A comparative case study of two models of a clinical informaticist service

Trisha Greenhalgh, Jane Hughes, Charlotte Humphrey, Stephen Rogers, Deborah Swinglehurst and Peter Martin

BMJ 2002;324:524-529
doi:10.1136/bmj.324.7336.524

Updated information and services can be found at:
http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7336/524

These include:

Data supplement
"Further details of the study"
http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7336/524/DC1

References
This article cites 18 articles, 9 of which can be accessed free at:
http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7336/524#BIBL

3 online articles that cite this article can be accessed at:
http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7336/524#otherarticles

Rapid responses
2 rapid responses have been posted to this article, which you can access for free at:
http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/324/7336/524#responses

You can respond to this article at:
http://bmj.com/cgi/eletter-submit/324/7336/524

Email alerting service
Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article

Topic collections
Articles on similar topics can be found in the following collections

Other Medical Informatics (284 articles)
Information in Practice (journal section) (108 articles)

Notes

To order reprints of this article go to:
http://www.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprintform

To subscribe to BMJ go to:
http://bmj.bmjournals.com/subscriptions/subscribe.shtml
A comparative case study of two models of a clinical informaticist service

Trisha Greenhalgh, Jane Hughes, Charlotte Humphrey, Stephen Rogers, Deborah Swinglehurst, Peter Martin

Abstract

Objectives To describe and evaluate two different models of a clinical informaticist service.

Design A case study approach, using various qualitative methods to illuminate the complexity of the project groups' experiences.

Setting UK primary health care.

Interventions Two informaticist projects to provide evidence based answers to questions arising in clinical practice and thereby support high quality clinical decision making by practitioners.

Results The projects took contrasting and complementary approaches to establishing the service. One was based in an academic department of primary health care. The service was academically highly rigorous, remained true to its original proposal, included a prominent research component, and involved relatively little personal contact with practitioners. This group achieved the aim of providing general information and detailed guidance to others intending to set up a similar service. The other group was based in a service general practice and took a much more pragmatic, flexible, and facilitative approach. They achieved the aim of acquiring all the requisite skills themselves. A study in British general practice found that the commonest reason cited for not practising evidence based health care was lack of time, followed by "personal and organisational inertia." Acknowledging that this resonated with their own experience, Guyatt and colleagues recently formally withdrew their call that all practitioners should become fully competent in evidence based medicine, and others have called for the development of pragmatic, as well as systematic, approaches to supporting best practice.

Conclusion An informaticist service should be judged on at least two aspects of quality—an academic dimension (the technical quality of the evidence based answers) and a service dimension (the facilitation of questioning behaviour and implementation). This study suggests that, while the former may be best achieved within an academic environment, the latter requires a developmental approach in which pragmatic service considerations are addressed.

Introduction

Evidence based health care involves deriving focused questions from clinical problems, searching and appraising the evidence, and applying new knowledge in the clinical context. But, although most clinicians support the notion of evidence based health care in principle and wish to use evidence based information generated by others, only a tiny fraction seek to acquire all the requisite skills themselves. A study in British general practice found that the commonest reason cited for not practising evidence based health care was lack of time, followed by "personal and organisational inertia." Acknowledging that this resonated with their own experience, Guyatt and colleagues recently formally withdrew their call that all practitioners should become fully competent in evidence based medicine, and others have called for the development of pragmatic, as well as systematic, approaches to supporting best practice.

One such pragmatic approach might be to provide an informaticist service, in which a specialist individual (informaticist) or group could assist general practitioners, nurses, and other health professionals to answer questions arising in day to day practice (see fig 1). Preliminary research from the United States suggests that such services are effective and cost effective in improving practice in the hospital setting. However, despite similar theoretical benefits in primary care, the feasibility, acceptability, and impact on patient outcomes is yet to be demonstrated in this setting. This paper describes and contrasts two projects to establish an informaticist service for primary care staff.
Background and methods

The projects

The projects were funded for two years from 1998 by North Thames Regional Office R & D Implementation Group. They were part of a programme of five projects exploring different ways of getting evidence into practice in primary care, which was evaluated by the Research into Practice in Primary Care in London Evaluation (RiPPLE) group at University College London. The RiPPLE group supported the projects’ own evaluative activities and carried out a qualitative evaluation of the programme as a whole, with the aim of understanding more about the processes involved in changing clinical practice in primary care.

The brief for the two projects reported here was to test the value of a clinical informaticist, whose role would be “to find, critically appraise, and summarise evidence to inform clinical decision making.” Two groups were funded—one based in a university department of primary care, at Imperial College London, with various local stakeholders having signed their support, and one based in the new town of Basildon, Essex, led by a general practitioner who had retired from clinical practice but was still active in education, research, and development locally and in collaboration with the community healthcare trust and the health authority. In both cases, participants (that is, those invited to send questions to the service) were general practitioners, practice nurses, and nurse practitioners based in practices that had joined the study.

Evaluation methods

The RiPPLE team adopted a holistic approach, using multiple methods. The role of the researcher in this approach has been described as that of a “bricoleur” or jack of all trades, who deploys whatever strategies, methods, or empirical materials are at hand in a pragmatic and self-reflexive manner in order to secure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question from as many angles as possible. Data collection involved documentary analysis, observation of participants and non-participants, and semistructured interviews. We had access to all minutes, reports, and other relevant documents generated by the projects. We participated in all steering group and other ad hoc meetings for both projects. At various stages over the two year funded period, we interviewed staff on both projects and local primary care practitioners receiving the informaticist services. (See box A on bmj.com for further details of methods used and analysis of data.)

Results

Aims and objectives

The original proposal from the Imperial College group gave 12 objectives (the main ones are listed in box B on bmj.com), all with a research or academic focus—that is, the project explicitly aimed to use rigorous methods to generate descriptive and evaluative data that would inform the design of informaticist services more generally. The Basildon project effectively limited its aims to setting up the service locally, seeing if it worked, and helping practice and community staff implement the answers to questions.

The informaticist’s role

For the Imperial College group, the role of the informaticist was to provide answers from the clinical research literature to questions submitted by post or fax by primary care staff. The goal of the project was to achieve technical excellence and rapid turnaround for this service; to address specific research questions such as whether the service changed clinicians’ knowledge of, or attitudes to, evidence based health care; and to document which resources were used in answering the questions. The expected standard of work was to provide rigorously researched answers to all questions submitted, even if that meant waiting for obscure references and appraising lengthy papers. Personal visits by project team workers were offered when practices enrolled in the project. The box gives details of the methods used by the project teams.

In contrast, the Basildon group wanted their informaticist to “identify the important questions in primary care” by talking to general practitioners generally about their problems, and to offer information and help that had a bearing on these. They called their project worker a “facilitator,” as they thought clinicians would not understand the term informaticist. His training included presentation skills as well as searching and critical appraisal. From the outset, he was expected to make face to face contact with clinicians to explain the service, elicit questions, and feed back information (ensuring that the client had got what he or she wanted). The Basildon facilitator worked to an explicit policy of using trusted secondary sources for most questions and not spending large amounts of time selecting or appraising primary sources. Quality control was provided by the project leader, who closely supervised his work.

Establishing local links

Both projects were meant in principle to become locally embedded. At the time bids were submitted, it was felt that this would involve working with newly emerging primary care groups and linking in with local developments in research and postgraduate education. Both groups found this more difficult than anticipated. They had assumed, for example, that the informaticist post would be filled by a local general practitioner, but, in the absence of suitable local applicants, both posts were filled from outside the area.

Both groups adopted a strategy of starting with a small group of innovators and building on local enthusiasm. The idea for the Imperial College project grew out of a research club that had been started for local general practitioners two years previously; one member had shown enthusiasm for the suggested informaticist service and offered two health centres as pilot practices. These were believed to have good practice information systems, an interest in research and clinical effectiveness, a willingness to innovate, and a culture of working together. Unfortunately, because of competing demands, the volunteer “product champion” did not deliver the anticipated contacts and commitment.

After a disappointing response from the pilot practices, the Imperial College group decided to “work with volunteers rather than conscripts,” meaning committed and reflective individuals who would spontaneously submit questions for which evidence based
Methods used by the two informaticist service projects

Imperial College project

Metaphor for the service
• “Like a laboratory test service”

Methods used to encourage questioning behaviour
• Research assistant “reminded” participants. Project worker saw priority as maintaining good turnaround time for questions
• In later stages, project website (with limited access) and newsletter to raise awareness of the service

Method for dealing with questions
• Participants encouraged to submit, using fax or email, an answerable, three part clinical question (such as relating to course and outcome of disease, risk factors, efficacy of treatment, etc) plus details of how the question arose
• If question needed refining discussion was sought with questioner by telephone or fax, but this rarely occurred in practice; the reformulated question was sent with the answer
• Question was addressed via thorough search of literature and appraisal of all high quality, relevant secondary and primary sources, even if this required a lengthy wait for obscure papers
• Answer sent by fax or post on a form that included the original question and the question on which the search was based plus questionnaire to seek feedback and evaluation

Additional services offered
• Towards end of project, training offered to small cadre of local general practitioners in searching and critical appraisal by informaticist

Basildon project

Metaphor for the service
• “Friendly local facilitator”

Methods used to encourage questioning behaviour
• Personal contact seen as the key to stimulating participants to ask questions. Informaticist visited practices regularly or invited general practitioners to lunchtime meetings where examples of clinical questions asked (and answers) were presented and discussed
• Specific focus on engaging nurses, with involvement of nursing hierarchies and visits to nursing teams; this task was difficult and took time to bear fruit—eventually a nurse facilitator was recruited

Method for dealing with questions
• Participants encouraged to ask “any questions,” including clinical and organisational ones
• Questions refined through face to face dialogue
• Searches limited to mainstream, easily accessible journals and reliable secondary sources; no attempt was made to produce an exhaustive answer; philosophy was to “find out what we can and then share it”
• Answer sent to questioner by fax or post, with follow up by telephone or in person to ask if it was helpful, but this was not done systematically or evaluated formally
• Previous questions shared with other interested participants

Additional services offered
• Making information accessible (such as production and distribution of desk mat for assessing and managing cardiovascular risk)
• Aimed to provide help in applying answer in practice

Information in practice
were very protective of clinicians’ time. The project leader therefore took on the task of “fronting” the project for the first year, with much greater success. Doctors who were initially reluctant to attend lunchtime meetings often became involved in discussions and stayed for two hours or more. The group noted the importance of face to face contacts and social interaction and gave it increased priority in their dissemination strategy.

The original plan in Basildon was to engage nurses via their management hierarchy, but this was unsuccessful. A different strategy was therefore devised, which involved face to face contact with individual nurses. A district nurse attended the project steering group and became an enthusiastic convert, engaging many of her colleagues. The facilitator also spent a day accompanying one district nurse on her rounds and helping her generate questions from clinical cases.

The Basildon group’s initial aim was to orient the new service with the newly formed primary care group, but this largely failed. However, the project was sufficiently adaptable to link in with a new clinical effectiveness unit being established within the health authority. The determined work of the project leader in spreading the vision for the service led to several new applicants for the expanding facilitator post, which is now split between four local general practitioners and a nurse, each working two sessions a week in his or her locality.

**Questions and questioning**

The quantity and nature of the questions in the two projects are available as separate reports and are summarised in the table on bmj.com. Both project groups found that relatively few primary care staff spontaneously submitted questions to the service.

The Imperial College group preferred focused, single topic, “three part” questions (population-intervention-outcome or population-exposure-outcome) that could be answered from research literature. Questions not phrased in this way were reformulated before being answered. The Imperial College informaticist commented that many of the questions were relatively idiosyncratic (such as queries about vitamins or alternative remedies featured in the popular press) and not related to what she described as “the burning questions of primary care” such as how to manage diabetes or cardiovascular risk.

The Imperial College group included as part of their research the link between questioning behaviour and clinical practice. For each question submitted, they collected data via a questionnaire on how the question arose, what the practitioner would otherwise have done, and whether the answer supplied was useful, relevant, and likely to be incorporated into practice (though they did not attempt to verify this). Initially, they assumed that participants would have little interest in questions asked by others and had not considered a mechanism for sharing or disseminating questions along with their evidence based answers. The most enthusiastic of the pilot practices posted their questions and answers on a practice intranet; subsequently, the project group established a website with a question and answer library, but unfortunately, most local practices were unable to access it.

The Basildon group invited questions on any topic and welcomed questions about the organisation of care. They even took seriously a question about the effect of music in the waiting room. The project leader identified a need for tools to assess risk of coronary heart disease and, using the New Zealand guidelines, produced laminated desk mats of colour risk charts, which the facilitator distributed in person as a kind of “icebreaker” for further dialogue. This example illustrates the difference in focus: having identified an important question with the help of the project leader, the Basildon facilitator developed an aid to implementation and used his social skills and contacts to disseminate the answer (and the tool) as widely as possible.

**Evaluation and outputs**

The Imperial College group invested heavily in documenting, monitoring, and asking participants to assess the service. This enabled them to provide a detailed and valuable written report on the frequency of questioning, the turnaround time for responding, the nature of the questions asked, and the extent to which the responses were considered to have affected patient care. While they took these research responsibilities seriously, they did not view it as their key objective to ensure that the initiative continued beyond the funded project. Rather, they felt their main task was to pass on information and skills to those motivated and able to benefit from them.

In contrast, the Basildon group were, from the outset, focused on establishing a sustainable local initiative and were wary of becoming “diverted” into evaluation. The project leader felt that this would require skills not available in the group and that detailed, systematic evaluation was inappropriate in the early, “fluid” phase of the project. Instead, the project’s resources were put into promoting the repeated personal contact between the facilitator and potential participants, which they felt was the key to promoting questioning behaviour. The Basildon group’s final report to the funder was described as a “log of problems, solutions, successes and failures” and was essentially the project leader’s reflections on the experience supported by some quantitative data and examples of questions.

**Different implicit models of change**

The Imperial College group followed the conventional approach taken in evidence based medicine, viewing questioning as an individual psychological process. Clinical questions were considered to arise from a doctor’s (or nurse’s) thoughts during a consultation. Hence, this group orientated their informaticist service towards individual doctors (and nurse practitioners) rather than practices or teams.

In contrast, the Basildon initiative was predicated on a complexity approach to change. Primary health care teams were viewed as complex systems, and changes in practice were seen as the result of interplay between individual reflection, social interaction, team relations, and organisational and professional culture. The project group were conscious of their own need to grow, adapt, and respond sensitively to feedback in order to survive and integrate. They were resistant to the use of the word “project” or associated terms such as stages, phases, timetables, or boundaries. Practices, they recognised, are suspicious of time limited and
often high profile projects that appear in response to politically or academically driven funding and which create dependency before disappearing with little to show except descriptive reports.

Discussion

Estimates of the frequency of questioning in clinical practice vary considerably. One study in secondary care found about five new questions generated per patient seen. One study in primary care found one question asked for every four patients, and another found 0.5 per half day. Other studies suggest that most questions in primary care, especially those not considered urgent or easily answerable, go unanswered. Only one study has been published on community nurses’ questioning behaviour in primary care, and no firm conclusions were drawn. A small qualitative study found that practice nurses said they needed clinical trial evidence not primarily for immediate study found that practice nurses said they needed clinical trial evidence not primarily for immediate clinical decision making but in order to understand the rationale behind national or local guidelines or protocols on particular topics and, perhaps more importantly, to support their role as information providers to patients.

The published literature on informaticist services is sparse. One small Australian study ran for a month and drew 20 questions from nine general practitioners; no general conclusions about the transferability of the service could be drawn. Preliminary data from the Welsh ATTRACT study showed that a fast (6 hour turnaround) questioning service using a pragmatic search protocol and fronted by a librarian informaticist was popular and led to (or supported) changes in practice in about half the cases; the general practitioners in this study did not seem to be concerned that the informaticist was not clinically qualified. Most questions submitted from general practitioners to distant informaticist services concern the choice or dose of a drug, the cause of a symptom, or the selection of a diagnostic test. We are not aware of any studies that addressed initiatives to promote questioning behaviour or help practitioners apply the results in practice.

The Imperial College group’s approach was academically oriented—that is, their work in developing the informaticist service was systematic, focused, thorough, consistent, and rigorous. Their main intended output was a comprehensive, flexible, emergent, and based to a high degree on personal contact. Their main intended output was to provide general information and detailed guidance to others intending to set up a similar service, and they have achieved this aim. In contrast, the Basildon group’s approach was service oriented—that is, their work was locally directed, pragmatic, flexible, emergent, and based to a high degree on personal contact. Their main intended output was to provide general information and detailed guidance to others intending to set up a similar service, and they have achieved this aim. In

---

**What is already known about this topic**

Many clinicians lack the skills or time to practise evidence based health care (that is, develop focused questions, search electronic databases, evaluate research papers, and extract a “clinical bottom line”).

A potential solution is an informaticist service in which clinicians submit questions by telephone, fax, or email and receive a structured response based on a thorough search and appraisal of the relevant literature.

Preliminary descriptive studies of informaticist services suggest that some general practitioners will use them and that those who do generally find them useful.

**What this study adds**

The study described two contrasting models of an informaticist service—an academically focused project that aimed to provide a central, highly rigorous answering service (a “laboratory test for questions”) and a service focused project (“friendly local facilitator”) that aimed to engage local general practices, promote questioning behaviour, and link with other local initiatives to support evidence based care.

Both models had important strengths and notable limitations, from which general recommendations about the design of informaticist services could be drawn.

---

**Technical quality of answers**

| High | Questions mainly asked by enthusiasts | High quality answers | Implementation and dissemination may be compromised |
| Low | Few questions | Answers of unknown quality | Inconsistent implementation | Little dissemination |

**Facilitation of questioning behaviour**

| High | Questions from wide range of practitioners | High quality answers that are implemented and disseminated in practice |
| Low | Questions from wide range of practitioners | Answers academically less rigorous but are implemented and disseminated in practice |

**Fig 2** Two dimensions of a clinical informaticist service
The evidence on getting research findings into practice is diffuse and conflicting, but some consistent messages are emerging. Sustained behaviour change among clinicians occurs more readily when interventions are locally driven, multifaceted, perceived as relevant, personalised (such as through social influence and local opinion leaders), supported by high-quality evidence, delivered via interactive educational methods, and include a prompt relating to the individual patient encounter. Potentially, an informaticist service that took the best elements of both projects described here (the top right quadrant of fig 2) could combine many of these known requirements for success.

So far, the published literature has focused exclusively on describing and evaluating the academic dimension, and there is now an urgent need to address and refine the service dimension. We suggest that such initiatives should not be undertaken as conventional research projects but should take a developmental approach in which the pragmatic service considerations are given validity and voice.
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