Multidisciplinary clinician perspectives on reducing avoidable inflammatory bowel disease admissions: A mixed methods study

Authors: Rachel L Hawkins, MSc[1], Matthew Lee, PhD[4], Fiona Sampson, PhD[1], Daniel Hind, PhD[3], Alan J Lobo, MD FRCP[2]

[1] Sheffield Centre for Health and Related Research, School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

[2] Sheffield Inflammatory Bowel Disease Centre, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

[3] School of Healthcare, The University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom

[4] Department of Applied Health Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

***Corresponding author**

Rachel Hawkins, BSc (Hons), MSc

The University of Sheffield, Sheffield Centre for Health and Related Research, School of Medicine and Population Health

rhawkins4@sheffield.ac.uk

07814452433

Financial disclosures

Funding from The University of Sheffield PhD Research Scholarships is acknowledged in supporting RLH to conduct this review.

Conflicts of interest

AJL has acted as a speaker or consultant for Takeda, BMS, Sandoz, JNJ, Celltrion and Medtronic.

Lay summary (40 words)

Unplanned hospital admissions for inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) are common, but it is unclear to what extent they are avoidable. This study explored gastroenterologists, IBD nurses, surgeons and allied professionals' perspectives of unplanned IBD admissions by an online survey and interviews.

Abstract

Background

Unplanned hospital admissions are costly outcomes in inflammatory bowel disease (IBD). However, the extent to which they are avoidable remains unclear. This study explored multidisciplinary clinicians' perceptions of admission types, causes, barriers, and enablers to their prevention.

Methods

A mixed-methods study using explanatory sequential design integrated findings from an online survey and follow-up semi-structured interviews. Clinicians ranked causes and barriers to preventing admissions, analysed by descriptive statistics and Friedman and Wilcoxon rank tests. Thematic Framework analysis, using Candidacy Theory, analysed qualitative data from the survey and interviews.

Results

Survey: 145 started and 80 (55.2%) were included. For all unplanned IBD admissions, ranking of all reasons were significantly different (p <0.001). An unpreventable disease progression was ranked most important (mean rank [MR] 32.20/100) (p <0.05), followed by missed opportunities for earlier intervention (MR 22.39/100) and patient access issues (MR 19.52/100).

Interviews: 13 clinicians were interviewed. Three overlapping themes summarised definitions of avoidable and preventable IBD admissions: (1) Missed opportunities in outpatient or primary care, (2) critical delays in specialised care, and (3) system constraints blocking timely action. Key challenges in preventing admissions related to patient navigation of services, organisational barriers, provider decision-making, and structural issues that impede access to care.

Conclusions

Clinicians perceive most avoidable admissions not as a failure of individuals, but a reflection of broader service inefficiencies and inequities. Reducing IBD admissions requires systemic investment and improvements in care navigation, rapid-access pathways, professional decision-making, patient education and service integration.

Key words: Inflammatory Bowel Diseases, unplanned admissions, clinician perspectives, survey, qualitative interviews

Key messages

What is already known?

Unplanned hospital admissions for inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) are a frequent and costly outcome, often linked to challenges in outpatient care. Clinicians' perspectives on why these admissions occur and how they could be prevented are not well understood.

What is new here?

This study shows that clinicians view most avoidable admissions not as individual failures, but as the result of system-wide inefficiencies. They identify missed opportunities for earlier intervention, critical delays in accessing specialist care, and resource constraints as key drivers.

How can this study help patient care?

These findings can help services build better rapid-access pathways for patients experiencing flares and justify targeted investment in IBD care. This shifts the focus from individual blame towards systemic issues.

Introduction

Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD) - Crohn's Disease (CD) and Ulcerative Colitis (UC) - are chronic, relapsing conditions of the gastrointestinal tract (Ananthakrishnan, 2015). People living with IBD (PwIBD) require lifelong treatment to manage flares of diseases which may result in unplanned admissions (Nguyen et al., 2021; Umar et al., 2025). Unplanned admissions are common as a result of severe flares and when hospital treatment becomes necessary, especially in the first five years after diagnosis (Lamb et al., 2019; Soriano et al., 2021; Tsai et al., 2022).

However, it remains unclear whether some of these admissions may be prevented or avoided by improving the quality of access to healthcare. There are inequalities in healthcare access, experience, and outcomes for PwIBD, including for unplanned hospital admissions (Hawkins et al., 2024). Poorer access to care, including lack of appropriate outpatient management, contributes to complications resulting in unplanned hospital admissions (Hawkins et al., 2024; IBD UK, 2024). Challenges relating to healthcare access have previously been explored using the Candidacy Framework, with seven interconnected constructs across individual, interpersonal, and system level influences across the healthcare journey (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006; Estupiñán Fdez. de Mesa et al., 2024; Liberati et al., 2022). The Candidacy framework has recently been applied to understanding system inequalities contributing to IBD admissions (pre-print) (Hawkins et al., 2025)

There is limited research exploring healthcare issues in preventing unplanned IBD admissions, including prioritisation for future healthcare improvement. IBD clinicians, including gastroenterologists and nurses, attempt to reduce unplanned hospitalisations (IBD UK, 2024; Lamb et al., 2019; Selinger et al., 2024). Gathering their perspectives, including perceived barriers or enablers, is important to inform future interventions to reduce unplanned IBD admissions (Jefferson et al., 2024).

Research aims

In line with mixed methods research, an international online survey and qualitative telephone interviews were conducted to explore the causes, consequences and barriers to reducing IBD admissions from the perspectives of IBD clinicians across disciplines. The Candidacy Framework (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006) was used to guide the interpretation of qualitative data collected across the survey and interviews. Following recommendations for integrated mixed methods research, the research questions included at least one that can only be answered through methods integration (Guetterman and Manojlovich, 2024). The aim of this study was to explore healthcare professionals' experiences of avoidable admissions in IBD. Specific research questions were:

- How do IBD healthcare professionals rank the frequency of different types of IBD admissions and causes for all unplanned IBD admissions?
- How do IBD healthcare professionals define avoidable and preventable unplanned IBD admissions?
- What are the perceived barriers and enablers for preventing unplanned IBD admissions? (survey

Materials and methods

Methods are reported using The Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES) (Eysenbach, 2004) and the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) (Tong et al., 2007). To describe methods integration, the GRAMMS checklist for reporting of mixed-methods research in health services research is used (O'cathain et al., 2008) (see supplementary data A for all checklists).

Design

A mixed methods explanatory sequential design (Guetterman and Manojlovich, 2024) used: 1) quantitative and qualitative survey data collection and, and 2) qualitative interviews (Figure 1). Integration was built with survey outputs informing the questions and prompts of the interview guide. This approach enabled the interview data to explain survey findings. Use of a survey and interviews enabled this issue to be explored both quantitatively and qualitatively. The mixed-methods design provided both breadth and depth regarding complex, multi-driver unplanned IBD admissions.

Setting

Experiences of multidisciplinary (MDT) IBD healthcare professionals were captured across the UK, and internationally. All participants were required to be working within a healthcare setting supporting PwIBD.

Participants and recruitment

Eligible participants were registered IBD healthcare professionals (gastroenterologists, nurses, surgeons) and allied health professionals (pharmacists, dieticians) previously or currently working in IBD care.

Survey recruitment used opportunistic and snowball sampling over 6 months (December 2023-May 2024). Emails and flyers were distributed across UK National Health Service (NHS) IBD teams through established research links and circulated by UK IBD charity and health professional networks. The survey was advertised online via the research team 'X' accounts, tagging relevant IBD organisations. Physical flyers were distributed at UK and European IBD professional events. Participants received no incentives.

Qualitative interview recruitment occurred via the survey over 3 months (June-August 2024). Survey participants were invited to participate in follow-up telephone calls.. Those responding "yes", and providing a contact email address, received participant information emails.

Survey and interview guide development

Due to the absence of a pre-existing survey on IBD unplanned admissions, we constructed a new survey. Domains were selected based on existing literature (Hawkins et al., 2024) and collaboration with UK IBD clinicians.

An initial survey was developed and piloted for face validity, utility and feasibility using a modified QQ10 questionnaire (Moores et al., 2012) with nine UK IBD clinicians. Respondents used Likert scales for statements such as "*The questionnaire included all the aspects of IBD care relevant to my practice as a clinician*", "*the questionnaire was too long*". Minor amendments were made following the pilot.

The final survey (supplementary B) consisted of 19 questions across 7 sections including: yes/no questions, open-questions, ranking items (scores weighting to a total of 100) and Likert scales (ranging from "never" to "all the time"). For definitions, a brief non-IBD specific definition from the literature was presented. Participants were asked if avoidable or preventable were separate terms and to provide

definitions if so. The survey was accessible on a computer or smartphone. The order ranked question items was randomised to minimise bias. Once started, the survey remained open for two weeks allowing answer review. Question completion was required to move to subsequent sections.

The interview guide (supplementary C) was developed from survey responses and existing literature. Interviews explored topic importance, definitions and examples of avoidable and preventable IBD admissions, and perceived barriers and enablers to preventing admissions. The guide was developed with IBD clinicians (AJL, ML) during research meetings and designed to last approximately 30 minutes.

Data collection

All data collection was remote via online link. Survey responses were collected using Qualtrics. To protect anonymity, no personal data was collected. Participants created a unique ID code using the last two letters of their postcode and telephone number. Email addresses for interview registration were stored separately from survey data. Qualtrics automatically quality-checked through speed assessment, metadata, reCAPTCHA bot detection and duplicate detection. All responses passed quality checks. No minimum completion time was set.

A predetermined 60% completion threshold was set for final analysis inclusion. Including partial responses enables perspectives from those unable to fully engage due to time constraints and role demands. The 60% threshold was deemed sufficient given anticipated in-depth qualitative interview data.

Semi-structured telephone and GoogleMeet interviews followed a topic guide, conducted by one female PhD researcher (RH). Only participants and the researcher were present. The researcher had five years

semi-structured interview experience with healthcare professionals and masters-level education. No prior participant relationships existed. Interview duration ranged 23-42 minutes. All interviews were audio recorded with participant consent. The researcher typed interview notes into a reflexive log during and after interviews.

Analysis

Survey results were analysed using descriptive statistics. Friedman and Wilcoxon signed rank tests assessed significant differences between ranking responses (5% significance level).

The qualitative dataset was analysed using Nvivo 14, consisting of free-text survey responses on admission definitions, combined with semi-structured interview data. This combined dataset was analysed using reflective thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2015; Ritchie and Spencer, 1994). The analysis was led by one researcher (RH) with support of a second (FS). Both researchers read the transcripts and discussed themes across the dataset during meetings. Inductive analysis with inductive coding of admission definitions was undertaken. Codes formed themes summarising these definitions.

For barriers and enablers to preventing IBD admissions, reflexive thematic analysis was conducted, using the framework method (Gale et al., 2013; Ritchie and Spencer, 1994). Gale's seven steps were followed: 1) transcription, 2) familiarisation, 3) coding, 4) developing analytical framework, 5) applying framework, and, 6) interpreting the data. The Candidacy Framework guided analysis of access issues and barriers. Codes were organised into an analytical framework using the seven constructs of the Candidacy Framework (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006; Estupiñán Fdez. de Mesa et al., 2024; Liberati et al., 2022) whilst remaining open to other codes not deductive to these constructs. Using Nvivo 14, data was charted using framework matrices and coding trees were created to explore the code clusters within the

analytical framework. Case summaries were added to the chartered framework matrices summarising key messages (Gale et al., 2013). Themes were identified by code cluster analysis across the framework. A summary of findings was shared with consenting participants.

Results

All questions were completed by 45% (66/145) of survey respondents, with a further 10% (80/145) passing the 60% completion threshold. Thirteen clinicians participated in interviews; 14 did not respond to invitations (Table 1). Nearly half of survey responses (36/80) and interviews (7/13) were with gastroenterologists. Participants varied in IBD care experience, from clinicians in training (15% of survey respondents) to those with 20+ years' experience (21.25%). Most participants worked in tertiary IBD care (71.25% of respondents, 100% of interviews).

[insert table 1]

Qualitative results: Survey

Ranking types of unplanned IBD admissions

The terms "preventable" and "avoidable" were the most favoured terms with only 5/80 clinicians ranking "inappropriate" first (Table 2). Most clinicians (57/80, 71.25%) considered avoidable and preventable admissions the same. Seventeen (21%) felt an important type of IBD admission was missing, including "necessary, unavoidable" and "urgent admission for optimisation".

[insert table 2]

Reasons for all unplanned IBD admissions

For all unplanned IBD admissions, ranking of reasons (Table 3) were significantly different for all factors (p <0.001). Clinicians ranked unpreventable disease progression most important (MR 32.20/100) (p

<0.05), followed by missed opportunities for earlier intervention in outpatient/community care (MR 22.39/100) and patient access to care issues (MR 19.52/100).

[Insert table 3]

Barriers to preventing IBD admissions

Of 69 participants ranking barriers (Figure 2), health service capacity and resource constraints were ranked highest (long appointment waiting times, availability of appointments and limited staff resource - 3.56-3.0/6.0). While ranked lower, participants recognised potentially modifiable structural barriers including lack of integration within community and outpatient services IT and referral system issues, and uncertainty in identifying patients needing early intervention (MR 1.79/6).

Sixteen (24%) participants identified additional barriers including health system capacity constraints and modifiable surgical care access issues, diagnosis/assessment/treatment issues, psychosocial circumstances of PwIBD, lack of patient support and education (Supplementary file D).

[Insert figure 2]

Qualitative results: Survey and interviews

Definitions of avoidable and preventable IBD admissions

Definitions suggest three overlapping themes showing clinicians perceive avoidable and preventable admissions result from organisation and access issues (Figure 3; Supplementary file E): (1) Missed opportunities in outpatient or primary care, (2) Critical delays in specialised care, and (3) System constraints blocking timely action.

[Insert Figure 3]

However, clinicians emphasised that *"it needs to be clear that not all admissions for IBD are avoidable"* (Specialist IBD Nurse, UK, interview) and that timely admissions are also necessary for good IBD care: *"bringing somebody in at the right time is the right thing to do"* (IBD Nurse Specialist, UK, interview). Timely admissions were not viewed as care failures.

Barriers and enablers to preventing IBD admissions

Theme 1: Navigation and permeability of IBD services

Barriers and enablers to prevent IBD admissions impacting patient navigation (awareness and practical resources needed to access services) and permeability (organisation and ease of using services) are summarised using three sub-themes.

Inadequate system pathways and organisation

The organisation of local IBD pathways were perceived inadequate, therefore delaying IBD care. Lack of clear service organisation resulted in PwIBD experiencing navigation barriers, making preventing admissions for clinicians difficult.

Despite acknowledging that many PwIBD may help through primary care, clinicians highlighted, *"we don't encourage patients to see their GP because the default position is to put them on steroids without any comprehensive assessment "* (Gastroenterologist, UK). Inadequate surgical referral agreements contributed to IBD admissions:

> *"We do have a surgical assessment unit… but again, our pathways to that aren't always agreeable… there are always those that don't meet that criteria and maybe, drop through the net a little bit."*
>
> (Clinical Nurse Specialist, UK)

Clinicians described a lack of healthcare "ability or *resilience"* (Gastroenterologist, UK), describing care as "fragmented". Bottlenecks in the current *"conventional clinical care model"* were common, including multiple hospital for testing and referrals, creating barrier to earlier intervention:

> *"We are aware of people that are struggling to come to hospital to have multiple tests done and if you then have these patients flaring and they're not being managed properly."* (Gastroenterologist, UK)

Bottlenecks were perceived in reviewing new flares, treatment escalation, investigations, and MDT processes, delaying vital care.. Clear flare pathways were perceived necessary for early intervention. Some clinicians shared positive examples:

> *"Now we have a rapid pathway so patients, if they have perianal Crohn's they can contact the IBD nurse specialist who then arranges direct admission to hospital through a dedicated clinical fellow. Have their operation that day, and MRI within a week and with the surgeon within two weeks"* (Colorectal Surgeon, UK)

To prevent admissions, clinicians perceived reorganising services as essential, especially for flare clinics. Suggested improvements included increased administrative support, use of automatic systems, increasing available urgent appointments, and follow-up appointments.

Knowledge and accessing care

Lack of awareness about symptoms and when or how to contact healthcare was a common perceived barrier for navigating services (and *identification of candidacy)*. Negative previous care experiences were thought to impact how PwIBD navigate services later, delaying contact with IBD services and making preventing admissions more difficult:

"if patients don't have knowledge or they're not educated and they don't know how to access the service, or they're not told when to seek advice. Then absolutely that's going to increase the likelihood of repeated hospital admissions." (IBD Nurse Specialist, UK)

Wider social barriers impacted how PwIBD navigate services. Clinicians discussed difficulties for people living in social deprivation, rural areas, or having lower health literacy. Transport barriers were linked with multiple hospital visits:

"I think at least here in […], some patients are not well educated in all fields so for them to understand a really complex disease is not easy to understand" (Gastroenterologist, South America)

This was perceived for PwIBD experiencing mental health difficulties, especially during disease flares:

"I think that is a bit of a problem for patients to find that number when they're in that crisis or in that situation…They, it all gets very entangled and how to help is really difficult." (Specialist IBD Nurse, UK)

To overcome these issues and avoid admissions, patient education was perceived as important for: empowering PwIBD to contact services, to navigate healthcare, to manage expectations, and promote symptom knowledge. Signposting by IBD teams, emergency services, and charitable organisations supported navigation:

"I think much better education so patients understand their symptoms better, when to contact us, and then after doing that and engaging with testing… I think if we can get patients confident in us that they would then access us even sooner." (Gastroenterologist, UK)

Delays to care

Within and outside the UK, delayed care at multiple touch points across the system were perceived as a barrier to admission avoidance. This started with delays in diagnosis and referrals into specialist IBD services from primary care, resulting in admissions:

"I think they [primary care doctors] are not referring, they don't refer to our hospital and that makes it a little bit difficult and that's of course why the patients have more hospitalisations." (Gastroenterologist, rest of Western Europe)

Delays were also discussed in PwIBD undergoing colonoscopies, advancing to biologics, accessing planned surgical care, and follow-up appointments. Delays in advancing treatments for IBD were highlighted in both the UK and international healthcare context. In a European hospital, they were the only centre providing biologics treatment leading to long waits. A UK clinician discussed overlapping issues:

"It's the fact that we are struggling to get people into these biologics. We had 150 patients waiting for biological therapy and a lot of these patients are getting admitted because we don't have the capacity to put them into chairs or to prescribe subcut." (Gastroenterologist, UK)

Theme 2: Healthcare professional adjudications

Barriers and enablers to prevent IBD admissions relating to professional adjudications (the judgements and decisions which influence subsequent access) of consultants, nurses and primary care providers were discussed across all participant interviews, summarised by two sub-themes.

Provider skills and confidence

For some, lacking confidence in treatment decisions amongst registrar doctors, primary care, emergency call handlers, and gastroenterologists with less experience was a perceived barrier. As advanced treatment options evolved, clinicians highlighted the need to "...*educate all the time because…They need to be able to recognise the signs and symptoms and be familiar with the novelty of the treatment so they can act."* (Gastroenterologist, rest of Western Europe). This might not be possible for all in all cases:

"...physicians, doctors, not being familiar with the drugs, not being sure how to use them, not sure when to use them, not sure when to sequence advanced therapies… I think it's often very difficult in the current climate to know where to go next" (Gastroenterologist, UK)

To support treatment decisions and prevent IBD admissions, openness of communication, *"close MDT working"* (Nurse Consultant, UK), and upskilling nursing teams making complex decisions on IBD advice lines was perceived as important. Moreover, *"raising awareness at the GP level"* (IBD Clinical Nurse Specialist, UK) was perceived as important:

"I would say the referral to the patient. More proactive care from primary care and the internal medicine doctors… more education about the symptoms and about the steps they need to take…when to refer to the patient for a colonoscopy." (Gastroenterologist, rest of Western Europe)

Relational and operational obstacles

Prompt escalation of treatment was perceived essential for reducing admissions. However, system constraints, lack of time and clinician continuity negatively impacted prompt treatment decision-making:

"Our clinics don't have the capacity to see patients in a manner that we would like to in terms of the time that we spend with them. So we see them very quickly, obviously putting us under a small degree of risk of missing things." (Gastroenterologist, UK)

Relational aspects were discussed by gastroenterologists and nurses, who shared challenges in making telephone assessments. Using interpreters in face-to-face clinics was perceived to restrict clear messaging to the patient by one consultant. Operational challenges of making advice line decisions impacted referral decisions:

"...there's only so much bridging you can do [on the helpline]. I requested a next available appointment today and I just got the email straight back to say for the consultant the next available appointment is in two months' time…it stops with us on the helpline, there's almost no point requesting." (IBD Specialist Nurse, UK)

In some services, clinicians experienced communication challenges between gastroenterology and surgical departments. Lack of safety netting processes worsened these issues, making preventing admissions more difficult:

"There is not always safety netting to ensure that we have checked responses to treatment…. clinic appointments are often cancelled at the moment…we may have initiated a treatment that is then not checked that they are actually responding to it." (IBD Clinical Nurse Specialist, UK)

Theme 3: Local conditions and structural barriers

Local conditions (structural, societal and relational aspects) were perceived across all interviews as barriers to avoiding IBD admissions, summarised across three sub-themes.

Inadequate resource

Consistently across all interviews, insufficient availability of local healthcare resources was perceived as a barrier. In the UK, this was *"a massive issue across the country"* (IBD Nurse Specialist, UK) and increasing IBD prevalence was perceived to compound these issues. Significant gaps included *"very few consultant gastroenterologists"* (Gastroenterologist, UK) and nurses, plus limited outpatient, infusion, inpatient and imaging capacity:

> *"The big problem we have is issues getting patients onto our infusion unit because we don't have the capacity in our infusion unit for the number of patients that we have. Patients are waiting six to eight weeks plus to get their first dose so some patients are being admitted in order to give them their first doses as an acute admission, because of that delay."* (IBD Nurse Specialist, UK)

Some issues were put down to broader NHS challenges. However, across the UK and international view, a lack of approvals for accessing medications was discussed, commonly due to costs, *"the drugs are expensive, it's the cost of the drug that is the main issue"* (Gastroenterologist, rest of Western Europe):

> "*They say it's expensive and there doesn't seem to be any joined up thinking that you know this delay is an expense in itself… I don't think that's a problem unique to our trust*" (Specialist IBD Nurse, UK).

Local IBD political context

Broader social and political barriers were outlined including how current services do not prioritise IBD funding, *"there's no political power in IBD like that."* (Gastroenterologist, UK). Generating discussions

with healthcare management and decision-makers was perceived as challenging, "*But it just is very difficult to get IBD services on the trust in general."* (Nurse Consultant, UK)".

Clinicians highlighted the competitiveness for IBD funding, especially compared to cancer services. Asking for more resource was challenging:

"But for the hospital the helpline is not a money-making service, directly, and it can be quite tricky to say that we need more staff to deal with that, when they may just look at well, you're going to have increasing staff costs for no increasing income" (Gastroenterologist, UK)

Better understanding of how to prevent or avoid IBD admissions was viewed as a leverage point to increase awareness of managers, to focus minds and support adequate resourcing:

"Because there's some managers and others may say well that's an acute admission it's going to happen anyway. But I think we need to highlight as an IBD community that these are avoidable, a proportion are avoidable and preventable if we had services in place to treat our patients or treat them more promptly to avoid this." (Gastroenterologist, UK, interview)

Role of interpersonal relationships

Building positive relationships with PwIBD was perceived as important for reducing IBD admissions. In South America, a clinician highlighted the importance of "*Knowing the patient and knowing the history".* Strengthening interpersonal relationships were viewed to help PwIBD feel empowered and confident to access IBD services:

"And actually part of our job is try to and form the relationships with those patients, because those are the ones that will probably come in and are going to be admitted and that come in when they don't have

to come in. Either because they are not accessing services at all. Or because they are accessing services all the time." (IBD ACP, UK)

Discussion

This mixed-methods study explored clinicians' perspectives on avoidable and preventable IBD admissions. Findings highlight systemic healthcare access barriers as drivers, consistent with existing literature (Benchimol et al., 2018; Hawkins et al., 2024). Clinicians perceive avoidable IBD admissions as resulting from cumulative system-level challenges rather than isolated failures, aligning with broader research on hospital admission factors (Busby et al., 2017; Pope et al., 2017).

Survey data revealed that "preventable admissions" was the most frequently observed terminology, although most participants (71.25%) used the terms "avoidable" and "preventable" interchangeably. Clinicians ranked systemic access issues as most critical causes, including long waiting times (MR 3.56/6) and poor appointment availability (MR 3.41/6). Interviews corroborated these findings, explaining that delays stem from unclear care pathways, overwhelmed clinics, and patients' uncertainty in navigating services. These access barriers are well-documented in UK national reports (IBD UK, 2021, 2024).

However, data highlighted that many admissions are not preventable due to disease progression. (mean rank of 32.2/100 and medium of 27/100). Clinicians emphasised timely, appropriate hospitalisation remains vital to IBD care (Lewin and Velayos, 2020). Rather than attributing blame, efforts should focus on patient-centred approaches enhancing service responsiveness (Grover et al., 2022).

Clinicians defined avoidable admissions as those resulting from missed opportunities in primary or outpatient care, critical delays in accessing specialist services, or resource constraints impeding timely action. Interview examples included poor care escalation, fragmented services, and limited healthcare capacity, factors potentially contributing to IBD diagnostic delays (AWARE-IBD Diagnostic Delay Working Group, 2024).Addressing these issues requires patient-centred approaches during acute flares, incorporating mental health support, enhanced education, and improved risk communication (Romain

et al., 2024).

The organisation and ease with which PwIBD navigate healthcare presented many barriers, including appointment delays, diagnostic or infusion service bottlenecks, and poor primary-secondary care integration. These findings reinforce the need for better-integrated approaches to deliver early and personalised IBD care (Delen et al., 2024; Noor et al., 2022). Relational challenges were identified, including lack of continuity, insufficient clinician confidence in prescribing advanced therapies, and MDT inefficiencies, affecting appropriate escalation.

Qualitative interviews highlighted how social determinants affect PwIBD 'candidacy' for care. Clinicians described how patients with lower health literacy, language barriers, poor mental health, socioeconomic constraints, or rural residency face additional hurdles in navigating complex IBD care pathways. These findings coincide with reviews on IBD care inequalities(Hawkins et al., 2024), and underscore the need for equity-focused interventions. The Candidacy Framework was valuable for interpreting this interplay between patient circumstances, provider decisions, and systemic constraints. (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006). Thematic mapping demonstrated how access is impacted throughout the patient journey and reinforced the complexity of preventing unplanned admissions. While constructs—like "identification of candidacy" and "offers and resistance to services"—were less prominent, they emerged in discussions about treatment hesitancy and symptom awareness in newly diagnosed patients, warranting further research exploring patient perspectives.

Implications of findings

Findings suggest several implications for improving IBD care. Services should develop clearly defined rapid-access pathways for flaring patients, supported by research modelling local service needs. Patient

navigation and education must be strengthened, through early education at diagnosis, symptom recognition, and clear signposting during flares. Significant investment in the IBD workforce and infrastructure is paramount, including clinic and infusion capacity, specialist staffing, and advanced therapies to reduce costly admissions and missed care escalation opportunities. Further research is essential to understand how the social and health inequities drive unplanned admissions and to develop targeted interventions.

Strengths and Limitations

The main strength of this study is its mixed-methods design. The survey provided quantitative breadth across IBD professionals, internationally, while the interviews added depth and contextual richness. The Candidacy Framework facilitated a structured understanding of barriers and enablers across multiple healthcare access domains.

Several limitations should be considered. Most participants were UK-based, limiting transferability. Survey completion rates were suboptimal, with just over half completing more than 60% of questions. Non-probability sampling contributed to unequal clinician group representation. Primary and emergency care perspectives were underrepresented in interviews, despite their critical roles in unplanned admissions. The study does not capture the experiences of PwIBD —a gap requiring further research.

Conclusions

Clinicians perceive avoidable IBD admissions as stemming from missed opportunities, delays in specialist care, and inadequate resources. Preventing these admissions requires a multifaceted approach that addresses organisational, knowledge, and interpersonal barriers. To be effective, services must be adequately resourced, flare pathways must be clearly defined, and patients must have the knowledge

and access needed to receive timely care.

Ethical considerations

The study received ethical approval from from the Health and Care Research Support Centre, Wales Research Ethics Committee 3 (REC reference 21/WA/0264)

References

Ananthakrishnan AN (2015) Epidemiology and risk factors for IBD. *Nature reviews. Gastroenterology & hepatology* 12(4): 205–217.

AWARE-IBD Diagnostic Delay Working Group (2024) Sources of diagnostic delay for people with Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis: Qualitative research study. *PloS one* 19(6). United States: e0301672.

Benchimol EI, Kuenzig ME, Bernstein CN, et al. (2018) Rural and urban disparities in the care of Canadian patients with inflammatory bowel disease: a population-based study. *Clinical epidemiology* 10. New Zealand: 1613–1626.

Braun V and Clarke V (2015) Thematic analysis. *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* 3. torrossa.com: 222–248.

Busby J, Purdy S and Hollingworth W (2017) How do population, general practice and hospital factors influence ambulatory care sensitive admissions: a cross sectional study. *BMC family practice* 18(1): 67.

Delen S, Jaghult S, Blumenstein I, et al. (2024) Framework of IBD Care Delivery Across Ages. *Journal of Crohn's & colitis* 18(Supplement_2): ii55–ii66.

Dixon-Woods M, Cavers D, Agarwal S, et al. (2006) Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC medical research methodology* 6(1): 35.

Estupiñán Fdez. de Mesa M, Marcu A, Ream E, et al. (2024) Using the Candidacy Framework to understand individual, interpersonal, and system level factors driving inequities in women with breast cancer: a cross-sectional study. *BJC Reports* 2(1): 83.

Eysenbach G (2004) Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES). *Journal of medical internet research* 6(3). Canada: e34.

Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, et al. (2013) Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC medical research methodology* 13(1): 117.

Grover S, Fitzpatrick A, Azim FT, et al. (2022) Defining and implementing patient-centered care: An umbrella review. *Patient education and counseling* 105(7): 1679–1688.

Guetterman TC and Manojlovich M (2024) Grand rounds in methodology: designing for integration in mixed methods research. *BMJ quality & safety* 33(7): 470.

Hawkins RL, Zia M, Hind D, et al. (2024) Inequalities in Healthcare Access, Experience and Outcomes in Adults With Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Scoping Review. *Inflammatory bowel diseases*: izae077.

Hawkins RL, Bulter K, Sampson F, et al. (2025) An adapted health system inequity framework for avoidable inflammatory bowel disease admissions: A scoping review. *medRxiv: the preprint server for health sciences*: 2025.09.08.25335323.

IBD UK (2021) *Crohn's and Colitis Care in the UK: The Hidden Cost and a Vision for Change*. April. IBD UK

Strategy Partnership Quality Improvement.

IBD UK (2024) *The State of IBD Care in the UK*. November. IBD UK.

Jefferson LA, Doran J, Gilburt H, et al. (2024) Exploring Health and Social Care perspectives on the implementation of 'Right Care, Right Person', under the National Partnership Agreement. Epub ahead of print December 2024.

Lamb CA, Kennedy NA, Raine T, et al. (2019) British Society of Gastroenterology consensus guidelines on the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults. *Gut* 68(Suppl 3). England: s1–s106.

Lewin S and Velayos FS (2020) Day-by-Day Management of the Inpatient With Moderate to Severe Inflammatory Bowel Disease. *Gastroenterology & hepatology* 16(9). United States: 449–457.

Liberati E, Richards N, Parker J, et al. (2022) Qualitative study of candidacy and access to secondary mental health services during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social science & medicine* 296: 114711.

Moores KL, Jones GL and Radley SC (2012) Development of an instrument to measure face validity, feasibility and utility of patient questionnaire use during health care: the QQ-10. *International journal for quality in health care: journal of the International Society for Quality in Health Care / ISQua* 24(5): 517–524.

Nguyen NH, Luo J, Ohno-Machado L, et al. (2021) Burden and Outcomes of Fragmentation of Care in Hospitalized Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A Nationally Representative Cohort. *Inflammatory bowel diseases* 27(7): 1026–1034.

Noor NM, Sousa P, Paul S, et al. (2022) Early Diagnosis, Early Stratification, and Early Intervention to Deliver Precision Medicine in IBD. *Inflammatory bowel diseases* 28(8). England: 1254–1264.

O'cathain A, Murphy E and Nicholl J (2008) The Quality of Mixed Methods Studies in Health Services Research. *Journal of health services research & policy* 13(2). SAGE Publications: 92–98.

Pope I, Burn H, Ismail SA, et al. (2017) A qualitative study exploring the factors influencing admission to hospital from the emergency department. *BMJ open* 7(8). England: e011543.

Ritchie J and Spencer L (1994) Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: *Analysing Qualitative Data*. Routledge, pp. 173–194.

Romain D, Larson C, Kathuria P, et al. (2024) Understanding the Perspectives and Experiences of Patients with Acute Severe Ulcerative Colitis in the Hospital: A Qualitative Analysis. *Digestive diseases and sciences*. United States. Epub ahead of print 18 September 2024. DOI: 10.1007/s10620-024-08633-0.

Selinger C, Bottle A, Lamb CA, et al. (2024) Evaluation of emergency hospital admissions for inflammatory bowel disease as a possible marker of quality of care of British IBD inflammatory bowel disease units. *Frontline gastroenterology* 15(3): 228.

Soriano CR, Powell CR, Chiorean MV, et al. (2021) Role of hospitalization for inflammatory bowel disease in the post-biologic era. *World journal of clinical cases* 9(26). United States: 7632–7642.

Tong A, Sainsbury P and Craig J (2007) Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care* 19(6): 349–357.

Tsai L, Nguyen N, Ma C, et al. (2022) Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: Risk of Hospitalization in Patients with Ulcerative Colitis and Crohn's Disease in Population-Based Cohort Studies. *Digestive diseases and sciences* 67.

Umar N, Harvey P, Adderley NJ, et al. (2025) The Time to Inflammatory Bowel Disease Diagnosis for Patients Presenting with Abdominal Symptoms in Primary Care and its Association with Emergency Hospital Admissions and Surgery: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Inflammatory bowel diseases* 31(1). England: 140–150.

Tables

Table 1: Participant demographics

Healthcare professional	Survey, n (%)	Interviews, n (%)
Gastroenterologist	36 (45)	7 (53.8)
Surgeon	15 (18.75)	2 (15.4)
Specialist IBD Nurse	21 (26.25)	4 (30.8)
General Practitioner	3 (3.75)	
Pharmacist	3 (3.75)	
Dietician	2 (2.5)	
Country or continent		
United Kingdom	63 (78.75)	11 (84.6)
Eastern Europe	5 (6.25)	
Rest of Western Europe	4 (5)	1 (7.7)
North America	3 (3.75)	
South America	2 (2.5)	1 (7.7)
South Asia	3 (3.75)	
Number of years working in IBD care		
Still in training	12 (15)	
Less than 5 years	12 (15)	1 (7.8)
6-10 years	18 (22.5)	2 (15.4)
11-20 years	16 (20)	3 (23)
20 years or more	17 (21.25)	7 (53.8)
Did not respond	5 (6.25)	
Working in a tertiary IBD service		

Responded ‘yes’	57 (71.25)	13 (100)
Interview format		
Video call		6 (46.1)
Telephone		7 (53.9)

Table 2. Ranking of observed IBD admission concepts

Admission concept	Overall ranking (n, % ranked first) across 80 survey responses	Mean rank
Preventable IBD admissions	1st (46, 57.5%)	1.62/4
Avoidable IBD admissions	2nd (22, 28%)	2.02/4
Unnecessary IBD admissions	3rd (7, 9%)	2.96/4
Inappropriate IBD admissions	4th (5, 6%)	3.39/4
Across the four admission types, overall comparisons of rankings were statistically different ($p < 0.001$ Friedman test)		

Table 3. Clinicians ranked perceived reasons for all IBD admissions

Ranked factor for all emergency IBD admissions	Mean overall ranking	Median overall ranking	Pairwise comparisons between rankings			
			Opportunity for earlier intervention	Patient access	Patient behaviour	Clinician decision making
			Adj. p	*Adj. p*	*Adj. p*	*Adj. p*
An unpreventable progression of disease requiring in-patient intervention	32.2	27	0.40	0.01*	<0.001***	<0.001***
An opportunity for earlier intervention in outpatient care or the community was missed	22.39	19		1	0.16	<0.001***
Patient access to IBD services	19.52	19			1	<0.001***
Patient behaviour, knowledge and beliefs about illness	15.1	15	0.16			0.001***
Clinician decision making error	5.5	5				
Other (please specify)	1.0	0	n=2 responses 1. No reason provided 2. "Social, hierarchy factors"			

Across all factors, overall comparisons of rankings were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), using the Friedman test.

Significant differences between two ranked factors were indicated using Wilcoxen Signed Rank Tests * $p < 0.05$, ***$p < 0.001$. Medians & adjusted *p* values included due to non-parametric data.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Flow chart of explanatory sequential mixed method design

Figure 2. Multidisciplinary IBD professionals ranking of barriers to preventing IBD admissions

Figure 3. Diagram of clinicians definitions of avoidable and preventable IBD admissions


1 - Missed opportunities in IBD outpatient and primary care
Lack of early intervention IBD services
Patient seeks help but care is not received in time
Lack of timely and accessible IBD care
3 - System constraints blocking timely action
Resource-driven treatment delays
2 - Critical delays in specialist IBD care


Ranked barriers to preventing IBD admissions
Long appointment waiting times
Limitted available clinic slots
Limitted staff and service resource
Degree of integration with community/outpatient services
Inadequate information technology and referral systems
Access and appropriate organisation of IBD helplines
Uncertainty identifying patients in need of early intervention
0
1
2
3
4


Quantitative data analysis
Survey data collection
Builds to
Thematic structure of interview guide
Conduct of interviews and production of more qualitative data for analysis
Interpretation of qualitative and quantitative findings
Review of qualitative data
Combined with