A Practical Framework for Understanding and Reducing Medical Overuse: Conceptualizing Overuse Through the Patient-Clinician Interaction
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Overuse of medical services is an increasingly recognized driver of poor-quality care and high cost. A practical framework is needed to guide clinical decisions and facilitate concrete actions that can reduce overuse and improve care. We used an iterative, expert-informed, evidence-based process to develop a framework for conceptualizing interventions to reduce medical overuse. Given the complexity of defining and identifying overused care in nuanced clinical situations and the need to define care appropriateness in the context of an individual patient, this framework conceptualizes the patient–clinician interaction as the nexus of decisions regarding inappropriate care. This interaction is influenced by other utilization drivers, including healthcare system factors, the practice environment, the culture of professional medicine, the culture of healthcare consumption, and individual patient and clinician factors. The variable strength of the evidence supporting these domains highlights important areas for further investigation. Journal of Hospital Medicine 2017;12:346-351. © 2017 Society of Hospital Medicine

Medical services overuse is the provision of healthcare services for which there is no medical basis or for which harms equal or exceed benefits.1 This overuse drives poor-quality care and unnecessary cost.2,3 The high prevalence of overuse is recognized by patients,4 clinicians,5 and policymakers.6 Initiatives to reduce overuse have targeted physicians,7 the public,8 and medical educators9,10 but have had limited impact.11,12 Few studies have addressed methods for reducing overuse, and de-implementation of nonbeneficial practices has proved challenging.1,13,14 Models for reducing overuse are only theoretical15 or are focused on administrative decisions.16,17 We think a practical framework is needed. We used an iterative process, informed by expert opinion and discussion, to design such a framework.

METHODS
The authors, who have expertise in overuse, value, medical education, evidence-based medicine, and implementation science, reviewed related conceptual frameworks15 and evidence regarding drivers of overuse. We organized these drivers into domains to create a draft framework, which we presented at Preventing Overdiagnosis 2015, a meeting of clinicians, patients, and policymakers interested in overuse. We incorporated feedback from meeting attendees to modify framework domains, and we performed structured searches (using key words in Pubmed) to explore, and estimate the strength of, evidence supporting items within each domain. We rated supporting evidence as strong (studies found a clear correlation between a factor and overuse), moderate (evidence suggests such a correlation or demonstrates a correlation between a particular factor and utilization but not overuse per se), weak (only indirect evidence exists), or absent (no studies identified evaluating a particular factor). All authors reached consensus on ratings.

Framework Principles and Evidence
Patient-centered definition of overuse. During framework development, defining clinical appropriateness emerged as the primary challenge to identifying and reducing overuse. Although some care generally is appropriate based on strong evidence of benefit, and some is inappropriate given a clear lack of benefit or harm, much care is of unclear or variable benefit. Practice guidelines can help identify overuse, but their utility may be limited by lack of evidence in specific clinical situations,19 and their recommendations may apply poorly to an individual patient. This presents challenges to using guidelines to identify and reduce overuse.

Despite limitations, the scope of overuse has been estimated by applying broad, often guideline-based, criteria for care appropriateness to administrative data.20 Unfortunately, these estimates provide little direction to clinicians and patients partnering to make usage decisions. During framework development, we identified the importance of a patient-level, patient-specific definition of overuse. This approach reinforces the importance of meeting patient needs while standardizing treatments to reduce overuse. A patient-centered approach may also assist professional societies and advocacy groups in developing actionable campaigns and may uncover evidence gaps.

Centrality of patient-clinician interaction. During framework development, the patient–clinician interaction emerged as
the nexus through which drivers of overuse exert influence. The centrality of this interaction has been demonstrated in studies of the relationship between care continuity and overuse21 or utilization,22,23 by evidence that communication and patient–clinician relationships affect utilization,24 and by the observation that clinician training in shared decision-making reduces overuse.25 A patient-centered framework assumes that, at least in the weighing of clinically reasonable options, a patient-centered approach optimizes outcomes for that patient.

Incorporating drivers of overuse. We incorporated drivers of overuse into domains and related them to the patient–clinician interaction.26 Domains included the culture of healthcare consumption, patient factors and experiences, the practice environment, the culture of professional medicine, and clinician attitudes and beliefs.

We characterized the evidence illustrating how drivers within each domain influence healthcare use. The evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Specific Impact</th>
<th>Likely Magnitude of Effect on Overuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture of healthcare consumption</td>
<td>Consumerism and advocating for one’s own health</td>
<td>Strength: weak</td>
<td>Likely leads to more general utilization, overuse, and use of costlier alternatives</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information found on the internet and through the media</td>
<td>None related to specific factors. Evidence related:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General expectations about the appropriate amount and type of care</td>
<td>Variations in care22,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief that you get what you pay for</td>
<td>General enthusiasm for screening26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient factors and experiences</td>
<td>Prior healthcare experiences (patient and family)</td>
<td>Strength: weak to strong</td>
<td>Variable; can contribute to overuse or protect against overuse</td>
<td>Moderate Interventions related to with patient demographics not defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic factors and education</td>
<td>Evidence related to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health literacy and numeracy</td>
<td>Impact of race/ethnicity on overuse and underuse27,28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient interactions with health center staff</td>
<td>Patient expectations24,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patient interactions with other clinicians</td>
<td>Patient desire for investigation and answers27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of professional medicine</td>
<td>Influence of broad regulations and metrics</td>
<td>Strength: absent to moderate</td>
<td>Overuse performance measures can limit overuse but measures for preventing underuse may lead to overuse</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value placed on finding answers, certainty</td>
<td>No evidence exploring role of most individual factors</td>
<td>Emphasis on certainty, technology and active intervention likely contribute to overuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value placed on doing things</td>
<td>Evidence related to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discomfort with discussing/admitting diagnostic uncertainty to others</td>
<td>Association between local culture and overuse22,24 (moderate evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(strong vs. weak)</td>
<td>Physician factors and geographic variations24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of missing diagnoses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New high tech solutions more valued and reimbursed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician attitudes and beliefs</td>
<td>Personality and personal biases</td>
<td>Strength: weak</td>
<td>Traditionally mostly push toward more care</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor numeracy and knowledge of evidence</td>
<td>Evidence related to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past experiences with other patients with the same condition</td>
<td>Physician beliefs and geographic variations24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of and attitudes toward particular patient</td>
<td>Variation in utilization based on specific physician characteristics26,28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of litigation (defensive medicine)</td>
<td>Self-reported drivers of physician overuse26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinician–clinician interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinician–staff interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comfort with discussing cost or other issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discomfort with diagnostic uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice environment</td>
<td>Financial incentives</td>
<td>Strength: weak</td>
<td>Local cultural norms are influential (including local training culture)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice norms within the group and expectations from the affiliated health system</td>
<td>Practice norms not well studied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures which influence specific practices</td>
<td>Evidence related to:</td>
<td>Other factors vary based on specifics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of lawsuits</td>
<td>Local cultural norms and aggressive care26,27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance metrics may encourage overuse</td>
<td>Residency training and utilization26,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial incentives26 (weak evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General influence of practice setting26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality metrics may encourage too much care and overuse26,27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The patient–clinician interaction</td>
<td>Specific communication styles</td>
<td>Strength: moderate for shared decision making, continuity, weak for other factors</td>
<td>Continuity of care likely reduces overuse</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordance of culture, race, language, and gender</td>
<td>Evidence related to:</td>
<td>Shared decision making likely reduces overuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior experiences with each other</td>
<td>Continuity of care and overuse26</td>
<td>Unclear impact of culture and language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit priorities</td>
<td>Continuity of care and utilization26,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared decision making and overuse26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for each domain is listed in Table 1.

RESULTS
The final framework is shown in the Figure. Within the healthcare system, patients are influenced by the culture of healthcare consumption, which varies within and among countries. Clinicians are influenced by the culture of medical care, which varies by practice setting, and by their training environment. Both clinicians and patients are influenced by the practice environment and by personal experiences. Ultimately, clinical decisions occur within the specific patient–clinician interaction. Table 1 lists each domain’s components, likely impact on overuse, and estimated strength of supporting evidence. Interventions can be conceptualized within appropriate domains or through the interaction between patient and clinician.

DISCUSSION
We developed a novel and practical conceptual framework for characterizing drivers of overuse and potential intervention points. To our knowledge, this is the first framework incorporating a patient-specific approach to overuse and emphasizing the patient–clinician interaction. Key strengths of framework development are inclusion of a range of perspectives and characterization of the evidence within each domain. Limitations include lack of a formal systematic review and broad, qualitative assessments of evidence strength. However, we believe this framework provides an important conceptual foundation for the study of overuse and interventions to reduce overuse.

Framework Applications
This framework, which highlights the many drivers of overuse, can facilitate understanding of overuse and help conceptualize change, prioritize research goals, and inform specific interventions. For policymakers, the framework can inform efforts to reduce overuse by emphasizing the need for complex interventions and by clarifying the likely impact of interventions targeting specific domains. Similarly, for clinicians and quality improvement professionals, the framework can ground root cause analyses of overuse-related problems and inform allocation of limited resources. Finally, the relatively weak evidence on the role of most acknowledged drivers of overuse suggests an important research agenda. Specifically, several pressing needs have been identified: defining relevant physician and patient cultural factors, investigating interventions to impact culture, defining practice environment features that optimize care appropriateness, and describing specific patient–clinician interaction practices that minimize overuse while providing needed care.

Targeting Interventions
Domains within the framework are influenced by different types of interventions, and different stakeholders may target different domains. For example:

• The culture of healthcare consumption may be influenced through public education (eg, Choosing Wisely® patient resources) and public health campaigns.

• The practice environment may be influenced by initiatives to align clinician incentives, team care, electronic health record interventions, and improved access.

• Clinician attitudes and beliefs may be influenced by audit and feedback, reflection, role modeling, and education.

• Patient attitudes and beliefs may be influenced by education, access to price and quality information, and increased engagement in care.

• For clinicians, the patient–clinician interaction can be improved through training in communication and shared decision-making, through access to information (eg, costs) that can be easily shared with patients, and through novel visit structures (eg, scribes).

• On the patient side, this interaction can be optimized with improved access (eg, through telemedicine) or with patient empowerment during hospitalization.

• The culture of medicine is difficult to influence. Change likely will occur through:
  ○ Regulatory interventions (eg, Transforming Clinical Practice Initiative of Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation).
TABLE 2. Using the Framework for Real-Life Examples of Overuse to Identify Practical Ways in Which Overuse Can Be Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of overuse</th>
<th>Possible Drivers/Domains</th>
<th>Feasible Approaches to Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A hospitalist on a general medical service wants to reduce use of routine lab testing</td>
<td>Culture of health care: expectation of all clinicians (including attendings, consultants, nursing) for daily lab testing. Clinician factors: belief that more is better, poor knowledge of evidence. Practice environment: ease of daily ordering in the EMR. Patient factors: expectation for frequent testing (likely a minor factor)</td>
<td>Culture: broad campaign across the medical center. Clinician: education about evidence/guidelines[43-44]. Practice environment: EMR alert[45].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A palliative care fellow seeks to reduce imaging tests in EOL hospitalized patients</td>
<td>Culture of healthcare: need to define clinical problems even if there is no intervention, discomfort with doing nothing. Clinician factors: belief that more information helps patients, belief that patients desire testing. Patient factors: poor knowledge or accepting of prognosis. Patient-clinician interaction: poor communication regarding prognosis and EOL preferences.</td>
<td>Clinician factors: education about harms of testing in these patients. Patient-clinician interaction: specific tools to improve communication about EOL preferences[43-45].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Abbreviations: EMR, electronic medical record; EOL, end of life.

- Educational initiatives (eg, high-value care curricula of Alliance for Academic Internal Medicine/American College of Physicians[53]).
- Professional organizations (eg, Choosing Wisely[6]).

As organizations implement quality improvement initiatives to reduce overuse of services, the framework can be used to target interventions to relevant domains. For example, a hospital leader who wants to reduce opioid prescribing may use the framework to identify the factors that encourage prescribing in each domain—poor understanding of pain treatment (a clinician factor), desire for early discharge encouraging overly aggressive pain management (an environmental factor), patient demand for opioids combined with poor understanding of harms (patient factors), and poor communication regarding pain (a patient–clinician interaction factor). Although not all relevant factors can be addressed, their classification by domain facilitates intervention, in this case perhaps leading to a focus on clinician and patient education on opioids and development of a practical communication tool that targets 3 domains. Table 2 lists ways in which the framework informs approaches to this and other overused services in the hospital setting. Note that some drivers can be acknowledged without identifying targeted interventions.

Moving Forward

Through a multi-stakeholder iterative process, we developed a practical framework for understanding medical overuse and interventions to reduce it. Centered on the patient–clinician interaction, this framework explains overuse as the product of medical and patient culture, the practice environment and incentives, and other clinician and patient factors. Ultimately, care is implemented during the patient–clinician interaction, though few interventions to reduce overuse have focused on that domain.

Conceptualizing overuse through the patient–clinician interaction maintains focus on patients while promoting population health that is both better and lower in cost. This framework can guide interventions to reduce overuse in important parts of the healthcare system while ensuring the final goal of high-quality individualized patient care.
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