

1

2

TITLE:

3

“Multimorbidity and consultation time: a systematic review”

4

5

AUTHORS:

6

Ana Carolina Reis Tadeu,¹

7

Inês Rosendo Carvalho e Silva Caetano,^{1,2,5}

8

Inês Jorge de Figueiredo^{1,3,4}

9

Luiz Miguel Santiago^{1,5,6}

10 1 – Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Portugal

11 2 – USF Coimbra Centro, Coimbra, Portugal

12 3 - USF Lusitana, ACeS Dão Lafões

13 4 - Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Beira Interior, Portugal

14 5 – General Practice/Family Practice clinic of the Faculty of Medicine of University of
15 Coimbra, Portugal

16 6 – Center for Health and Investigation studies of the University of Coimbra (CEISUC)

17

18

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 **Background:** Multimorbidity (MM) is one of the major challenges health systems currently
21 face. Management of time length of a medical consultation with a patient with MM is a matter
22 of concern for doctors.

23 **Objectives:** To describe the impact of MM on the average time of a medical consultation.

24 **Methods:** A systematic review was performed considering the Preferred Reporting Items for
25 Systematic Review and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The systematic online searches
26 of the Embase and PubMed databases were undertaken, from January 2000 to August 2018.
27 The studies were independently screened by two reviewers to decide which ones met the
28 inclusion criteria. (Kappa=0.84 and Kappa=0.82). Differing opinions were solved by a third
29 person. This systematic review included people with MM criteria as participants (two or more
30 chronic conditions in the same individual). The type of outcome included was explicitly defined
31 – the length of medical appointments with patients with MM. Any strategies aiming to analyse
32 the impact of MM on the average consultation time were considered. The length of time of
33 medical appointment for patients without MM was the comparator criteria. Experimental and
34 observational studies were included.

35 **Results:** Of 85 articles identified, only 1 observational study was included, showing a clear
36 trend for patients with MM to have longer consultations than patients without MM criteria
37 ($p<0.001$).

38 **Conclusions:** More studies are necessary to assess better allocation length-time for patients
39 with MM and to measure other characteristics like doctors workload.

40 **Keywords:** Multimorbidity; Medical appointment; Quality of healthcare; Consultation length-
41 time.

42

43 1. INTRODUCTION

44 Multimorbidity (MM) is defined by the European General Practice Research Network
45 as "any combination of chronic disease with at least one other disease (acute or chronic) or
46 biopsychosocial factor (associated or not) or somatic risk factor".¹ This is sometimes simplified
47 to, "the simultaneous occurrence of two or more chronic diseases in the same individual".²
48 MM is now one of the main challenges faced by health systems at an international level and
49 occupies a considerable part of the daily activity of General Practitioners/Family Doctors
50 (GPs/FMs) around the world.³⁻⁶

51 With an ever ageing world population, MM and its consequences, are becoming a
52 major issue in public health and primary care. According to United Nations data,^{7,8} Europe has
53 the largest percentage of population aged 60 or over (25%).⁷ In 2015 the number of people in
54 the world aged 60 years and older was 901 million.⁸ It is projected that in 2030 this figure will
55 rise to 1.4 billion (a 56% increase since 2015) and stand at 2.1 billion in 2050.⁸ Several studies
56 have shown that there is a significant association between age² and the prevalence of MM,
57 most national health systems not being prepared or able to cope with this rapid ageing with
58 many demands.^{5,6}

59 So it is imperative to think about the approach to patients with MM to maximize the
60 quality of services provided by the Health Services (HS) consequently guaranteeing a better
61 quality of life for such patients.

62 GPs/FMs medical team face various difficulties in caring for a patient with MM like lack
63 of resources; consultation time restrictions; lack of interdisciplinary care/teams; inadequate
64 patient support (largely relying on community-based support services); inadequate tools
65 (guidelines are drawn up strictly for specific diseases and not for the MM patient); the attitude
66 of the patient (often discouraged and poorly engaged).^{4,9}

67 Information about the length-time of a consultation with a patient with MM is essential
68 to better organize and deliver healthcare. To our knowledge, no previous review has
69 summarized data related to: “What is the impact of having MM on the medical consultation?”
70 “Is the average length-time consultation with a patient with MM longer than for a patient without
71 MM?”

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87 **2. METHODS**

88 A systematic review was performed considering the Preferred Reporting Items for
89 Systematic Review and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-
90 analysis with:

91 **2.1 Eligibility criteria**

92 Articles about people with MM. The most widely used definition of MM was used, which
93 is the coexistence of two or more chronic conditions in the same individual.² The World Health
94 Organization (WHO) definition of chronic disease was adopted, namely, “health problems that
95 require ongoing management over a period of years or decades”.¹⁰

96 Studied outcome: explicitly defined length-time of medical appointments with patients
97 with MM. Any strategies aiming to analyse the impact of MM on the average consultation time
98 were considered. Studies which did not specify the time spent on medical appointments were
99 excluded.

100 The length of time of medical appointment for patients without MM was the comparator
101 criteria.

102 Experimental and observational studies were included.

103 **2.2 Information sources and search strategy**

104 The systematic online searches were undertaken using combinations of keywords in
105 the following electronic databases: the Embase and PubMed databases, from 1st January
106 2000 until the 31st August 2018 to find pertinent studies.

107 The search was limited to papers in English, Portuguese, Spanish and French. No
108 other limits were imposed during this stage of the study.

109

110 **2.3 Data extraction and quality assessment**

111 The potentially relevant studies were selected in two stages. First, the titles and
112 abstracts quoted in the literature search were independently screened by two reviewers (CT
113 and IF) to decide which ones met the inclusion criteria ($Kappa=0.84$). Those not meeting the
114 inclusion criteria were excluded. Differing opinions on studies inclusion were resolved by a
115 third person (IR).

116 Secondly, the researchers independently read and analysed the integrity of the
117 matching studies and tried to reach an agreement concerning eligibility ($Kappa=0.82$). Those
118 not meeting the inclusion criteria were excluded. The quality and risk of bias of the included
119 studies was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), more precisely, the
120 Newcastle-Ottawa scale adapted for cross-sectional studies.¹¹ This tool assesses three
121 aspects of a study: the selection of the sample; the comparability of the groups; and the
122 outcome (assessment of outcome and statistical test). It is composed of 7 items and classifies
123 the study in 4 possible levels: Very good (9-10 points), Good (7-8 points), Satisfactory (5-6
124 points) and Unsatisfactory (0-4 points). Any disagreement was resolved through consensus.

125 This systematic review was conducted using Covidence¹³, the standard production
126 platform used for Cochrane reviews, which was used for the data and records management.

127 **2.4 Outcomes and statistical analysis**

128 The patients were split into two groups, those with and those without MM, and
129 the relative frequencies were calculated. The results were analyzed using the chi-square
130 distribution test.

131

132


133

134 **3. RESULTS**

135 **3.1 Study selection**

136 As described in **Flowchart 1**, the electronic database searches started with 85
137 potentially eligible references (26 in PubMed and 59 in Embase). Of these, 5 were duplicates
138 and were thus excluded and 31 were considered irrelevant based on a review of the title and
139 abstract. The remnant studies were fully read, analysed and assessed for eligibility, 36 being
140 excluded due to wrong outcome^{3,12-46}, 5 because of wrong study design⁴⁷⁻⁵¹, 4 due to wrong
141 patient population^{9,52-54}, 2 for wrong language⁵⁵⁻⁵⁶ and 1 for wrong setting⁵⁷. In the end, 1 study
142 was included.⁵⁸

143



144

145

146

147

Flowchart 1 – Literature search and selection process for studies included.

148

149 3.2 Study characteristics and quality

150 The main relevant features and outputs of the study were extracted for the purpose of
151 this systematic review and are summed up in **Table 1**.

152 The included study was conducted between 2008 and 2009 in Denmark, over 12
153 months. It involved 404 general practitioners (GPs) participants and a total of 8236 contacts.
154 It included patients aged 40 years or more, grouped as those without any chronic condition
155 and those with one, two, three or more chronic conditions.

156 During the study period, the GPs completed a one-page registration form for each of
157 their patient contacts. Of the various items that were registered, the ones relevant for this
158 review were information on chronic diseases and length-time of consultation. Quality
159 assessment result, performed as described in methodology, is presented in **Table 2**. The
160 quality of the study was considered satisfactory (score 6 out of a maximum score of 10), its
161 main weakness being in the comparability section.

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176
177
178
179
180

Table 1 – Summary of study’s characteristics.

Author	Year of study	Country	Design	Number of participants	Population (inclusion criteria)	Setting	Method of data collection	Outcomes measured	Author’s conclusions
Moth et al	2008-2009	Denmark	Cross-sectional	404 GPs, 8236 contacts	Persons aged 40 years or more	General practice	Registration form completed by GP about all patient contacts on one randomly assigned date during the study period.	- Length of consultation time, chronic disease, reason for appointment, diagnosis, number of additional psychosocial problems raised by the patient during the consultation, difficulty found with consultation of the consultation, referral to specialized care, and whether a nurse could have replaced the GP.	- GPs found consultations with patients suffering from chronic conditions to be more difficult than those with patients without chronic disease ($p < 0.001$).

181 GP – General Practitioner.

182
183
184

Table 2 – Quality of study - Newcastle-Ottawa Scale adapted for cross-sectional studies.

Author	Selection				Comparability	Outcome		Total score	Power
	Representativeness of the sample	Sample size	Non-respondents	Ascertainment of exposure (risk factor)	Comparability of subjects in different outcome groups on the basis of design or analysis.	Assessment of outcome	Statistical test		
Moth et al	*	- (b)	*	**	-	*	*	6*	Satisfactory

185 (b) – Calculation not reported.
186

187
188

189 **3.3 Results of study**

190 **Table 3** shows the relationship between the length of consultation time and the type
191 of patient (with and without MM). There is a clear significant trend for patients with MM to
192 have longer consultations than patients without MM ($p<0.001$).

193 More than 25% of MM patients had a consultation length-time of at least 16 minutes
194 while more than 75% of the patients without MM had a consultation length-time under 15
195 minutes. Length-time consultation on both types of patients is more frequently between 6 and
196 15 minutes. There is a significant difference, however, in the percentage of patients with MM
197 requiring more time than patients without MM criteria.

Length of consultation time	No MM		MM		p-value
	(n)	%	(n)	%	
<5 min	293	11.7	96	7.7	p<0.001
6-15 min	1686	67.3	804	64.9	
16-30 min	485	19.4	314	25.3	
>30 min	42	1.7	25	2.0	
Total	2506	100	1239	100	

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205 4. DISCUSSION

206 The present systematic review sought to answer the following question: “Is the average
207 consultation time spent on patients with MM longer than that spent on patients who do not
208 meet the MM criteria?” could only identify one study,⁵⁸ undertaken in Denmark, in which the
209 consultation time was logged as a function of the number of chronic diseases. This study
210 revealed a tendency for consultations to take longer for patients with MM than for those without
211 MM. However, the study was not directly aimed at answering this question and it did not take
212 confounding factors into account. In addition, it does not describe the calculation to determine
213 the sample size of the study and it could be inaccurate to study this specific outcome. So the
214 study was classified as “Satisfactory”.

215 The small number of publications in the literature on this subject shows that more
216 studies should be designed to investigate the impact of MM on the consultation length-time. It
217 is vital to analyse this issue in order to manage resources so that they meet the actual need,
218 and to ensure the services provided by health services, national or private, are appropriate. It
219 will thus be possible to guarantee better quality health services and outcomes for these
220 patients. In fact MM is about a patient with more than two chronic diseases or one chronic
221 disease with biopsychosocial factor (associated or not) or somatic risk factor, so illness being
222 included and not only about the specific sufferances.^{1,9}

223 In studies with calculated size population representative random samples it is
224 important that accurate methods are used to measure the real length-time of a consultation
225 (i.e. from the moment that the doctor opens the patient’s file to the moment it is closed). Using
226 stop-watches and self-reporting will probably lead to inaccuracies. The calculation of the
227 length-time of the consultation obtained by dividing the total time a medical practitioner is in
228 the clinic by the number of patients could yield average times that mask the real duration of
229 each patient’s consultation. Also confounding factors must be eliminated as the time spent on
230 administrative work, breaks and work meetings. Only direct observation using video recording

231 has been proven to obtain accurate values when measuring the duration of consultations,⁵⁹
232 which could be a procedure that mitigates many of the errors previously mentioned. The
233 length-time of a consultation must be measured accurately to avoid errors and skewed
234 judgements. It is essential to identify beforehand any possible confounding factors inherent to
235 the patients (for example, hearing difficulty, education level, age, socio-economic level),
236 inherent to the doctor (in particular, a change in behaviour due to the participation in the
237 research study – Hawthorne effect⁶⁰), and inherent to the consultation/institution (for example,
238 glitches in computer systems, organization of necessary information in the health informatics
239 records, coding errors, telephone call interruptions). The time lost searching for information in
240 consultation, the friendliness of clinical informatics and the time spent on e.records are also
241 issues to be studied and thought of ^{61, 62}. Health determinants are factors to be studied in such
242 a MM population for better health and social outcomes.⁶³

243 The data analysis must be evaluated using objective validated laboratory methods
244 and, if possible, it should be a blind assessment. Statistical tests used to analyse the data
245 must be appropriate and clearly described. Measures of association, including confidence
246 intervals and the P value, must be presented.

247 The main limitation of this systematic review was the difficulty in ensuring that all the
248 relevant literature was included. Even though the research used two of the main databases –
249 Pubmed and Embase – there could be other relevant material in grey literature.

250 The scarcity of the literature that was found was a limitation for this review. The one
251 publication found, besides not directly answering our question, also does not take confounding
252 factors into account, and does not describe the calculation to determine the sample size of the
253 study. However, it does highlight the relevance of the subject matter.

254

255

256

257

258 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

259 This “impact of MM on the duration of a consultation” has hardly been studied, this
260 systematic review shows.

261 A tendency for consultations of patients with MM to take longer than those without MM
262 was found in the only one study with “satisfactory” quality which met the inclusion criteria.

263 So more research is needed to acquire more information on this subject, important to
264 deal not only with diseases but with the person suffering from MM for consultation must have
265 the adequate length duration to enable doctors and stake-holders with a proper quantification
266 of the time and associated costs.

267 If a longer consultation time is confirmed, it will be important to rethink and adapt GPs’
268 lists of patients in order to achieve better medical care providing agendas with specific times
269 and allocating enough time for all the required tasks.

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281 **6. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

282 MM – Multimorbidity

283 GP – General Practitioner

284 PRISMA – Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analyses

285 HS – Health Service

286 WHO – World Health Organization

287

288 **7.DECLARATIONS:**

289 Ethics approval and consent to participate – Not applicable

290 Consent for publication – Not applicable

291

292 Availability of data and materials – Materials can be assessed upon request

293

294

295 Financial and non-financial competing interests:

296 No author states financial and non-financial competing interests for this work.

297 .

298

299 Authors' contributions

300 ACRT: Data extraction, data examination, treatment of data, writting of manuscript and its
301 scientific cticism as well as aproval.

302 IRCSC: Data extraction, data examination, treatment of data, writting of manuscript and its
303 scientific cticism as well as aproval.

304 Inês Jorge de Figueiredo: Sata examination, treatment of data, writting of manuscript and its
305 scientific cticism as well as aproval.

306 Luiz Miguel Santiago: Scientific review of the article.

307 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

308

309 Acknowledgements –

310 Helena Donato, MD for her valuable contribution in the literature search.

311

312 Group authorship: Not aplicable

313

314

315 Authors' information

316 Ana Carolina Reis Tadeu,¹

317 Inês Rosendo Carvalho e Silva Caetano,¹

318 Inês Jorge de Figueiredo³

319 Luiz Miguel Santiago⁴

320 1 – MD

321 2 – MD, PhD. GP/FD

322 3 – MD, PhD student; GP/FD

323 4 – MD, PhD, Associate Professor with Agregation; Senior consultant GP/FD

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340 **7. REFERENCES**

341 1. Le Reste JY, Nabbe P, Manceau B, Lygidakis C, Doerr C, Lingner H, et al. The
342 European General Practice Research Network presents a comprehensive definition of
343 multimorbidity in family medicine and long term care, following a systematic review of relevant
344 literature. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2013;14(5):319-25.

345 2. Violan C, Foguet-Boreu Q, Flores-Mateo G, Salisbury C, Blom J, Freitag M, et al.
346 Prevalence, determinants and patterns of multimorbidity in primary care: a systematic review
347 of observational studies. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(7):e102149.

348 3. Glynn LG, Valderas JM, Healy P, Burke E, Newell J, Gillespie P, et al. The prevalence
349 of multimorbidity in primary care and its effect on health care utilization and cost. *Fam Pract.*
350 2011;28(5):516-23.

351 4. Moffat K, Mercer SW. Challenges of managing people with multimorbidity in today's
352 healthcare systems. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2015;16:129.

353 5. Azais B, Bowis J, Wismar M. Facing the challenge of multimorbidity. *J Comorb.*
354 2016;6(1):1-3.

355 6. Navickas R, Petric VK, Feigl AB, Seychell M. Multimorbidity: What do we know? What
356 should we do? *J Comorb.* 2016;6(1):4-11.

357 7. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World*
358 *Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision, Key Findings and Advance Tables.* 2017. p. 11.

- 359 8. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World*
360 *Population Ageing 2015*. 2015. p. 9.
- 361 9. Prazeres F, Santiago L. The Knowledge, Awareness, and Practices of Portuguese
362 General Practitioners Regarding Multimorbidity and its Management: Qualitative Perspectives
363 from Open-Ended Questions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2016;13(11).
- 364 10. World Health Organization. Innovative care for chronic conditions: building blocks for
365 action. Global report. World Health Organization, 2002.
- 366 11. Lo CK, Mertz D, Loeb M. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale: comparing reviewers' to authors'
367 assessments. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2014,14:45.
- 368
- 369 12. Gunturi N, Gunturi N, Gennari A, Bartels K. Patient-centered Goals of Care: Using the
370 Chronic Care Management (CCM) Code Towards Cooperative Goal Setting in the Multimorbid
371 Elderly. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*. 2018;19(3).
- 372 13. Johnson TL, Kaldor J, Falster MO, Sutherland K, Humphries J, Jorm LR, et al.
373 Predictive risk modelling under different data access scenarios: who is identified as high risk
374 and for how long? *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(2).
- 375 14. Kangovi S, Carter T, Charles D, Smith RA, Glanz K, Long JA, et al. Toward A Scalable,
376 Patient-Centered Community Health Worker Model: Adapting the IMPaCT Intervention for Use
377 in the Outpatient Setting. *Popul Health Manag*. 2016;19(6):380-8.
- 378 15. Mann EG, Johnson A, VanDenKerkhof EG. Frequency and characteristics of
379 healthcare visits associated with chronic pain: results from a population-based Canadian
380 study. *Can J Anaesth*. 2016;63(4):411-41.

- 381 16. Palmer K, Onder G. Comprehensive geriatric assessment: Benefits and limitations.
382 Eur J Intern Med. 2018;54:e8-e9.
- 383 17. Rosbach M, Andersen JS. Patient-experienced burden of treatment in patients with
384 multimorbidity - A systematic review of qualitative data. PLoS One. 2017;12(6):e0179916.
- 385 18. Salisbury C, Johnson L, Purdy S, Valderas JM, Montgomery AA. Epidemiology and
386 impact of multimorbidity in primary care: a retrospective cohort study. Br J Gen Pract.
387 2011;61(582):e12-21.
- 388 19. Sampalli T, Desy M, Dhir M, Edwards L, Dickson R, Blackmore G. Improving wait times
389 to care for individuals with multimorbidities and complex conditions using value stream
390 mapping. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2015;4(7):459-66.
- 391 20. Smith SM, Soubhi H, Fortin M, Hudon C, O'Dowd T. Managing patients with
392 multimorbidity: systematic review of interventions in primary care and community settings.
393 BMJ. 2012;345:e5205.
- 394 21. Stokes T, Tumilty E, Doolan-Noble F, Gauld R. Multimorbidity, clinical decision making
395 and health care delivery in New Zealand Primary care: a qualitative study. BMC Fam Pract.
396 2017;18(1):51.
- 397 22. Tetzlaff J, Junius-Walker U, Muschik D, Epping J, Eberhard S, Geyer S. Identifying
398 time trends in multimorbidity—defining multimorbidity in times of changing diagnostic
399 practices. Journal of Public Health. 2016;25(2):215-22.
- 400 23. Tinetti ME, Naik AD, Dodson JA. Moving From Disease-Centered to Patient Goals-
401 Directed Care for Patients With Multiple Chronic Conditions: Patient Value-Based Care. JAMA
402 Cardiol. 2016;1(1):9-10.

- 403 24. Wong ES, Rosland AM, Fihn SD, Nelson KM. Patient-Centered Medical Home
404 Implementation in the Veterans Health Administration and Primary Care Use: Differences by
405 Patient Comorbidity Burden. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2016;31(12):1467-74.
- 406 25. European General Practice Research Network (EGPRN) Abstracts from the EGPRN
407 meeting in Leipzig, Germany, 12-16 October 2016. Theme: 'General practice/family medicine
408 in a changing world'. *Eur J Gen Pract.* 2017;23(1):143-54.
- 409 26. Abraham-Kaba A, Stopol C. Survivorship Continuum: Implications for Patient-
410 Centered Programming. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology.* 2016; 34(1-2):125-27.
- 411 27. *Annals of Long-Term Care: Clinical Care and Aging.* 2016;24(4):17-20.
- 412 28. Blomgreen J, Ekman A, Nygaard H, Demény AK, Wejse MR, Pressel E. Geriatric
413 assessment at the Acute Medical Unit: Improving the outcome. *European Geriatric*
414 *Medicine.* 2017; 8(1): s153.
- 415 29. Scheiner SR, Olson JM, Velner J. Collaborative drug therapy management in a
416 skilled nursing facility to improve transitions of care in older adults. *Pharmacotherapy.*
417 2017; 37(12): e221-e222.
- 418 30. Osborn R, Moulds D, Schneider EC, Doty MM, Squires D, Sarnak DO. Primary Care
419 Physicians In Ten Countries Report Challenges Caring For Patients With Complex Health
420 Needs. *Health Affairs.* 2015; 34(12): 2104–2112.
- 421 31. Bower P. Better management of multimorbidity: a critical look at the 'Ariadne principles'.
422 *BMC Medicine.* 2014; 12:222.
- 423 32. Cassil A. Innovations in preventing and managing chronic conditions: what's working
424 in the real world?. *Issue brief.* 2010; 132: 1-4.

- 425 33. Porter I, Valderas JM. Development of a feedback form for routine clinical use of
426 PROs in primary care for patients with multimorbidity. *Quality of Life Research*. 2015; 24(1):
427 181-182.
- 428 34. Ehman KM, Deyo-Svendsen M, Merten Z, Kramlinger AM., Garrison G.M. How
429 Preferences for Continuity and Access Differ Between Multimorbidity and Healthy Patients
430 in a Team Care Setting. *Journal of primary care & community health*. 2017; 8(4): 319-323.
- 431 35. Vasquez AH, Patel N, Tripathy C, Jaen C. Optimizing virtual care to improve access and
432 quality of care. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2018; 66 (2): 109.
- 433 36. Fisher K, Griffith L, Gruneir A, Panjwani D, Gandhi S, Sheng LL, et al. Comorbidity and
434 its relationship with health service use and cost in community-living older adults with diabetes:
435 A population-based study in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2016;122:113-23.
- 436 37. Hien H, Ouedraogo M, Berthe A, Konate B, Toe N, Drabo MK, et al. [Patient
437 complaints: an opportunity to improve the quality of care of older people with multimorbidity in
438 Burkina Faso]. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2017;28:140.
- 439 38. Junius-Walker U, Voigt I, Wrede J, Hummers-Pradier E, Lazic D, Dierks ML. Health
440 and treatment priorities in patients with multimorbidity: report on a workshop from the
441 European General Practice Network meeting 'Research on multimorbidity in general practice'.
442 *Eur J Gen Pract*. 2010;16(1):51-4.
- 443 39. Kadam UT, Croft PR, North Staffordshire GPCG. Clinical multimorbidity and physical
444 function in older adults: a record and health status linkage study in general practice. *Fam*
445 *Pract*. 2007;24(5):412-9.
- 446 40. Strauss VY, Jones PW, Kadam UT, Jordan KP. Distinct trajectories of multimorbidity
447 in primary care were identified using latent class growth analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
448 2014;67(10):1163-71.

- 449 41. van Dongen JJ, Lenzen SA, van Bokhoven MA, Daniels R, van der Weijden T,
450 Beurskens A. Interprofessional collaboration regarding patients' care plans in primary care: a
451 focus group study into influential factors. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2016;17:58.
- 452 42. Johnson TL, Kaldor J, Falster MO, Sutherland K, Humphries J, Jorm LR, et al.
453 Predictive risk modelling under different data access scenarios: who is identified as high risk
454 and for how long? *BMJ Open.* 2018;8(2).
- 455 43. Lam CLK, Calvert MJ, Valderas JM, Wee HL, Gibbons C. Routine applications of
456 patient reported outcomes (PROs) in primary care: Identifying and overcoming the
457 challenges. *Quality of Life Research.* 2016; 25(1): 9.
- 458 44. Potter C, Hunter C, Kelly L, Gibbons E, Forder J, Coulter A, Fitzpatrick R, Peters M.
459 PROs for personalized care: Patient perspectives on potential use of the long-term
460 conditions questionnaire (LTCQ) in clinical practice. *Quality of Life Research.* 2016; 25(1):
461 196.
- 462 45. Jowsey T, McRae IS, Valderas JM, Dugdale P, Phillips R, Bunton R, et al. Time's up.
463 descriptive epidemiology of multi-morbidity and time spent on health related activity by older
464 Australians: a time use survey. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(4): e59379.
- 465 46. Deruaz-Luyet A, N'Goran AA, Tandjung R, Frey P, Zeller A, Haller DM, et al.
466 Multimorbidity in primary care: protocol of a national cross-sectional study in Switzerland. *BMJ*
467 *Open.* 2015;5(10):e009165.
- 468 47. Oliver D. David Oliver: A manifesto for multimorbidity. *BMJ.* 2018;360:k1044.
- 469 48. Feather A. Managing patients with multimorbidity. *Medicine.* 2018;46(7):397-401.
- 470 49. Kadam U. Redesigning the general practice consultation to improve care for patients
471 with multimorbidity. *BMJ.* 2012;345:e6202.

- 472 50. Wise J. Patients with multimorbidity need longer GP consultations, says RCGP. *BMJ*.
473 2016;355:i5961.
- 474 51. Loeb DF, Bayliss EA, Candrian C, De Gruy FV, Binswanger IA. Treating complex
475 patients in primary care: Physician offer a new view of competing demands. *Journal of*
476 *General Internal Medicine*. 2013; 28(1): S224-S225.
- 477 52. Bower P, Macdonald W, Harkness E, Gask L, Kendrick T, Valderas JM, et al.
478 Multimorbidity, service organization and clinical decision making in primary care: a qualitative
479 study. *Fam Pract*. 2011;28(5):579-87.
- 480 53. Irving G, Neves AL, Dambha-Miller H, Oishi A, Tagashira H, Verho A, et al.
481 International variations in primary care physician consultation time: a systematic review of 67
482 countries. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(10):e017902.
- 483 54. O'Malley AS, Sarwar R, Keith R, Balke P, Ma S, McCall N. Provider Experiences with
484 Chronic Care Management (CCM) Services and Fees: A Qualitative Research Study. *J Gen*
485 *Intern Med*. 2017;32(12):1294-300.
- 486 55. Klement A, Oemler M, Wienke A, Richter M, Wolfradt U. [(Expected) Consultation
487 length, mental (co-)morbidity and patient satisfaction in the family practice encounter]. *Z Evid*
488 *Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes*. 2015;109(8):560-9.
- 489 56. Mühlhäuser U, Götz K, Weinmayr L-M, Steinhäuser J. DEGAM-guidelines
490 "multimorbidity" – a field test. *Zeitschrift für Allgemeinmedizin*. 2018; 94(2): 64-69.
- 491 57. Gruneir A, Dhalla IA, van Walraven C, Fischer HD, Camacho X, Rochon PA, et al.
492 Unplanned readmissions after hospital discharge among patients identified as being at high
493 risk for readmission using a validated predictive algorithm. *Open Medicine*. 2011; 5(2): E104-
494 E111.

- 495 58. Moth G, Vestergaard M, Vedsted P. Chronic care management in Danish general
496 practice--a cross-sectional study of workload and multimorbidity. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2012;13:52.
- 497 59. Pringle M, Stewart-Evans C. Does awareness of being video recorded affect doctors'
498 consultation behaviour?. *British Journal of General Practice.* 1990;40:455–458.
- 499 60. Holden JD. Hawthorne effects and research into professional practice. *Journal of*
500 *Evaluation in Clinical Practice.* 2001;7:65–70.
- 501 61. [https://ecamfic.wordpress.com/2018/10/21/documento-de-posicionamiento-sobre-el-](https://ecamfic.wordpress.com/2018/10/21/documento-de-posicionamiento-sobre-el-hiperregistro-registritis-en-el-encuentro-clinico-profesional-paciente-en-la-atencion-primaria-ap/)
502 [hiperregistro-registritis-en-el-encuentro-clinico-profesional-paciente-en-la-atencion-primaria-](https://ecamfic.wordpress.com/2018/10/21/documento-de-posicionamiento-sobre-el-hiperregistro-registritis-en-el-encuentro-clinico-profesional-paciente-en-la-atencion-primaria-ap/)
503 [ap/](https://ecamfic.wordpress.com/2018/10/21/documento-de-posicionamiento-sobre-el-hiperregistro-registritis-en-el-encuentro-clinico-profesional-paciente-en-la-atencion-primaria-ap/) [assessed the 11th September 2019]
- 504 62. Laranjo L, Dunn AG, Tong HL, Kocaballi AB, Chen J, Bashir R, et al. Conversational
505 agents in healthcare: a systematic review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics*
506 *Association,* 25(9), 2018, 1248–1258. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocy072
- 507
- 508 63. Veja PB, Losi S, Martinez LS, Bovell-Ammon A, Garg A, James T, et al. Implementing an
509 EHR-based Screening and Referral System to Address Social Determinants of Health in
510 Primary Care. *Med Care* 2019;57: S133–S139