lower completion rates at Location T compared to Location B (Tables 3a and 3b) may reflect differences in operational maturity. Location B, a newly established clinic within a recently opened hospital campus, was less burdened by established organizational culture and workflows. This likely provided greater flexibility to adopt change, as evidenced by the earlier implementation of the “quick registration” process and more proactive patient engagement by staff. In contrast, Location T, having operated for many years, faced greater change management challenges due to its long-standing organizational and operational processes (68). These findings align broadly with other implementation science studies, showing that healthcare professionals with established practices may have less motivation to adopt new workflows, even when provided evidence of their efficacy (69–71). These operational insights highlight the importance of tailoring site-specific strategies and employing adaptive implementation processes to address organizational contexts.

4.2 ePRO Completion and Diagnosis

Our analysis of clinical diagnoses and ePRO completion revealed patterns consistent with clinical characteristics of the underlying psychiatric conditions. Patients with neurocognitive disorders, psychosis, schizophrenia spectrum disorders, and substance use disorders demonstrated significantly lower odds of ePRO completion (Table 4). These findings align with existing research indicating that cognitive burden, reduced engagement, and symptom severity in these populations may hinder participation in self-reported assessments (68,72–74).

Conversely, patients with anxiety disorders, ADHD, autism spectrum disorder (ASD), Cluster B personality disorders, insomnia, and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) exhibited

higher odds of ePRO completion. These results could reflect condition-specific factors that promote ePRO engagement. For instance, patients with ASD, anxiety or OCD may feel more compelled to complete ePROs due to inflexibility of behavior (75) or due to concerns about unfinished tasks (76,77). Similarly, patients with ADHD may find ePROs a useful distraction while waiting for treatment, and individuals with Cluster B personality disorders may use ePROs as a means to express heightened emotional states (76). Notably, the completion rate for patients with insomnia was very high, although derived from a small sample (0.3%), (57% increased odds; p = 0.006). While the low number of insomnia cases warrants cautious interpretation, this finding may reflect high awareness of and desire to report sleep-related impairments among patients that are diagnosed with insomnia.

These observations highlight the importance of tailoring ePRO implementation strategies to the unique patient populations. For patients with cognitive or severe psychiatric disorders, simplified measures, proxy reporting, or assisted completion may improve the completion and adoption of measurements. Additionally, adding brief symptom-specific ePROs for diagnoses with higher odds of completion and optimizing automated ePRO notifications can drive and maintain “Reach”, without placing additional burden on patients or staff.

4.3 ePRO Implementation

We found that ePRO implementation benefitted from the utilization of Learning Evaluation and FRAME for documentation of stakeholder feedback and modification development. Utilizing these frameworks improved communication and reduced knowledge gaps between the urgent care and ePRO implementation teams and improved overall feedback tracking. RE-AIM further enriched these frameworks by providing concise, comprehensible, and measurable domains that communicate the real-world impact of an intervention.

4.3.1 *Implementation Facilitators*

Several facilitators described in ePRO implementation literature (26,29) supported the successful implementation of ePROs in psychiatric urgent care. First, multi-modal ePRO

delivery (i.e. email, SMS/text, QR) enhanced accessibility and broadened reach (Mod #5, Figure 5). SMS/text notifications, in particular, streamlined ePRO completion for patients in waiting rooms and contributed to increased “Reach”.

Second, integration of ePROs into the EMR reduced administrative burden by automating deployment and report generation. This enabled real-time data availability for clinical decision-making, which was critical for provider acceptance (15,78). The brevity and clinical relevance of the PROMIS measures (2–8 questions) minimized response burden while maintaining utility for assessing depression, anxiety, sleep, and substance use (79). Spanish-language options helped address language barriers.

Continuous engagement through governance meetings and training opportunities helped mitigate the challenges of staff turnover, contributing to sustained ePRO completion post-implementation (Figure 3). Governance meetings and targeted training opportunities ensured that stakeholder feedback, including input from clinicians and administrative staff, informed system enhancements. For example, the introduction of the “quick registration” process was developed iteratively based on this feedback. Monitoring implementation metrics during governance meetings provided transparency and offered opportunities for staff to reflect on progress and identify areas for improvement. The brief, focused meeting structure did not require significant time burden on participating staff, with approximately 9.5 hours spent in ePRO-related meetings or trainings between August 2021 and December 2023 (see section “3.1.3 Implementation”).

4.3.2 *Implementation Barriers*

Several implementation barriers were encountered. System usability and stability were recurring challenges. For example, while dashboard filters and location identifiers improved functionality (Mod #1 and Mod #3, Table 6), staff continued to report difficulties navigating the system. These challenges were mitigated through ePRO training during staff onboarding (Figure

5) and iterative system enhancements, underscoring the importance of a user-centered design approach and agile technical infrastructure.

The introduction of SMS/text notifications initially presented difficulties due to technical issues causing delays in ePRO completion resulting in disruptions in clinic workflows. Staff inconsistently employed alternative strategies, such as tablet use or reminders for patients, highlighting the need for clear and standardized protocols to manage disruption of standard services (SMS/text, email). These challenges underscore the importance of high performance technical infrastructure for implementation of software-based interventions (Mod #5 in Figure 5).

Clinician engagement was another early barrier. Initial skepticism regarding the clinical utility of ePROs, particularly in a high-paced urgent care environment, was mostly expressed in the context of added workload and time burden for a change with limited perceived clinical relevance. Through the Learning Evaluation process, we incorporated clinician feedback to refine ePRO measures, integrating clinically relevant instruments like substance use screeners and aligning ePROs with CMS quality metrics (Table 7). These themes are consistent in settings with high PRO implementation (80). Clinicians' acceptance of ePROs grew over time, helping to reinforce administrative processes and promote regular data collection at admission.

4.4 *Practical Applications and Future Directions*

The findings of this study can inform scalable models for ePRO implementation in similar urgent care/walk-in clinical settings. Healthcare organizations can replicate the multi-modal delivery strategies to increase patient reach and streamline data collection while limiting administrative burden. In addition, utilizing brief instruments such as PROMIS short form measures can mitigate patient response burden and allow organizations to quickly capture clinically relevant data across health-related domains. EMR integration is critical to enhance interoperability of patient data and clinical decision-making.

This study highlights the importance of structured feedback frameworks, including regular stakeholder feedback. Our governance meetings facilitated continuous feedback and

monitoring of implementation metrics and iterative development of system enhancements. The addition of feedback tracking and agile methodology allowed thorough planning, testing, deployment, and stakeholder training phases for the modifications.

The implementation strategies and processes utilized in this study were derived from established and well supported implementation science and product development frameworks. While our study specifically shows the applicability of these frameworks for ePRO system implementation, the strategies used are broadly applicable to many healthcare implementation and quality improvement efforts, in particular for those requiring IT system integration and structured review of organizational culture. Stakeholder feedback demonstrated important concepts to long-term sustainability of implementation: aligning ePROs with clinical (clinically relevant instrument domains), administrative (modernized workflows), and institutional (CMS quality metrics) priorities. We expect that support for data-driven healthcare and quality metrics will continue to increase with the advancement of efforts to transition to a value-based care system in the US and worldwide. ePROs are able to provide important patient-centered metrics to support treatment planning while also enhancing program quality improvement efforts and will likely be of key importance for future efforts to measure treatment effectiveness in the context of value-based care.

Diagnostic and demographic differences in ePRO completion observed in this study warrant further efforts to identify and address disparities in clinical care. Lower ePRO completion among certain patient groups indicates a need for enhanced accessibility efforts, such as improved proxy-reporting instruments and technologies that increase access for patients with cognitive or physical impairments.

4.5 Limitations

Modifications developed in this study reflect the specific nature of the urgent care setting, thus may not be entirely applicable to other clinical settings or patient populations. Further adaptations may be required to increase the efficacy of the methods used. In addition, this study

was not conducted as a randomized control trial, which could have improved the validity of our findings and conclusions regarding between-group/between-facility differences. However, a randomized trial design would have resulted in increased workflow burden, making it impractical for this study.

5. Conclusion

This study highlights the feasibility and sustainability of implementing ePROs in psychiatric urgent care settings. Key facilitators included multi-modal delivery methods, EMR integration, and continuous staff engagement through governance processes. Barriers, such as technical challenges and initial clinician concerns, were addressed through iterative system enhancements and targeted training based on stakeholder feedback. Importantly, this work demonstrates that ePROs can be successfully integrated into fast-paced clinical environments.

Future research should focus on addressing disparities in ePRO completion, particularly among patients with cognitive disorders and severe mental illness. Additionally, exploring strategies to further optimize the clinical utility of ePRO data and the development of patient-centered quality metrics data have the potential to address the critical need for overall better healthcare outcomes for patients with psychiatric conditions. By leveraging and integrating implementation science frameworks such as Learning Evaluation and RE-AIM with well-established software and product development processes, this study provides a model for implementation efforts in complex real-world healthcare scenarios.

References

1. Krägeloh CU, Czuba KJ, Billington DR, Kersten P, Siegert RJ. Using feedback from patient-reported outcome measures in mental health services: a scoping study and typology. Psychiatr Serv. 2015 Mar 1;66(3):224–41.

2. Hatfield D, McCullough L, Frantz SHB, Krieger K. Do we know when our clients get worse? an investigation of therapists' ability to detect negative client change. Clin Psychol Psychother. 2010 Feb;17(1):25–32.

3. Gondek D, Edbrooke-Childs J, Fink E, Deighton J, Wolpert M. Feedback from Outcome Measures and Treatment Effectiveness, Treatment Efficiency, and Collaborative Practice: A Systematic Review. Adm Policy Ment Health. 2016 May;43(3):325–43.

4. Dowrick C, Leydon GM, McBride A, Howe A, Burgess H, Clarke P, et al. Patients' and doctors' views on depression severity questionnaires incentivised in UK quality and outcomes framework: qualitative study. BMJ. 2009 Mar 19;338:b663.

5. Dano S, Lan HH, Macanovic S, Bartlett S, Howell D, Li M, et al. Two-step screening for depressive symptoms in patients treated with kidney replacement therapies: a cross-sectional analysis. Nephrol Dial Transplant. 2023 May 4;38(5):1318–26.

6. Fogh SE, Silverstein J, Yee E, Mannheimer L, Braunstein SE, Boreta L. Impact of screening for distress, anxiety, depression and supportive care needs in patients undergoing radiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2021 Nov 1;111(3S):e161.

7. Lippold B, Tarkunde YR, Cheng AL, Hannon CP, Adelani MA, Calfee RP. Depression and anxiety screening identifies patients that may benefit from treatment regardless of existing diagnoses. Arthroplasty Today. 2022 Jun;15:215-219.e1.

8. Iturralde E, Adams RN, Barley RC, Bensen R, Christofferson M, Hanes SJ, et al. Implementation of depression screening and global health assessment in pediatric

subspecialty clinics. J Adolesc Health. 2017 Nov;61(5):591–8.

9. Sapyta J, Riemer M, Bickman L. Feedback to clinicians: theory, research, and practice. J Clin Psychol. 2005 Feb;61(2):145–53.

10. Låver J, McAleavey A, Valaker I, Castonguay LG, Moltu C. Therapists' and patients' experiences of using patients' self-reported data in ongoing psychotherapy processes-A systematic review and meta-analysis of qualitative studies. Psychother Res. 2024 Mar;34(3):293–310.

11. American Psychiatric Association. Position Statement on Utilization of Measurement Based Care. 2023 Dec [cited 2024 Aug 31]; Available from: https://www.psychiatry.org/about-apa/policy-finder/position-statement-on-utilization-of-measurement-b

12. Johns Hopkins University. Users' Guide to Integrating Patient-Reported Outcomes in ElectronicHealth Records. Snyder C, Wu AW, editors. Baltimore, MD: Funded by Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (PCORI); 2017 May. Report No.: JHU Contract No. 10.01.14 TO2 08.01.15.

13. Deutsch A, Smith L, Gage B, Kelleher C, Garfinkle D. Patient-reported outcomes in performance measurement. Washington, D.C.: National Quality Forum; 2012 Oct. Report No.: Commissioned Paper 2.

14. The Joint Commission. Outcome Measures Standard [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 28]. Available from: https://www.jointcommission.org/accreditation-and-certification/health-care-settings/behavioral-health-care/outcome-measures-standard/

15. Philpot LM, Barnes SA, Brown RM, Austin JA, James CS, Stanford RH, et al. Barriers and Benefits to the Use of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures in Routine Clinical Care: A

Qualitative Study. Am J Med Qual. 2018 Jul;33(4):359–64.

16. Harle CA, Listhaus A, Covarrubias CM, Schmidt SO, Mackey S, Carek PJ, et al. Overcoming barriers to implementing patient-reported outcomes in an electronic health record: a case report. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2016 Jan;23(1):74–9.

17. Zhang R, Burgess ER, Reddy MC, Rothrock NE, Bhatt S, Rasmussen LV, et al. Provider perspectives on the integration of patient-reported outcomes in an electronic health record. JAMIA Open. 2019 Apr;2(1):73–80.

18. Zimmerman M, McGlinchey JB. Why don't psychiatrists use scales to measure outcome when treating depressed patients? J Clin Psychiatry. 2008 Dec 2;69(12):1916–9.

19. Jensen-Doss A, Haimes EMB, Smith AM, Lyon AR, Lewis CC, Stanick CF, et al. Monitoring treatment progress and providing feedback is viewed favorably but rarely used in practice. Adm Policy Ment Health. 2018;45(1):48–61.

20. Boswell JF, Kraus DR, Miller SD, Lambert MJ. Implementing routine outcome monitoring in clinical practice: benefits, challenges, and solutions. Psychother Res. 2013;25(1):6–19.

21. Bommersbach TJ, McKean AJ, Olfson M, Rhee TG. National Trends in Mental Health-Related Emergency Department Visits Among Youth, 2011-2020. JAMA. 2023 May 2;329(17):1469–77.

22. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2022 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; 2023. Report No.: HHS Publication No. PEP23-07-01-006, NSDUH Series H-58.

23. Kroll DS, Latham C, Mahal J, Siciliano M, Shea LS, Irwin L, et al. A Successful Walk-In Psychiatric Model for Integrated Care. J Am Board Fam Med. 2019;32(4):481–9.

24. Ohaiba MM, Anamazobi EG, Okobi OE, Aguda K, Chukwu VU. Trends and patterns in

emergency department visits: A comprehensive analysis of adult data from the national center for health statistics (NCHS) database. Cureus. 2024 Aug 3;16(8):e66059.

25. Bailey SC, O'Conor R, Bojarski EA, Mullen R, Patzer RE, Vicencio D, et al. Literacy disparities in patient access and health-related use of Internet and mobile technologies. Health Expect. 2015 Dec;18(6):3079–87.

26. Lin MP, Kligler SK, Friedman BW, Kim H, Rising K, Samuels-Kalow M, et al. Barriers and Best Practices for the Use of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures in Emergency Medicine. Ann Emerg Med. 2023 Jul;82(1):11–21.

27. Taylor S, Guirguis M, Raney EM. Can Patients and Families Read the Questionnaires for Patient-related Outcome Measures? J Pediatr Orthop. 2019;39(5):e397–401.

28. Meirte J, Hellemans N, Anthonissen M, Denteneer L, Maertens K, Moortgat P, et al. Benefits and Disadvantages of Electronic Patient-reported Outcome Measures: Systematic Review. JMIR Perioper Med. 2020 Apr 3;3(1):e15588.

29. Lavallee DC, Chenok KE, Love RM, Petersen C, Holve E, Segal CD, et al. Incorporating Patient-Reported Outcomes Into Health Care To Engage Patients And Enhance Care. Health Aff (Millwood). 2016 Apr;35(4):575–82.

30. Bennett AV, Jensen RE, Basch E. Electronic patient-reported outcome systems in oncology clinical practice. CA Cancer J Clin. 2012 Oct;62(5):337–47.

31. Balasubramanian BA, Cohen DJ, Davis MM, Gunn R, Dickinson LM, Miller WL, et al. Learning Evaluation: blending quality improvement and implementation research methods to study healthcare innovations. Implement Sci. 2015 Mar 10;10:31.

32. Glasgow RE, Harden SM, Gaglio B, Rabin B, Smith ML, Porter GC, et al. RE-AIM Planning and evaluation framework: Adapting to new science and practice with a 20-year review. Front Public Health. 2019 Mar 29;7:64.

33. Harden SM, Smith ML, Ory MG, Smith-Ray RL, Estabrooks PA, Glasgow RE. RE-AIM in Clinical, Community, and Corporate Settings: Perspectives, Strategies, and Recommendations to Enhance Public Health Impact. Front Public Health. 2018 Mar 22;6:71.

34. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. BMJ. 2014 Mar 7;348:g1687.

35. LeRouge C, Austin E, Lee J, Segal C, Sangameswaran S, Hartzler A, et al. ePROs in Clinical Care: Guidelines and Tools for Health Systems. 2020 May;

36. PROMIS Health Organization. Intro to PROMIS® [Internet]. HealthMeasures. [cited 2020 Dec 15]. Available from: https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/promis/intro-to-promis

37. Bush K, Kivlahan DR, McDonell MB, Fihn SD, Bradley KA. The AUDIT alcohol consumption questions (AUDIT-C): an effective brief screening test for problem drinking. Ambulatory Care Quality Improvement Project (ACQUIP). Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Arch Intern Med. 1998 Sep 14;158(16):1789–95.

38. Schofield MJ, Mishra GD. Validity of self-report screening scale for elder abuse: Women's Health Australia Study. Gerontologist. 2003 Feb;43(1):110–20.

39. Prihodova L, Guerin S, Tunney C, Kernohan WG. Key components of knowledge transfer and exchange in health services research: Findings from a systematic scoping review. J Adv Nurs. 2019 Feb;75(2):313–26.

40. Cothran H, Wysocki A. Developing SMART Goals for Your Organization. EDIS. 2005;

41. Wiltsey Stirman S, Baumann AA, Miller CJ. The FRAME: an expanded framework for reporting adaptations and modifications to evidence-based interventions. Implement Sci.

2019 Jun 6;14(1):58.

42. Wilson K, Bell C, Wilson L, Witteman H. Agile research to complement agile development: a proposal for an mHealth research lifecycle. npj Digital Med. 2018 Sep 13;1:46.

43. Kannan V, Basit MA, Bajaj P, Carrington AR, Donahue IB, Flahaven EL, et al. User stories as lightweight requirements for agile clinical decision support development. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2019 Nov 1;26(11):1344–54.

44. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap): A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009 Apr;42(2):377–81.

45. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed Inform. 2019 Jul;95:103208.

46. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022.

47. Chang W, Cheng J, Allaire JJ, Sievert C, Schloerke B, Xie Y, et al. shiny: Web Application Framework for R. R package version 1.8.1.9000, https://github.com/rstudio/shiny; 2024.

48. Drupal. Overview of Drupal [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2024 Jan 2]. Available from: https://www.drupal.org/docs/getting-started/understanding-drupal/overview-of-drupal

49. Chu B, Liu M, Leas EC, Althouse BM, Ayers JW. Effect size reporting among prominent health journals: a case study of odds ratios. BMJ Evid Based Med. 2020 Dec 10;26(4):184.

50. Bingham AJ. From Data Management to Actionable Findings: A Five-Phase Process of Qualitative Data Analysis. Int J Qual Methods. 2023 Jan;22.

51. Rinker T. Package ‘sentimentr’: Calculate Text Polarity Sentiment [Internet]. CRAN; 2021 [cited 2024 Jan 7]. Available from: https://github.com/trinker/sentimentr

52. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Depression and Follow-Up Plan. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jun 30]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_134_MIPSCQM.pdf

53. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Preventive Care and Screening: Tobacco Use: Screening and Cessation Intervention. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_226_MIPSCQM.pdf

54. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Tobacco Use and Help with Quitting Among Adolescents. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_402_MIPSCQM.pdf

55. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Preventive Care and Screening: Unhealthy Alcohol Use: Screening & Brief Counseling. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_431_MIPSCQM.pdf

56. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Functional Outcome Assessment. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_182_MIPSCQM.pdf

57. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Falls: Plan of Care. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from:

https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_155_MIPSCQM.pdf

58. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Elder Maltreatment Screen and Follow-Up Plan. 2021 Dec [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://qpp.cms.gov/docs/QPP_quality_measure_specifications/CQM-Measures/2022_Measure_181_MIPSCQM.pdf

59. American Psychiatric Association. Measurement-Based Care Processes: Index Assessment, Monitoring and Care Plan Review. 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 1]; Available from: https://www.psychiatry.org/getmedia/42c3d163-bf0f-41f7-b902-1ba96fe16ee5/PsychPRO-Measurement-Based-Care-Processes.pdf

60. Kristensen S, Holmskov J, Pølund K, Hjermitslev A-LL, Bergh-Hanssen K, Christensen IH, et al. Using patient-reported outcome measures in psychiatric hospital care: an observational study describing an iterative implementation process in Denmark. Int J Qual Health Care. 2022 Mar 31;34(Supplement_1):ii40–8.

61. Morris AC, Ibrahim Z, Heslin M, Moghraby OS, Stringaris A, Grant IM, et al. Assessing the feasibility of a web-based outcome measurement system in child and adolescent mental health services - myHealthE a randomised controlled feasibility pilot study. Child Adolesc Ment Health. 2023 Feb;28(1):128–47.

62. Borowsky PA, Kadri OM, Meldau JE, Blanchett J, Makhni EC. The Remote Completion Rate of Electronic Patient-Reported Outcome Forms Before Scheduled Clinic Visits-A Proof-of-Concept Study Using Patient-Reported Outcome Measurement Information System Computer Adaptive Test Questionnaires. J Am Acad Orthop Surg Glob Res Rev. 2019 Oct 2;3(10).

63. Hyland CJ, Guo R, Dhawan R, Kaur MN, Bain PA, Edelen MO, et al. Implementing

patient-reported outcomes in routine clinical care for diverse and underrepresented patients in the United States. J Patient Rep Outcomes. 2022 Mar 7;6(1):20.

64. Samuel CA, Smith AB, Elkins W, Richmond J, Mahbooba Z, Basch E, et al. Racial differences in user experiences and perceived value of electronic symptom monitoring in a cohort of black and white bladder and prostate cancer patients. Qual Life Res. 2021 Nov;30(11):3213–27.

65. Smith AB, Samuel CA, McCabe SD, Deal A, Jonsson M, Mueller DE, et al. Feasibility and delivery of patient-reported outcomes in clinical practice among racially diverse bladder and prostate cancer patients. Urol Oncol. 2021 Jan;39(1):77.e1-77.e8.

66. Levens B, Kim BS, Aksu N, Dorris CS, Svoboda S, Douoguih W, et al. Young or Old Age and Non-White Race Are Associated With Poor Patient-Reported Outcome Measure Response Compliance After Orthopaedic Surgery. Arthrosc Sports Med Rehabil. 2023 Dec;5(6):100817.

67. Anderson M, Faverio M, Gottfried J. Teens, Social Media and Technology 2023 [Internet]. Pew Research Center; 2023 Dec [cited 2024 Jun 10]. Available from: https://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2023/12/PI_2023.12.11-Teens-Social-Media-Tech_FINAL.pdf

68. Lewis CC, Boyd M, Puspitasari A, Navarro E, Howard J, Kassab H, et al. Implementing Measurement-Based Care in Behavioral Health: A Review. JAMA Psychiatry. 2019 Mar 1;76(3):324–35.

69. Tacia L, Biskupski K, Pheley A, Lehto RH. Identifying barriers to evidence-based practice adoption: A focus group study. CNS. 2015 Feb 4;3(2).

70. Kristensen N, Nymann C, Konradsen H. Implementing research results in clinical practice-the experiences of healthcare professionals. BMC Health Serv Res. 2016 Feb 10;16:48.

71. Dagne AH, Beshah MH. Implementation of evidence-based practice: The experience of nurses and midwives. PLoS ONE. 2021 Aug 27;16(8):e0256600.

72. Amini M, Oemrawsingh A, Verweij LM, Lingsma HF, Hazelzet JA, Eijkenaar F, et al. Facilitators and barriers for implementing patient-reported outcome measures in clinical care: An academic center's initial experience. Health Policy. 2021 Sep;125(9):1247–55.

73. Aiyegbusi OL, Roydhouse J, Rivera SC, Kamudoni P, Schache P, Wilson R, et al. Key considerations to reduce or address respondent burden in patient-reported outcome (PRO) data collection. Nat Commun. 2022 Oct 12;13(1):6026.

74. Aboraya A, Nasrallah HA, Elswick DE, Ahmed E, Estephan N, Aboraya D, et al. Measurement-based Care in Psychiatry-Past, Present, and Future. Innov Clin Neurosci. 2018 Nov 1;15(11–12):13–26.

75. Hirota T, King BH. Autism spectrum disorder: A review. JAMA. 2023 Jan 10;329(2):157–68.

76. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th ed. 2013.

77. Reed GM, First MB, Kogan CS, Hyman SE, Gureje O, Gaebel W, et al. Innovations and changes in the ICD-11 classification of mental, behavioural and neurodevelopmental disorders. World Psychiatry. 2019 Feb;18(1):3–19.

78. Aiyegbusi OL, Nair D, Peipert JD, Schick-Makaroff K, Mucsi I. A narrative review of current evidence supporting the implementation of electronic patient-reported outcome measures in the management of chronic diseases. Ther Adv Chronic Dis. 2021 May 24;12:20406223211015960.

79. Riley WT, Pilkonis P, Cella D. Application of the National Institutes of Health Patient-reported Outcome Measurement Information System (PROMIS) to mental health

research. J Ment Health Policy Econ. 2011 Dec;14(4):201–8.

80. Teela L, van Muilekom MM, Kooij LH, Gathier AW, van Goudoever JB, Grootenhuis MA, et al. Clinicians' perspective on the implemented KLIK PROM portal in clinical practice. Qual Life Res. 2021 Nov;30(11):3267–77.

Figure 1. ePRO workflow



Figure 1 shows the ePRO workflow based on an implementation guide by LeRouge et al. 2020. The figure displays how the ePRO system handles ePROs for patients, administrative staff, and clinical staff. The descriptions of each workflow component are:
Deploy - sending ePROs to the patient
Collect - ePRO completion
Track - monitoring of ePRO completion
Review - accessing and viewing the ePRO data
Document - saving ePRO data over time

Figure 2. Governance meeting process



Figure 2 displays the site governance process used for ePRO implementation. Site governance meetings occur monthly and are restricted to key stakeholders for a program or care level. If needed, the stakeholders can schedule ePRO trainings for their staff with ePRO project coordinators as an action item.

The governance meeting process was developed based on the components of knowledge transfer and exchange by (39). The purpose of this process is to identify key items affecting ePRO implementation (Focus), develop achievable goals to address the key items (Goals), develop procedures to achieve the goals (Action items), and document the focus, goals and action items (Documentation). This process allows key stakeholders and staff to be engaged and accountable for ePRO implementation, along with the ePRO implementation team.

Table 1. RE-AIM dimensions applied to ePRO metrics

RE-AIM Dimension	Dimension Definition	ePRO Implementation Measure
Reach	The number, proportion, or representativeness of admitted patients completing ePROs	ePRO completion (Number of patients with a completed ePRO / the number of patients admitted)
Adoption	The number, proportion, or representativeness of clinicians documenting ePRO data	ePRO documentation (Number of patients with an ePRO populated in an EMR appointment note / the number of patients with completed ePROs)
Implementation	The identification, time, and usage of intervention protocols and strategies	Number of meetings with urgent care staff
		Number of ePRO system modifications
		Time to complete ePRO system modifications
Maintenance	The extent to which the ePRO implementation strategies become part of urgent care practices	ePRO completion remains above average
		Active use of ePRO modifications

Table 1 displays how RE-AIM dimensions were aligned with the ePRO intervention metrics. Each ePRO outcome measure was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

Figure 3. Monthly ePRO completion with trendline



Figure 3 displays ePRO completion ("Reach") throughout the implementation period (August 2021 - December 2023) and post-implementation (January - October 2024 highlighted in gray). A total of 5,383 patients completed ePROs during the intervention period. The equation for the polynomial trend line (dotted red line) during the implementation period is $y = 2.46602e\text{-}10x^3 + -3.10373e\text{-}05x^2 + 1.29678x + -17975.7$ (R^2 = 0.834413, P = <0.0001).

Upper (UCL) and lower (LCL) control limits for ePRO completion during the implementation period are displayed, stratified by location. Both locations had a LCL of 0% but different UCLs: 60% for Location B, 44% for Location T, and 51% for both locations combined (Total). The average monthly ePRO completion for the implementation period was 25%. Post-implementation average was 63%.

From 2021 and 2022, ePRO completion dropped by 30%, from 12% total in 2021 to 9% total in 2022. From 2022 to 2023, ePRO completion increased by 400%, from 9% total in 2022 to 44% total in 2023.

Table 2a. ePRO completion for urgent care in 2021

Location	Metric	Aug 21	Sep 21	Oct 21	Nov 21	Dec 21	2021 Total
Location B	ePRO Completion	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	**1%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	0	4	2	0	0	**6**
	Total Care Episodes	126	165	243	241	253	**1,028**
Location T	ePRO Completion	9%	19%	20%	15%	17%	**16%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	50	128	140	90	102	**510**
	Total Care Episodes	543	669	683	619	608	**3,122**
Location Total	ePRO Completion	7%	16%	15%	10%	12%	**12%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	50	132	142	90	102	**516**
	Total Care Episodes	669	834	926	860	861	**4,150**

Table 2b. ePRO completion for urgent care in 2022

Location	Metric	Jan 22	Feb 22	Mar 22	Apr 22	May 22	Jun 22	Jul 22	Aug 22	Sep 22	Oct 22	Nov 22	Dec 22	2022 Total
Location B	ePRO Completion	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	13%	20%	18%	**7%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	38	69	54	50	**223**
	Total Care Episodes	212	264	319	223	323	246	207	225	295	348	299	262	**3,223**
Location T	ePRO Completion	13%	10%	11%	2%	1%	0%	0%	5%	15%	17%	22%	20%	**10%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	69	60	73	12	5	0	0	19	72	89	91	86	**576**
	Total Care Episodes	514	598	660	494	528	448	413	409	485	525	419	435	**5,928**
Location Total	ePRO Completion	10%	7%	7%	2%	1%	0%	0%	5%	14%	18%	20%	20%	**9%**
	ePRO Complete	69	60	73	12	5	0	0	31	110	158	145	136	**799**

	Care Episodes													
	Total Care Episodes	726	862	979	717	851	694	620	634	780	873	718	697	**9,151**

Table 2c. ePRO completion for urgent care in 2023

Location	**Metric**	**Jan 23**	**Feb 23**	**Mar 23**	**Apr 23**	**May 23**	**Jun 23**	**Jul 23**	**Aug 23**	**Sep 23**	**Oct 23**	**Nov 23**	**Dec 23**	**2023 Total**
Location B	ePRO Completion	22%	24%	9%	4%	42%	75%	79%	85%	85%	85%	87%	82%	**51%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	90	103	38	13	154	201	208	203	251	267	249	231	**2,008**
	Total Care Episodes	409	432	429	330	370	268	262	240	296	315	285	283	**3,919**
Location T	ePRO Completion	18%	24%	8%	8%	29%	49%	42%	46%	65%	65%	63%	65%	**38%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	101	120	47	36	139	185	152	163	276	314	273	254	**2,060**
	Total Care Episodes	561	505	581	428	485	381	361	357	423	481	434	393	**5,390**

Location Total	ePRO Completion	20%	24%	8%	6%	34%	59%	58%	61%	73%	73%	73%	72%	**44%**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	191	223	85	49	293	386	360	366	527	581	522	485	4,068
	Total Care Episodes	970	937	1,010	758	855	649	623	597	719	796	719	676	9,309

Tables 2a-2c display the monthly ePRO completion for the urgent care locations during the implementation period by year. The far right column for each table displays the annual metrics by location and combined ([Year] Total). The bottom row (Location Total) displays the combined metrics for both locations. 22,610 care episodes were admitted during the intervention period.
ePRO Completion = (ePRO Complete Care Episodes / Total Care Episodes) * 100
ePRO Complete Care Episodes = number of care episodes admitted to urgent care location that completed an ePRO
Total Care Episodes = number of care episodes admitted to urgent care location
For 2021, ePRO completion increased significantly between August and September (112% increase) before dropping by 32% between October and November, and increasing again by 12% between November and December.
For 2022, ePRO completion increased throughout the year. Completion decreased by 90% between the first and second quarters, increased by 822% between the second and third quarters, and increased by 177% between the third and fourth quarters.
For 2023, ePRO completion significantly increased throughout the year. Completion increased by 88% between the first and second quarters, increased by 101% between the second and third quarters, and increased by 12% between the third and fourth quarters.

Table 3a. Comparing patient demographics and ePRO completion during implementation period (August 2021 - December 2023)

Variable	Summary Statistics			ePRO Completion Regression		
	Total, N = 22,610	**ePRO incomplete, N = 17,221**	**ePRO complete, N = 5,383**	**log(OR) (95% CI)**	**log(OR) Interpretation**	**p-value**
Location						
Location B	8,171 (36%)	5,929 (73%)	2,237 (27%)	—		—
Location T	14,439 (64%)	11,292 (78%)	3,146 (22%)	-0.31 (-0.38, -0.25)	27% ↓	<0.001
Sex						
Female	12,986 (57%)	9,804 (75%)	3,182 (25%)	—		—
Male	9,618 (43%)	7,417 (77%)	2,201 (23%)	-0.10 (-0.17, -0.04)	10% ↓	0.001
Other	6 (<0.1%)			NA	NA	NA
Age	28 (17)	28 (17)	27 (16)	—		—
Age Range						
Adult 18-64 yrs	12,859 (57%)	9,723 (76%)	3,131 (24%)	—		—
Pediatric 12-17 yrs	6,702 (30%)	5,137 (77%)	1,564 (23%)	-0.07 (-0.14, 0.00)	7% ↓	0.052
Proxy-Report 5-11 yrs	2,136 (9.4%)	1,616 (76%)	520 (24%)	0.04 (-0.07, 0.15)	4% ↑	0.5
Geriatric 65+ yrs	913 (4.0%)	745 (82%)	168 (18%)	-0.38 (-0.55, -0.21)	32% ↓	<0.001
Race						

White	12,060 (53%)	9,031 (75%)	3,024 (25%)	—		—
Black/African-American	7,646 (34%)	5,938 (78%)	1,708 (22%)	-0.16 (-0.22, -0.09)	15% ↓	<0.001
Other	2,261 (10%)	1,754 (78%)	506 (22%)	-0.20 (-0.31, -0.10)	18% ↓	<0.001
Asian	643 (2.8%)	498 (77%)	145 (23%)	-0.22 (-0.42, -0.03)	20% ↓	0.023

Table 3b. Age group stratification of ePRO completion

Variable	**Adult 18-64 years**						**Geriatric 65+ years**					
	Summary Statistics			**ePRO Completion Regression**			**Summary Statistics**			**ePRO Completion Regression**		
	Total, N = 12,854	**ePRO incomplete, N = 9,723**	**ePRO complete, N = 3,131**	**log(OR) (95% CI)**	**log(OR) interpretation**	**p-value**	**Total, N = 913**	**ePRO incomplete, N = 745**	**ePRO complete, N = 168**	**log(OR) (95% CI)**	**log(OR) interpretation**	**p-value**
Location												
Location B	4,468 (35%)	3,201 (72%)	1,267 (28%)	—	—	—	261 (29%)	198 (76%)	63 (24%)	—	—	—
Location T	8,386 (65%)	6,522 (78%)	1,864 (22%)	-0.33 (-0.41, -0.25)	28% ↓	<0.001	652 (71%)	547 (84%)	105 (16%)	-0.47 (-0.8, -0.11)	37% ↓	0.010

Sex												
Female	7,236 (56%)	5,360 (74%)	1,876 (26%)	—	—	—	557 (61%)	449 (81%)	108 (19%)	—	—	—
Male	5,618 (44%)	4,363 (78%)	1,255 (22%)	-0.20 (-0.29, -0.12)	18% ↓	<0.001	356 (39%)	296 (83%)	60 (17%)	-0.17 (-0.53, 0.18)	16% ↓	0.3
Race												
White	7,140 (56%)	5,295 (74%)	1,845 (26%)	—	—	—	685 (75%)	560 (82%)	125 (18%)	—	—	—
Black/African-American	4,326 (34%)	3,368 (78%)	958 (22%)	-0.19 (-0.28, -0.10)	17% ↓	<0.001	182 (20%)	151 (83%)	31 (17%)	-0.09 (-0.5, 0.33)	9% ↓	0.7
Other	1,047 (8.1%)	810 (77%)	237 (23%)	-0.22 (-0.37, -0.06)	20% ↓	0.006	37 (4.1%)	26 (70%)	11 (30%)	0.47 (-0.3, 1.2)	60% ↑	0.2
Asian	341 (2.7%)	250 (73%)	91 (27%)	-0.03 (-0.28, 0.21)	3% ↓	0.8	9 (1.0%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	-0.77 (-3.7, 1.0)	54% ↓	0.5

Variable	Pediatric 12-17 years		Proxy-Report 5-11 years	
	Summary Statistics	**ePRO Completion Regression**	**Summary Statistics**	**ePRO Completion Regression**

	Total, N = 6,701	ePRO incomplete, N = 5,137	ePRO complete, N = 1,564	log(OR) (95% CI)	log(OR) interpretation	p-value	Total, N = 2,136	ePRO incomplete, N = 1,616	ePRO complete, N = 520	log(OR) (95% CI)	log(OR) interpretation	p-value
Location												
Location B	2,709 (40%)	1,996 (74%)	713 (26%)	—	—	—	728 (34%)	534 (73%)	194 (27%)	—	—	—
Location T	3,992 (60%)	3,141 (79%)	851 (21%)	-0.30 (-0.41, -0.18)	26% ↓	<0.001	1,408 (66%)	1,082 (77%)	326 (23%)	-0.22 (-0.43, -0.01)	20% ↓	0.036
Sex												
Female	4,345 (65%)	3,348 (77%)	997 (23%)	—	—	—	848 (40%)	647 (76%)	201 (24%)	—	—	—
Male	2,356 (35%)	1,789 (76%)	567 (24%)	0.06 (-0.06, 0.18)	6% ↑	0.3	1,288 (60%)	969 (75%)	319 (25%)	0.07 (-0.13, 0.27)	7% ↑	0.5
Race												
White	3,283 (49%)	2,481 (76%)	802 (24%)	—	—	—	947 (44%)	695 (73%)	252 (27%)	—	—	—
Black/African-American	2,285 (34%)	1,766 (77%)	519 (23%)	-0.10 (-0.22, 0.03)	9.5% ↓	0.14	853 (40%)	653 (77%)	200 (23%)	-0.16 (-0.38, 0.05)	15% ↓	0.13

Other	880 (13%)	683 (78%)	197 (22%)	-0.15 (-0.33, 0.02)	14% ↓	0.090	296 (14%)	235 (79%)	61 (21%)	-0.37 (-0.70, -0.06)	31% ↓	0.022
Asian	253 (3.8%)	207 (82%)	46 (18%)	-0.44 (-0.79, -0.12)	36% ↓	0.008	40 (1.9%)	33 (82%)	7 (18%)	-0.61 (-1.5, 0.16)	46% ↓	0.2

Tables 3a and 3b display a summary (“Summary Statistics") and logistic regression ePRO completion (“ePRO Completion”) for urgent care patients by demographic variable (3a) and age group (3b). “Summary Statistics” displays the count of all care episodes admitted and stratified by demographic variable (“Total”), the count of care episodes who did not complete an ePRO during their admission (“ePRO incomplete”), and the count of care episodes who completed an ePRO during their admission (“ePRO complete”). For the “Total” column, all variable statistics are presented as n (%) for the column. For “Age”, the data is presented as Mean (SD). “ePRO incomplete” and “ePRO complete” statistics are presented as n (%) for the row (i.e. variable).
“ePRO Completion Regression” displays the logistic regression (“log(OR)”) of completing ePROs, the associated confidence interval (“95% CI”), and *p* (“p-value”). The logistic regression and confidence interval are not exponentiated. “log(OR) interpretation” is calculated as $(1 - e^{log(OR)}) \times 100$. Values are rounded to the nearest zero. The absolute value was used for negative values. Down arrows ↓ indicate decreased odds and Up arrows ↑ indicate increased odds. NA indicates the variable was not included in the logistic regression.

Table 4. Comparing diagnostic categories and ePRO completion during implementation period

	Summary Statistics			ePRO Completion Regression		
Diagnostic Category	**Total, N = 54,302**	**ePRO incomplete, N = 40,986**	**ePRO complete, N = 13,316**	**log(OR) (95% CI)**	**log(OR) interpretation**	**p-value**
All Diagnostic Categories	54,302 (100%)	40,986 (68%)	13,316 (32%)	—	—	—
Depressive Disorders	14,979 (28%)	11,196 (75%)	3,783 (25%)	0.04 (0.00, 0.08)	4% ↑	0.055
Anxiety Disorders	9,841 (18%)	7,126 (72%)	2,715 (28%)	0.16 (0.11, 0.21)	17% ↑	<0.001
Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders	6,165 (11%)	4,875 (79%)	1,290 (21%)	-0.20 (-0.27, -0.14)	18% ↓	<0.001
Bipolar Disorders	4,307 (7.9%)	3,278 (76%)	1,029 (24%)	-0.03 (-0.11, -0.04)	3% ↓	0.4
Psychosis, Schizophrenia Spectrum, Delusional Disorders	3,618 (6.7%)	2,966 (82%)	652 (18%)	-0.39 (-0.48, -0.30)	32% ↓	<0.001
ADHD	3,427 (6.3%)	2,498 (73%)	929 (27%)	0.14 (0.06, 0.21)	15% ↑	<0.001
Trauma Disorders	3,255 (6.0%)	2,485 (76%)	770 (24%)	-0.05 (-0.13, 0.04)	5% ↓	0.3
Adjustment Disorders	1,509 (2.8%)	1,167 (77%)	342 (23%)	-0.10 (-0.22, 0.02)	9% ↓	0.1
Severe and Treatment Resistant Mood Disorders	1,269 (2.3%)	988 (78%)	281 (22%)	-0.13 (-0.27, 0.00)	12% ↓	0.055
Impulse Control Disorders	1,216 (2.2%)	921 (76%)	295 (24%)	-0.01 (-0.15, 0.12)	1% ↓	0.9

Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)	874 (1.6%)	635 (73%)	239 (27%)	0.15 (0.00, 0.30)	16% ↑	0.052
OCD	816 (1.5%)	581 (71%)	235 (29%)	0.22 (0.07, 0.37)	25% ↑	0.005
Cluster B Personality Disorders	745 (1.4%)	536 (72%)	209 (28%)	0.18 (0.02, 0.34)	20% ↑	0.025
Eating Disorders	557 (1.0%)	428 (77%)	129 (23%)	-0.07 (-0.27, 0.12)	7% ↓	0.5
Neurodevelopmental Disorders, Other	360 (0.7%)	286 (79%)	74 (21%)	-0.23 (-0.49, 0.02)	21% ↓	0.084
Neurocognitive Disorders	298 (0.5%)	243 (82%)	55 (18%)	-0.36 (-0.66, -0.07)	30% ↓	0.016
No Dx Listed	287 (0.5%)	200 (70%)	87 (30%)	0.29 (0.04, 0.54)	34% ↑	0.023
Gender Dysphoria	233 (0.4%)	182 (78%)	51 (22%)	-0.15 (-0.47, 0.16)	14% ↓	0.4
DMDD	206 (0.4%)	150 (73%)	56 (27%)	0.14 (-0.17, 0.44)	15% ↑	0.4
Somatic Disorders	171 (0.3%)	133 (78%)	38 (22%)	-0.13 (-0.50, 0.22)	12% ↓	0.5
Insomnia	169 (0.3%)	112 (66%)	57 (34%)	0.45 (0.12, 0.77)	57% ↑	0.006

Table 4 displays the (“Summary Statistics") and logistic regression ePRO completion (“ePRO Completion”) of diagnostic category entries in the EMR for patients admitted to urgent care during the implementation period. “Summary Statistics” displays the count of all diagnostic category entries (“Total”), the count of diagnostic categories that did not complete an ePRO during admission (“ePRO incomplete”), and the count of diagnostic categories that completed an ePRO during admission (“ePRO complete”). For the “Total” column, all diagnostic category statistics are presented as n (%) for the column. The “Total” is higher than the actual number of admitted patients (n = 22,610) because most patients had more than one diagnostic category assigned in the EMR; there was an average of 2.2 diagnostic categories per patient (*SD* = 1.1). “ePRO incomplete” and “ePRO complete” statistics are presented as n (%) for the row (i.e. diagnostic category).

“ePRO Completion Regression” displays the logistic regression (“log(OR)”) of completing ePROs, the associated confidence interval (“95% CI”), and *p* (“p-value”). The logistic regression and confidence interval are not exponentiated. “log(OR) interpretation” is calculated as $(1 - e^{log(OR)}) \times 100$. Values are rounded to the nearest zero. The absolute value was used for negative values. Down arrows ↓ indicate decreased odds and Up arrows ↑ indicate increased odds.

Table 5. ePRO documentation in 2023

Location	Metric	Jan 23	Feb 23	Mar 23	Apr 23	May 23	Jun 23	Jul 23	Aug 23	Sep 23	Oct 23	Nov 23	Dec 23	2023 Total
Location B	ePRO Documentation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	18%	17%	27%	28%	34%	42%	**21%**
	ePRO Documented Care Episodes	0	0	0	0	0	23	37	34	67	74	84	97	**416**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	90	103	38	13	154	201	208	203	251	267	249	231	**2,008**
Location T	ePRO Documentation	12%	8%	4%	6%	9%	6%	17%	7%	15%	22%	24%	20%	**15%**
	ePRO Documented Care Episodes	12	10	2	2	12	12	26	12	41	69	65	50	**313**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	101	120	47	36	139	185	152	163	276	314	273	254	**2,060**

Location Total	ePRO Documentation	6%	4%	2%	4%	4%	9%	18%	13%	20%	25%	29%	30%	**18%**
	ePRO Documented Care Episodes	12	10	2	2	12	35	63	46	108	143	149	147	**729**
	ePRO Complete Care Episodes	191	223	85	49	293	386	360	366	527	581	522	485	**4,068**

Table 5 displays the ePRO documentation ("Adoption") for the urgent care locations and combined totals in 2023 by month. The far right column displays the annual metrics by location and combined ("2023 Total"). The column on the bottom ("Location Total") displays the monthly combined metrics for both locations. All of the combined metrics are bolded.
ePRO Documentation = ePRO Documented Care Episodes / ePRO Complete Care Episodes
ePRO Documented Care Episodes = number of ePRO complete care episodes with an ePRO documented in the EMR by their appointment provider
ePRO Complete Care Episodes = number of care episodes admitted to urgent care location that completed an ePRO

Figure 4. Monthly ePRO documentation in 2023



Figure 4 shows ePRO documentation ("Adoption") throughout 2023, the final year of the implementation period (2023) and post-implementation (January - October 2024 highlighted in gray). The equation for the polynomial trend line (dotted red line) during the implementation period is $y = 2.80969e\text{-}06x^2 + -0.252506x + 5673.2$ (R^2 = 0.801437, P = < 0.0001). ePRO documentation is defined as the process of incorporating ePRO data into an EHR appointment note.

Upper (UCL) and lower (LCL) control limits for the intervention period are displayed, stratified by location. Both locations had a LCL of 0% but different UCLs: 30% for Location B, 19% for Location T, and 24% for both locations combined (Total). The average ePRO documentation for the implementation period was 14%. Post-implementation average was 59%.

Table 6. ePRO modifications

Modification ID for Figure 6	Modification description	Modification owner	Time from request to implementation	Completion date	Story Points
Mod #1	Add Location B to the ePRO dashboard	ePRO implementation team	2 days	August 2, 2021	1
Mod #2	Add substance use screener to ePRO battery	ePRO implementation team	4.5 months (146 days)	March 22, 2022	2
Mod #3	Add location filter on ePRO dashboard	ePRO implementation team	4 months (121 days)	August 19, 2022	2
Mod #4	Add ePROs to the quality metrics tracking system	ePRO implementation team and EHR department	2 months (73 days)	October 27, 2022	3
Mod #5	Add SMS option for sending ePROs to patients	ePRO implementation team	5 months (156 days)	May 5, 2023	6
Mod #6	Use “quick registration” workflow for all patients	Urgent care staff	Location B – approximately 8 months (256 days) Location T - approximately 11 months (344 days)	Location B - no specific date defined; staff provided confirmation of full time usage June 15, 2023 Location T - no specific date defined; staff was instructed on September 11, 2023 to use workflow full time	3 - Although urgent care staff did not utilize story points to calculate level of effort, the estimation is based on the level of effort of the ePRO implementation team for coordination and follow up with the urgent care staff.

Table 6 displays the modifications implemented throughout the ePRO implementation period. The “Modification owner” is the individual or group that was in charge of completing the modification. “Time from request to implementation” refers to the amount of time needed to build, test, and

release the completed modification. “Completion date” refers to the exact date that the modification was completed and presented to users or when users confirmed that the modification was complete. Mod #6 had two release dates since the completion was confirmed by the individual urgent care locations at different times. “Story Points (SP)” refers to the units of measure for the level of effort required to complete the modification by the ePRO implementation team. The story points reflected in this column were tracked on user story cards completed during the sprints. The minimum story point value is 1, indicating the task was lower in complexity and amount of work to complete. Increased complexity, risk to functionality, and amount of work results in story point increases based on the Fibonacci sequence (1, 2, 3, 5, 8, etc.). Some modifications were completed across multiple user story cards thus the story points reflected in this table reflect the total story points across multiple cards.

Figure 5. Monthly ePRO completion with modification timepoints



Figure 5 displays ePRO completion throughout the implementation period (August 2021 - December 2023) and post-implementation (January - October 2024). A gantt chart of the 6 modifications implemented displayed. The length of each gantt bar represents the amount of time needed to complete the modification ("Time from request to implementation" in Table 6). The month and year presented to the right of each gant bar represents when the modification was completed ("Completion date" in Table 6). Mod #6 has two completion dates because the modification was completed at two different times for Location B and Location T.

Upper (UCL) and lower (LCL) control limits for ePRO completion during the implementation period are displayed, stratified by location. Both locations had a LCL of 0% but different UCLs: 60% for Location B, 44% for Location T, and 51% for both locations combined (Total). The average monthly ePRO completion for the implementation period was 25%.

Figure 6. Mean sentiment by month



Figure 6 displays the monthly mean sentiment value of ePRO intervention comments and audit notes in the feedback database. Mean sentiment increased towards the end of the intervention, as demonstrated in the linear trend line, although this increase was not significant: $y = 0.000105094x + -4.60263$ (R^2 = 0.05061, P = 0.354456).

Table 7. ePROs used for CMS Quality Payment Program program Quality Metrics

Quality ID	Name	Description	ePROs used
134	Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Depression and Follow-Up Plan	Percentage of patients aged 12 years and older screened for depression on the date of the encounter or up to 14 days prior to the date of the encounter using an age-appropriate standardized depression screening tool AND if positive, a follow-up plan is documented on the date of the eligible encounter.	PROMIS Short Form v1.0 - Depression 4a PROMIS Pediatric Short Form v2.0 - Depressive Symptoms 8a
226 (NQF 0028)	Preventive Care and Screening: Tobacco Use: Screening and Cessation Intervention	Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older who were screened for tobacco use one or more times within the measurement period AND who received tobacco cessation intervention on the date of the encounter or within the previous 12 months if identified as a tobacco user	Tobacco Use Screen
402	Tobacco Use and Help with Quitting Among Adolescents	The percentage of adolescents 12 to 20 years of age with a primary care visit during the measurement year for whom tobacco use status was documented and received help with quitting if identified as a tobacco user	Tobacco Use Screen
431 (NQF 2152)	Preventive Care and Screening: Unhealthy Alcohol Use: Screening & Brief Counseling	Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older who were screened for unhealthy alcohol use using a systematic screening method at least once within the last 12 months AND who received brief counseling if identified as an unhealthy alcohol user	AUDIT-C
182 (NQF 2624)	Functional Outcome Assessment	Percentage of visits for patients aged 18 years and older with documentation of a current functional outcome assessment using a standardized functional outcome assessment tool on the date of the encounter AND documentation of a care plan based on identified functional outcome deficiencies on the date of the identified deficiencies	PROMIS Short Form v2.0 - Physical Function 4a
155 (NQF	Falls: Plan of Care	Percentage of patients aged 65	Fall Screen

0101)		years and older with a history of falls that had a plan of care for falls documented within 12 months	
181	Elder Maltreatment Screen and Follow-Up Plan	Percentage of patients aged 65 years and older with a documented elder maltreatment screen using an Elder Maltreatment Screening tool on the date of encounter AND a documented follow-up plan on the date of the positive screen.	Vulnerability to Abuse Screening Scale (VASS)
PP10	Measurement-Based Care Processes: Index Assessment, Monitoring and Care Plan Review	Percentage of individuals 18 years of age and older with a mental and/or substance use disorder, who had a comprehensive index assessment in the measurement period, with monitoring and care plan review.	PROMIS Short Form v1.0 - Depression 4a PROMIS Short Form v1.0 - Anxiety 4a PROMIS Short Form v1.0 - Severity of Substance Use (Past 30 days) 7a AUDIT-C

Table 7 displays the CMS Quality Payment Program program Quality Metrics utilized by urgent care and the ePROs that were used to complete the metric. The full names of and descriptions of the quality metrics are listed. Some metrics were associated with multiple ePROs based on the age of the patient or the comprehensive nature of the metric.