BMJ Open Quality Patients and healthcare professionals' voice on preventable readmissions

Jordi Adamuz ⁽¹⁾, ^{1,2} David Lorente-García, ³ Maria-José Ruiz-Martínez, ⁴ Carme Nieto-Ruiz, ⁵ Maria Colomer-Plana, ⁶ Sergio Alonso-Fernández, ^{2,7} Laura de la Cueva-Ariza, ² María-Eulalia Juvé-Udina^{2,8}

INTRODUCTION

Currently, about 10% of patients required unplanned readmissions within 30 days after discharge.¹² This proportion has not changed substantially over the past several years despite intense efforts to improve the discharge process.

Although several studies³ ⁴ have been performed, including patients' and physicians' opinion on the preventability of readmissions and factors that would predict preventability, only a few studies have included nurses' opinions and the consensus with all stakeholders.⁵ We aimed to determine the patient's opinion on preventable readmission, associated factors and the extent to which patients, nurses and physicians agree on readmission preventability.

METHODS

To achieve the proposed objectives, a descriptive transversal correlational multicentre study was developed. This study was approved by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee (reference number: PR114/17). From 2 April 2017 to 18 January 2019, all patients readmitted within 30 days to 2 medical and 2 surgical departments (internal medicine, pneumology, trauma and digestive surgery) at 4 university hospitals were identified. Patients who provided written informed consent were interviewed within 72 hours of readmission. Four research nurses were trained to deliver the interviews. The patient's interview involved 23 questions⁶ about functional status at discharge, discharge process and follow-up care, including readmission preventability (online supplemental material). Two independent physicians and nurses of the research team concurrently reviewed electronic health records to identify factors contributing to potentially preventable readmissions.

Clinical and demographic patients' characteristics were also collected.

We estimated that a total sample size of 276 patients was needed for a proportion of 11% of preventable readmission,⁷ 95% confidence level and 0.04 precision and assuming 15% potentially missed cases. A logistic regression model has been used to assess the association between the patient profile and his answer to the main question of his readmission preventability. The conditions of application of the models have been validated and CIs at 95% of the estimator have been calculated whenever possible. Cohen's kappa statistic has been calculated to assess the concordance between physicians', nurses' and patients' answer to this preventability readmission question. All the analysis has been done with the statistic package R V.3.5.3 (11 March 2019) for Windows.

Patients were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting or dissemination plans of this study.

RESULTS

We assessed 805 consecutive patients for eligibility, of whom 529 were excluded refused or unavailable (314 presented haemodynamic instability, 107 were discharged early, 104 refused to participate and four had language barrier). Among 276 patients included, 44.2% were admitted to internal medicine, 13.8% pneumology, 8% trauma and 34.1% digestive surgery department, respectively. The mean age was 68 years and 65.9% were men. The median (IQR) time between discharge and readmission was 11 days (5-17 days) and the median (IQR) Charlson comorbidity index was 5 (3-6).

Ninety-six (34.8%) patients reported that their readmission was preventable, 69 (25.0%) were undecided and 111 (40.2%) reported that their readmission was not

To cite: Adamuz J, Lorente-García D, Ruiz-Martínez M-J, *et al.* Patients and healthcare professionals' voice on preventable readmissions. *BMJ Open Quality* 2021;**10**:e001344. doi:10.1136/ bmjoq-2021-001344

Additional supplemental material is published online only. To view, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi.org/10. 1136/bmjoq-2021-001344).

Received 10 January 2021 Accepted 6 June 2021



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2021. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to Dr Jordi Adamuz; jordi.adamuz@gmail.com



Table 1 Factors associated with preventable	e readmissior	IS						
	Total sample N=2	:76	Preventable ru undecided N=	eadmission or 165 (59.8%)	Non-prever N=111 (40.2	Itable readmission %)		
Factors	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No	(%)	OR (95% CI)	P value
Patient characteristic								
Male sex	182	(65.9)	107	(64.8)	75	(67.6)	1.13 (0.68–1.89)	0.64
Age, median (IQR), years	70	(60–78)	71	(61–78)	69	(59–77)	1.00 (0.98–1.02)	0.91
Education level								
None	77	(27.9)	52	(31.5)	25	(22.5)	1.37 (0.67–2.78)	0.39
Elementary education*	141	(51.1)	78	(47.3)	63	(56.8)	0.81 (0.44–1.52)	0.52
Higher education†	58	(21.0)	35	(21.2)	23	(20.7)	1.03 (0.57–1.86)	0.92
Charlson comorbidity index, median (IQR)	5.0	(3.0–6.0)	4.5	(3.0–6.8)	5.0	(3.0-6.0)	1.00 (0.93–1.11)	0.71
Length of initial hospital stay (days), median (IQR)	7.0	(4.0–11.0)	6.0	(4.0–10.0)	8.0	(5.0–12.0)	0.99 (0.97–1.02)	0.50
Admission to a medical ward	160	(58.0)	06	(54.5)	70	(63.1)	0.70 (0.43–1.15)	0.16
Admission to a surgical ward	116	(42.0)	41	(36.9)	75	(45.5)	1.42 (0.87–2.33)	0.16
Number of days between discharge and readmission, median (IQR)	11.0	(5.0–17.0)	0.0	(4.0–15.0)	14.0	(7.0–19.5)	0.95 (0.92–0.98)	0.002
Caregiver support home	23	(9.2)	12	(8.1)	12	(11.0)	0.71 (0.30–1.67)	0.71
Polypharmacy‡	178	(64.7)	104	(58.4)	74	(41.6)	0.83 (0.50–1.38)	0.47
Functional status at discharge								
Poor self-related health§	88	(31.9)	52	(31.5)	36	(32.4)	0.78 (0.41–1.46)	0.43
Fully dependent¶	60	(21.7)	37	(22.4)	23	(20.7)	1.56 (0.76–3.19)	0.23
Somewhat dependent¶	153	(55.4)	96	(58.2)	57	(51.4)	1.63 (0.90–2.95)	0.11
Independent¶	63	(22.8)	32	(19.4)	31	(27.9)	0.62 (0.35–1.09)	0.62
Discharge process								
Patient remember diagnosis	(n=272)		(n=162)		(n=110)		1.96 (1.10–3.50)	0.02
No	62	(22.8)	29	(17.9)	33	(30.0)		
Yes	210	(77.2)	133	(63.3)	22	(36.7)		
Attended ≥1 follow-up appointment	(n=276)		(n=165)		(n=111)		0.69 (0.42–1.14)	0.14
No	171	(62.0)	108	(65.5)	63	(56.8)		
Yes	105	(38.0)	57	(34.5)	48	(43.2)		
Follow-up appointment with PCP, specialist or nurse arranged or already scheduled on discharge	(n=272)		(n=164)		(n=108)		0.51 (0.30–0.84)	0.009
No	112	(41.2)	78	(47.6)	34	(31.5)		
Yes	160	(58.8)	86	(52.4)	74	(68.5)		
Had medications reviewed before discharge	(n=263)		(n=157)		(n=106)		0.32 (0.11–0.98)	0.048
No	21	(7.6)	17	(10.8)	4	(3.8)		
Yes	242	(87.7)	140	(89.2)	102	(96.2)		
Felt all concerns were addressed before discharge	(n=275)		(n=165)		(n=110)		0.30 (0.17–0.54)	<0.001
								Continued

 $\mathbf{\Omega}$

Intentional Intentional Factors intentional intentional Factors intentional intentional No issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout issue bout No issue bout issue bout issue bout	Preventable read Cotal Preventable read sample N=276 undecided N=16 Vo. (%) No. 33 (33.8) 72	dmission or	Non-preventa	ble readmission		
Total Total Condition Periodication Actors No. Yes No. No. No 93 53.3.9 24.3. Ves 182 66.2.9 33 Permember talking with physician or nurse about 182 66.2.9 33 Ves 113 75.9 76.9 78 No 36 24.3 7.4 76.9 78 No 113 75.9 7.6 78 76 No 113 7.5 7.6 7.6 78 No 113 7.5 7.6 7.6 78 No 113 7.7 7.7 7.4 7.6 No 113 7.7 7.7 7.7 7.4 No 114 7.7 7.7 7.4 7.4 No 122 122 7.7 7.4 7.4 No 122 122 7.7 7.4 7.4	Total Preventable read sample N=276 undecided N=16 Vo. (%) No. 33 (33.8) 72	dmission or	Non-preventa	ble readmission		
Action No. No. No. No 182 (6.2) 23 No 182 (6.2) 23 No 182 (6.2) 23 No 182 (6.2) 24 Permenter taking with physician or nurse about (1-24) (1-43) Permenter taking with physician or nurse about 13 (75.9) 13 Ves 13 (75.9) 14 (1-65) No 263 (7.2) 14 (1-65) No 13 (7.2) 14 (1-65) No 14 (7.2) 14 (1-65) No 14 (1-25) (1-65) (1-65) No 14 (1-25) (No. (%) No. 33 (33.8) 72	(%8.8C) C	N=111 (40.2%	(
N0 53 53 52 Yes 182 66.2) 69 Ferember talking with physician or nurse about becommodations at discharge 16 66.2) 66 No 2 2 66.2) 66 No 2 2 66.2) 66 No 11 75.6) 16 16 Ves 113 75.6) 75 16 Discharget burden unsing facility (n=275) 7 16 No 2 7 7 16 No 13 (n=25) 16 16 No 14 17 16 16 No 16 (n=25) 16 16 No 16 16 16	33 (33.8) 72	(%)	No	(%)	OR (95% CI)	P value
ψe ispace		(43.6)	21	(19.1)		
Remember taking with physician or nurse about necommendations at discharge (==249) (==149) No 36 (=249) 36 Ves 113 (=249) 36 Patent satisfied, mean (SD)* 81 (=0) 36 Discharged to skilled nursing facility (=263) 36 36 No 263 (=0) 36 36 No 132 (=25) 36 36 No 132 (=263) 36 36 No 132 (=263) 36 36 No 142 (=263) 36 36 No 162 16 16 36 No 162 16 16 36 No 16 16 16 36 No 16	(66.2) 93	(56.4)	89	(80.9)		
No 36 (242) 36 Yes 113 (75.0) 113 Patient satisfied, mean (SD)* 8.1 (75.0) 7.8 Discharged to skilled nursing facility (1-276) (75.0) 7.8 Discharged to skilled nursing facility (1-276) (1-676) (1-676) No 283 (65.3) (67.4) (1-676) Yes (1-252) (1-252) (1-676) No 13 (1-252) (1-6176) No Yes (1-254) (1-6176) No Yes (1-254) (1-6176) No Yes (1-254) (1-6176) No Yes (1-264) (1-6167) No Yes (1-264) (1-264) No Yes	n=249) (n=149)		(n=100)		1.41 (0.80–2.48)	0.23
Yes T13 T58 T13 Patient satisfied, mean (SD)** 8.1 (75.8) 7.8 Discharged to skilled nursing facility (1-276) 7.8 No 263 66.3) 154 Ves 13 (1-70) 7.8 Yes 13 (1-70) 7.4 Ves 13 (1-70) 7.4 Yes 142 147 147 Ves 142 147 147 Ves 142 142 141 Ves 144 142 141 Ves	36 (24.2) 36	(24.2)	31	(31.0)		
Patient satisfied, mean (SD)** 8.1 (2.0) 7.8 Discharged to skilled nursing facility (n=276) (n=165) No 263 (95.3) (16) Ves (n=276) (n=276) (17) Ves (n=275) (17) (17) Same-day discharge reported (n=253) (72) (14) No (n=254) (72) (147) Ves (n=254) (72) (147) Ves (n=254) (n=264) (147) Ves (n=254) (n=263) (147) Ves (n=264) (n=264) (165) Ves (n=264) (160) (165) Ves (n=276) (161) (166) Ves (n=276) (161) (161)	113 (75.8) 113	(75.8)	69	(69.0)		
Discharged to skilled runsing facility (n=276) (n=165) No 263 (6.3) 154 Ves 13 (4.7) 11 Same-day discharge reported (n=252) (n=70) No (n=253) (722) 104 Ves (n=254) (722) 104 No (n=254) (n=264) 104 No (n=254) (n=264) 104 No (n=254) (n=264) 104 No (n=264) (n=264) 104 No (n=276) (n=276) 104 No (n=276) (n=276) 104 No (n=276) (n=276) 104 No (n=276)	3.1 (2.0) 7.8	(2.3)	8.6	(1.4)	0.77 (0.67–0.90)	0.001
No 263 95.3) 154 Yes 13 (4.7) 1 Ne (1-252) (1-252) (1-7) No 182 (72.2) (1-47) No 182 (72.2) (1-47) Ves 70 (72.2) (1-47) Ves (1-254) (1-254) (1-47) Ves (1-254) (1-254) (1-47) Ves (1-254) (1-254) (1-47) No (1-254) (1-254) (1-47) No (1-263) (1-263) (1-147) Ves (1-263) (1-263) (1-165) No (1-263) (1-263) (1-165) No (1-161) (1-161) (1-165) No (1-276) (1-276) (1-165) No (1-276) (1-276) (1-165) No (1-276) (1-276) (1-165) No (1-276) (1-276) (1-165) No	n=276) (n=165)		(n=111)		3.89 (0.85–17.9)	0.08
Yes 13 (4.7) 11 Rame-day discharge reported (n=252) (n=70) No 182 (7.2.2) (n=70) Yes 70 (7.2.2) 104 Feit they were discharged before ready (n=254) (n=147) No (n=254) (n=147) (n=147) Pert they were discharged before ready (n=264) (n=147) (n=147) No (n=264) (n=264) (n=147) (n=147) Ves (n=261) (n=262) 84 (n=147) No (n=264) (n=263) 84 (n=165) No Ves (n=161) (n=162) 112 Ves No (n=276) (n=165) 113 No (n=276) (n=276) 121 (n=165) No Ves (n=276) (n=276) 121 No Ves (n=276) 121 121 No Ves (n=276) 121 121 No	263 (95.3) 154	(93.3)	109	(98.2)		
Same-day discharge reported (n=28) (n=70) No 182 (7.2.2) 104 Yes 70 (2.7.3) 104 Fet they were discharged before ready (n=26.4) (n=147) (n=147) Fet they were discharged before ready (n=26.4) (n=147) (n=147) Ves (n=26.4) (n=26.4) (n=165) (n=165) Ves Ves (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) Ves (n=276) (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) No Ves (n=276) (n=276) (n=165) No Ves (n=276) (n=276) (n=165) No Ves (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) No Ves (n=276) (n=166) (n=166) No	13 (4.7) 11	(6.7)	2	(1.8)		
No 182 72.2) 104 Yes 70 77.8) 49 Felt they were discharged before ready (n=25.4) (n=147) No 168 (60.9) 84 No 168 (61.12) 84 Yes 86 (31.2) 63 Reported improved overall health condition from index discharge (n=263) 84 No 53 (70.1) 122 No 53 (70.1) 122 No 119 (16.1) 122 No 119 (170.1) 123 No 119 (170.1) 126 No 110 (170.1) 126 </td <td>n=252) (n=70)</td> <td></td> <td>(n=182)</td> <td></td> <td>2.74 (1.18–6.46)</td> <td>0.019</td>	n=252) (n=70)		(n=182)		2.74 (1.18–6.46)	0.019
Yes 70 (27.8) 49 Felt they were discharged before ready (n=254) (n=147) No 168 (60.9) 84 No 168 (60.9) 84 Ves 86 (31.2) 63 Peported improved overall health condition from index (n=263) 84 No 75 (76.1) 125 No 53 (20.2) 33 Ves 210 (76.1) 122 No 76 76 76 Ves 119 (43.1) 76 No 119 (143.1) 76 Ves 76 76 76 No 119 (75.1) 76 Ves 76 76 76 No 76 76 76 Ves 76 76 76 No 76 76 76 Ves 76 76 76 No 76<	104 (72.2) 104	(68.0)	78	(78.8)		
Felt they were discharged before rady $(n=254)$ $(n=147)$ No1686.9.984Yes86(31.2)63Yes86(31.2)63Reported improved overall health condition from index discharge $(n=263)$ 2Reported improved overall health condition from index discharge $(n=263)$ 23No53(20.2)33Ves210(76.1)122No119(76.1)122Orated health correlation before readmission $(n=276)$ 86No119(76.1)26No157(66.9)89No157(66.9)86No156(66.9)86No157(121(31.6)No156(66.9)86No156(66.9)86No157(126)86No132(121(166)No132(152)86No132(50.0)85No132(50.0)85No132(50.0)85No132(121)(1616)No132(152)85No132(50.0)85No132(50.0)85No132(50.0)75No132(50.0)75No132(50.0)75No132(50.0)75No132(50.0)75	70 (27.8) 49	(32.0)	21	(21.2)		
No 168 (60.9) 84 Yes 86 (31.2) 63 Peported improved overall heath condition from index admission to index discharge (n=263) 53 (1=155) No 53 (20.2) 33 (1=155) (1=155) No 53 (20.2) (1=155) (1=155) (1=155) Ves 210 (76.1) (122 (1=165) (1=165) No No (1=19) (1=19) (1=165) (1=165) (1=165) No Ves (1=19) (1=16) (1=16) (1=165) (1=165) No Ves (1=16) (1=276) (1=276) (1=165) (1=165) No Ves (1=16) (1=276) (1=276) (1=160) (1=165) No Ves (1=276) (1=276) (1=276) (1=160) (1=165) No Ves (1=160) (1=264) (1=160) (1=165) (1=166) (1=166) (1=166) (1=166) (n=254) (n=147)		(n=107)		0.36 (0.21–0.64)	<0.001
Yes 86 (312) 63 Reported improved overall health condition from index discharge (n=263) (n=155) No 53 (202) 33 No 53 (202) 33 Ves 210 (76.1) 122 Orbate the admission 210 (76.1) 122 Improved the admission (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) No 119 (n=276) (n=165) Ves 157 (56.9) 89 Ves 157 (56.9) 80 Ves 157 (43.1) (n=165) No 157 (43.1) (n=165) No 157 (43.1) (n=165) No 157 (56.9) 80 No 157 (43.8) 85 No 121 (43.8) 85 No 122 (1610) 85 No 122 (1610) 85 No 122	168 (60.9) 84	(57.1)	84	(78.5)		
Reported improved overall health condition from index discharge (n=163) (n=156) No 53 (20.2) 33 No 53 (20.2) 33 Verse 210 (76.1) 122 Contracted health conditionsion (19) (76.1) 123 Follow-up care 119 (76.1) 76 No 157 (56.9) 89 No 157 (56.9) 80 No 155 (56.2) 80 No 121 (43.8) 85 No 121 (132) 85 No 132 (50.0) 85 No 132 (50.0) 85	36 (31.2) 63	(42.9)	23	(21.5)		
No 53 (20.2) 33 Yes 210 (76.1) 122 Follow-up care 210 (76.1) 122 Follow-up care 1 1 122 Contacted healthcare professional before readmission (n=276) (76.1) 76 No 119 (19) (43.1) 76 Yes 157 (56.9) 89 No 157 (56.9) 89 Yes 157 (56.9) 89 No 157 (56.9) 80 Ves 157 (43.1) (1=165) Ves 121 (43.8) 80 Ves 126 (56.2) 80 Ves 122 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85	n=263) (n=155)		(n=108)		0.84 (0.45–1.56)	0.84
Yes 210 (76.1) 122 Follow-up care 1 1 1 Follow-up care (n=276) (n=165) Ornacted heathcare professional before readmission (n=276) (33.1) 76 No 157 (56.9) 89 89 Feling concern (n=276) (167) 80 No 155 (56.9) 80 Openession1 (n=276) (171) (13.8) 85 No 121 (13.8) 85 85 No 132 (50.0) 85 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85	53 (20.2) 33	(21.3)	20	(18.5)		
Interformation (n=165) Contacted healthcare professional before readmission (n=276) (n=165) No 119 (43.1) 76 Ves 157 (56.9) 89 Feeling concern (n=276) (n=276) 89 No 155 (56.2) 80 Ves 121 (43.8) 85 Ves 121 (43.8) 85 No 122 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85	210 (76.1) 122	(78.7)	88	(81.5)		
Contacted healthcare professional before readmission (n=76) (n=165) No 119 (43.1) 76 Yes 157 (56.9) 89 Feeling concern (n=276) (n=165) 89 No (n=276) (155 (56.2) 80 Ves 121 (43.8) 85 Ves 121 (43.8) 85 No 132 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85						
No 119 (43.1) 76 Yes 157 (56.9) 89 Feeling concern (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) No 155 (56.2) 80 Yes 121 (43.8) 85 Oppressiont1 (n=264) (n=160) 85 No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85	n=276) (n=165)		(n=111)		0.74 (0.45–1.21)	0.23
Yes 157 (56.9) 89 Feling concern (n=276) (n=165) (n=165) No 155 (56.2) 80 Yes 121 (43.8) 85 Depression†t (n=264) (n=160) 85 No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 85 Ves 132 (50.0) 85	19 (43.1) 76	(46.1)	43	(38.7)		
Feeling concern (n=276) (n=165) No 155 (56.2) 80 Yes 121 (43.8) 85 Operession11 (n=264) (n=160) No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 85	157 (56.9) 89	(53.9)	68	(61.3)		
No 155 (56.2) 80 Yes 121 (43.8) 85 DepressionTT (n=264) (n=160) No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 85	n=276) (n=165)		(n=111)		2.20 (1.34–3.67)	0.002
Yes 121 (43.8) 85 Depression11 (n=264) (n=160) No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 75	155 (56.2) 80	(48.5)	75	(67.6)		
Depression11 (n=160) No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 75	121 (43.8) 85	(51.5)	36	(32.4)		
No 132 (50.0) 85 Yes 132 (50.0) 75	n=264) (n=160)		(n=104)		0.73 (0.44–1.20)	0.21
Yes 132 (50.0) 75	132 (50.0) 85	(53.1)	47	(45.2)		
	(50.0) 75	(46.9)	57	(54.8)		
*Elementary education included primary or secondary education. Higher education included post-secondary or university education. Polypharmacy: regular use of at least six medications daily. Secolent, very good, good, fair or poor. IF-neticental status: (a) can your depend or chair yourself; (b) can your dress and bathe yourself; (c) can you make your. *Patient satisfaction with hospital discharge team. Responses were recorded on a scale of 0–10, from 'very unsatisfactory' Thepression. PHQ-2 score 23.	very good, good, fair or poor. ou dress and bathe yourself; (c) can you make your own m orded on a scale of 0-10, from 'very unsatisfactory' to 'very	aals and (d) can you do satisfactory'.	your own shoppir	g (yes and no).		

BMJ Open Qual: first published as 10.1136/bmjoq-2021-001344 on 21 June 2021. Downloaded from http://bmjopenquality.bmj.com/ on July 9, 2021 by guest. Protected by copyright.

3

Table 2 Factors contributing to potential	y preventat	ole readmissio	ons accordi	ing to physici	an and nurs	se opinion	
	Physici N=276	ian	Nurse N=276		All N=552		P value
Factors	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	
Preventable readmission or undecided	81	(29.3)	93	(33.7)	174	(31.5)	0.14
Care during index stay*	45	(16.3)	69	(25.0)	114	(20.6)	0.01
Discharge process†	17	(6.2)	12	(4.3)	29	(5.2)	0.45
Follow-up care‡	40	(14.5)	14	(5.1)	54	(9.8)	<0.001

*Care during index stay included: (a) inattention to advance care planning, (b) suboptimal management of chronic condition (c) unrecognised worsening condition, (d) suboptimal coordination of care, (e) patient unstable at discharge or discharged too soon, (e) medication error, (f) missed or inaccurate diagnosis and (g) surgical/procedural complication.

†Discharge process included: (a) transition care plan absent or inadequate, (b) unaddressed psychological and social needs, (c) inadequate assessment of patient or caregiver understanding or ability, (d) delayed/inaccurate information from hospital to outpatient providers and (e) inadequate arrangements for supplies.

‡Follow-up care included: (a) inadequate attention to psychological or social needs, (b) suboptimal management of index satay condition, (c) suboptimal management of chronic condition, (d) medication error, (e) inadequate patient instructions, (f) poor coordination between inpatient and outpatient providers, (g) surgical/procedural complication, (h) missed or inaccurate diagnosis and (i) lack of follow-up on referrals made after discharge.

preventable. Comparing patients who reported nonpreventable readmissions to those who reported preventable readmissions or were undecided, the latter had less time between discharge and readmission, did not have a follow-up appointment scheduled with primary care or specialist at discharge, no medication reviewed and felt concerns were not addressed before discharge. Also, patients who were less satisfied with the hospital's discharge team, who felt were discharged before being ready and felt concern during follow-up care were more likely to report preventable readmission or undecidedness (table 1).

Among patients who reported a preventable readmission or were undecided, physicians' reviewers agreed 19.6% and nurses' reviewers agreed 22.8% of the time, identifying physicians or nurses agreed 31.2% of the cases reported. The overall agreement was 55.4% (Cohen's κ =0.12; 95% CI, 0.01–0.23). Care during index stay and follow-up care were the most common factors identified by physicians and nurses (table 2).

DISCUSSION

The results of this study are consistent with previous reports, which have found that almost one-third of patients believed that their readmission was preventable,⁶ and the associated factors were linked to the discharge process and follow-up care. Furthermore, although the patient and healthcare professionals' preventability agreement were slight, this percentage increases when the opinion of nurses was considered. These findings must be interpreted in the context of our study design because the limitations of this study include the recall bias of patients' interviews.

Therefore, the results support the argument that actually the patient's understanding about their diagnosis and education prior discharge was suboptimal.⁸ Future studies should evaluate the impact of strategies to improve the transition of care that incorporate the patients' and nurses' opinion about readiness to discharge.

Author affiliations

¹Nursing Knowledge Management and Information Systems Department, Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge. Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Bellvitge (IDIBELL), L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain

²Fundamental Care and Medical-Surgical Nursing Department, School of Nursing, Medicine and Health Science Faculty, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain ³Urology Department, Hospital Universitari Vall d'Hebron. Institut de Recerca Vall d'Hebron (VHIR), Barcelona, Spain

⁴Internal Medicine Department, Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge. Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Bellvitge (IDIBELL), L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain ⁵Nursing Knowledge Management and Information Systems Department, Hospital Universitari Arnau de Vilanova. Institut de Recerca Biomèdica de Lleida (IRBLleida), Lleida, Spain

⁶Quality and Safety Department, Hospital Universitari de Girona Doctor Josep Trueta. Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Girona Dr. Josep Trueta (IDIBGi), Girona, Spain ⁷Nursing research support, Hospital Universitari Germans Trias i Pujol. Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Bellvitge (IDIBELL), Badalona, Spain

⁸Catalan Institute of Health. Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Bellvitge (IDIBELL), Barcelona, Spain

Twitter Jordi Adamuz @jordi_adamuz

Acknowledgements We want to thanks the other collaborators at Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge: Hugo Rodríguez-Fernández, Maribel González-Samartino, Marta Tapia-Pérez, Maria-Magdalena López-Jiménez, Emilio Jiménez-Martínez; at Hospital Universitari Arnau de Vilanova: Pilar Ricart and Esther Gomis-Treig; at Hospital Universitari de Girona: Josep Trueta, Heleni Contreras-Fernandez and Marina Figueras-Besalú; at Biostatistics Unit of Institute of Biomedical Research of Bellvitge: Pau Satorra and Cristian Tebé; and at University of Barcelona: Marta Romero-Garcia, Pilar Delgado-Hito and ARES group in the Catalan Institute of Health Hospitals. Writing assistance was provided by Luis Manuel de Casas Hernandez.

Collaborators ARES group members: Hugo Rodríguez-Fernández, Maribel González-Samartino, Marta Tapia-Pérez and Maria-Magdalena López-Jiménez (Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge); Pilar Ricart and Esther Gomis-Treig (Hospital Universitari Arnau de Vilanova); Heleni Contreras-Fernandez and Marina Figueras-Besalú (Hospital Universitari de Girona Josep Trueta).

Contributors All authors had full access to all study data and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Study concept and design: JA and MEJU. Coordination team: JA. Acquisition of data: DLG, MJRM, CNR, MCP, SAF and ARES group in the Catalan Institute of Health Hospitals. Analysis

and interpretation data, and drafting of the manuscript: JA and MEJU. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: DLG, MJRM, CNR, MCP, LdICA and SAF. Statistical analysis: JA and SAF. Obtained funding: LdICA and JA. Administrative, technical and material support: SAF and MEJU. Study supervision: MEJU. Writing assistance was provided by Luis Manuel de Casas Hernandez.

Funding This study was supported by the Departament de Salut de la Generalitat de Catalunya, Pla estratègic de recerca i innovació en salut (PERIS) 2016-2020 (SLT002/16/00085), Catalunya, Spain, and School of Nursing, Medicine and Health Science Faculty, University of Barcelona (PREI-18-005-I).

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval This study was approved by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of Hospital Universitari de Bellvitge (reference number: PR114/17).

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is

properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

ORCID iD

Jordi Adamuz http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5480-0981

REFERENCES

- Tan SY, Feng JY, Joyce C, et al. Association of hospital discharge against medical advice with readmission and in-hospital mortality. JAMA Netw Open 2020;3:e206009.
- 2 Adamuz J, González-Samartino M, Jiménez-Martínez E, et al. Care complexity individual factors associated with Hospital readmission: a retrospective cohort study. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2018;50:411–21.
- 3 Jeffs L, Dhalla I, Cardoso R, et al. The perspectives of patients, family members and healthcare professionals on readmissions: preventable or inevitable? J Interprof Care 2014;28:507–12.
- 4 Auerbach AD, Kripalani S, Vasilevskis EE, et al. Preventability and causes of readmissions in a national cohort of general medicine patients. JAMA Intern Med 2016;176:484–93.
- 5 van Galen LS, Brabrand M, Cooksley T, *et al.* Patients' and providers' perceptions of the preventability of hospital readmission: a prospective, observational study in four European countries. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2017;26:958–69.
- 6 Howard-Anderson J, Lonowski S, Vangala S, et al. Readmissions in the era of patient engagement. JAMA Intern Med 2014;174:1870–2.
- 7 Feigenbaum P, Neuwirth E, Trowbridge L, et al. Factors contributing to all-cause 30-day readmissions: a structured case series across 18 hospitals. *Med Care* 2012;50:599–605.
- 8 Weerahandi H, Ziaeian B, Fogerty RL, et al. Predictors for patients understanding reason for hospitalization. *PLoS One* 2018;13:e0196479–10.