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ABSTRACT

Background
Systems to detect and minimise unwarranted variation in clinician practice are crucial to ensure increasingly multidisciplinary healthcare workforces are supported to practise to their full potential. Such systems are limited in English general practice settings, with implications for the efficiency and safety of care.

Aim
To evaluate the benefits and limitations of a continuous, risk-based, consultation peer-review system used for 10 years by an out-of-hours general practice service in Bristol, UK.

Design and setting
A qualitative interview study in South-West England

Method
Semi-structured interviews with intervention users (clinicians, peer-reviewers and clinical management), analysed by inductive thematic analysis and integrated into a programme theory.

Results
20 clinicians were interviewed between September 2018 - January 2019. Interviewees indicated the intervention supported clinician learning through improved peer-feedback; highlighting learning needs and validating practice. It was compared favourably with existing structures of ensuring clinician competence; supporting standardisation of supervision, clinical governance and learning culture.

These benefits were potentially limited by intervention factors such as differential feedback quality between clinician groups, the efficiency of methods to identify learning needs, and limitations of assessments based on written clinical notes. Contextual factors such as clinician experience, motivation and organisational learning culture influenced the perception of the intervention as a support or stressor.

Conclusion
Our findings demonstrate the potential of this methodology to support clinicians in an increasingly multidisciplinary general practice workforce to efficiently and safely practise to their full potential.
Our programme theory provides a theoretical basis to maximise its benefits and accommodate its potential limitations.
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**How this fits in**

- Unwarranted variation in clinical practice is an area of increasing interest due to the costs and harms of too much or too little healthcare.
- Effective systems to detect and minimise unwarranted variation in clinician practice are crucial to ensure clinicians in increasingly multidisciplinary healthcare workforces are supported to practise to their full potential.
- Such systems are limited in English general practice settings, with implications for the efficiency and safety of care.
- Continuous, risk-based, consultation peer-review provides a mechanism to detect and minimise unwarranted variation in clinician practice, and a potential methodology to support clinicians in an increasingly multidisciplinary general practice workforce to efficiently and safely practise to their full potential.
INTRODUCTION

Unwarranted variation in clinical practice is an area of increasing interest due to the costs and harms of too much or too little healthcare. Within primary care internationally there is evidence of significant variation in clinician practice and a substantial burden of preventable harm. However, determining the extent to which observed variation is unwarranted and potentially harmful to patients is challenging, and requires detailed assessment of the clinician-patient interaction.

Systems to identify and minimise unwarranted variation in individual clinician practice are increasingly relevant in the context of trends towards more multidisciplinary clinical workforces. Such initiatives have been adopted in England, as in other countries, seeking efficiencies by ensuring all staff are working “at the top of their licence;” maximising the use of each team member’s skills.

Effective and standardised systems to detect and minimise unwarranted variation in clinician practice are crucial to ensure clinicians can be deployed and supported to practise to their full potential, rather than beyond their competence. Such systems are limited in English general practice settings, with implications for the efficiency and safety of care.

A potential solution is a continuous, risk-based, consultation peer-review system developed and used by an out-of-hours general practice service provider in Bristol, England, over the last 10 years. The ‘Clinical Guardian’ (CG) methodology (Figure 1) continuously samples a proportion of all clinicians’ consultation records for peer-review. The proportion sampled varies between clinicians and is based on their clinical ‘risk-status.’ ‘Risk-status’ is conceptualised as the degree of uncertainty regarding a clinician’s standard of practice and informed initially by time working with the organisation and subsequently by ongoing practice. Sampled consultation records are randomly selected and screened by members of a trained peer-review team with protected time to perform this function. Cases causing concern are escalated for detailed consensus peer-review at regular team meetings. Case-grading, and where indicated constructive comments, are continuously fed-back to clinicians through written electronic feedback to which they are encouraged to respond. Continuous modification of clinicians’ risk-status on the basis of their practice creates a feedback mechanism to focus the peer-review resource where it is most needed (Supplementary Document 1: CG Intervention Description).
This study explored the benefits and limitations of CG to support the identification and minimisation of unwarranted variation in clinician practice in out-of-hours primary care and informed the development of a programme theory to understand its impact.

**METHODS**

**Setting**

This study was undertaken in an out-of-hours general practice service in Bristol, England (BrisDoc Healthcare Services), with interviews between September 2018 and January 2019. At that time the service served approximately one million patients and received over 100,000 patient contacts annually. It was staffed by approximately 150 mostly self-employed general practitioners (GPs) working flexibly, and 12 whole time equivalent non-GP clinical team members, alongside a clinical management team.

**Methodological orientation**

We used semi-structured interviews to explore clinicians’ views on the benefits and limitations of CG. We perceived the intervention to be at the “development stage” of the UK Medical Research Council guidance on the development and evaluation of complex interventions. Our approach aimed to gather a breadth of perspectives to inform the generation of a programme theory and evidence whether the intervention merits further development.

**Sampling**

To triangulate viewpoints from those subject to the intervention, those that deliver it, and those that commission it, interviewees were purposively selected by role and experience across three groups:

1. Clinicians subject to the CG peer-review system (GPs, non-GP clinicians (NGP), and GP trainees (GPT))
2. CG peer-review team members (CGPRT)
3. Senior management team (SMT) members involved in clinical governance

**Recruitment**

Interviewees were invited to participate via emails from their employer. GP trainees were invited to participate via emails from their training programme and a leaflet distributed at their teaching sessions.
Data collection
Semi-structured interviews were undertaken by the lead researcher (IBB), using interview topic guides (Supplementary Document 2) exploring the benefits and limitations of the intervention. Specific questions about the role of CG in patient safety, care quality, clinician learning and the identification of clinicians in need of support were asked to elicit views on areas hypothesised to be important a priori. Written or audio-recorded verbal consent was gained prior to each interview. Interviews were recorded using an encrypted digital-audio recording device and interviewees were offered a £40 gift-voucher for their time.

Data analysis
Interviews were transcribed, anonymised and checked against each recording to ensure accuracy. Transcripts were analysed using inductive thematic analysis, however the lead author’s knowledge of quality assurance structures in general practice may have engendered a level of deduction. Initial codes were generated through review of all transcripts. Codes were reviewed, grouped into themes and checked to ensure congruence with individual coded extracts and the overall dataset. Two researchers (IBB & JB) independently coded a subset (15%) of the transcripts to ensure consensus over coding and generation of themes (Supplementary Document 3: Coding tree). Analysis was organised using NVivo 12 qualitative data-analysis software.

Sampling of clinicians was based on an initial target of 18 interviews, informed by previous experience of qualitative research (JB, CS & ACS). No new themes were emerging on completion of this target except in relation to clinician experience, leading to two further interviews. We presented our preliminary findings to 9 members of the CG senior management and peer-review team to support service development and as an opportunity for feedback. No objections to findings were raised and no new themes emerged, supporting our assessment of data saturation.

To ensure a theoretical basis for further enquiry we synthesised our findings to produce a programme theory (Figure 2).

RESULTS
We interviewed 20 clinicians with interviews lasting 23 to 52 minutes. The distribution of participants’ roles are summarised in Table 1. Most interviewees (85%) worked in both in-hours and out-of-hours general practice at the time of interview, and nearly all had previous experience of in-
hours general practice (90%). Interviews were undertaken face-to-face at the University of Bristol (n=3), the clinicians’ workplace (n=3), or by telephone (n=14).

1.) Benefits of the CG intervention
The benefits of CG pertained to themes of supporting clinician learning, ensuring clinician competence and organisational quality assurance.

1.1) Supporting clinician learning
1.1a) Peer feedback levels
Many of those with experience of in-hours general practice noted peer-feedback to be infrequent in that setting. By comparison, CG was felt to have a positive impact on feedback frequency, circumventing many identified causes of infrequent feedback, such as time, clinical isolation, professional hierarchy, and avoidance of conflict.

“[CG is] the only feedback I really get on my documentation, ... my colleagues are probably too nice, and they’re not in a rush to offer me that feedback.” GP8

1.1b) Identification of learning needs
Clinicians recognised inconsistencies in their own practice and how minimising this could improve care.

“... there’s a high rate of variation even in my own practice so I think anything we can do where we spot inconsistencies, could potentially improve quality.” GP1

In contrast with existing, predominantly reactive quality assurance structures, CG supported proactive identification of clinicians’ learning needs.

“At the moment, the way people’s unknown unknowns get picked up is some sort of significant event or complaint when something has gone wrong. Otherwise, it just passes under the radar ...” GP7

CG facilitated feedback regarding issues that would otherwise not be highlighted due to its frequency and detail with potential patient benefit through optimisation of existing clinical management.
“[Without CG] you don’t get the sort of small bits of feedback or slight nudges to improve like, “make sure you document your safety netting.” I mean who is ever going to spot that otherwise?” GPT2

1.1c) Validation of practice
CG was identified as a means of validating clinician practice and benchmarking with peers. The use of CG to reflect on how clinicians’ actions correlated with patient outcomes provided a mechanism to reinforce positive practice or trigger learning.

1.2) Ensuring clinician competence
1.2a) Clinician supervision
CG was felt to ensure a minimum standard of supervision for a professionally diverse and often transient out-of-hours general practice workforce.

“… [CG is] really crucial because you’re employing a [range] of clinicians, and a lot of them are nurses, and paramedics. So, how on Earth do you check somebody is alright? You have a responsibility to the patients to ensure ... you’re checking up on standards …” CGPRT1

Due to infrequent peer-feedback in in-hours general practice, many clinicians noted CG feedback on their out-of-hours role was the only form of clinical supervision they received. Many felt the accountability provided by such supervision was likely to improve clinical practice.

“… there could be an element of … if you know that someone is checking your work, you might be a bit more thorough. There shouldn’t be, but there probably is.” GP7

There were concerns that CG could be seen as a replacement for supervision that should be more formalised and detailed.

“I think the problem with doing Clinical Guardian is it could too easily become a substitute for something that should be a lot better” GP6

Inadequate supervision was recognised to have greater consequences for those with less clinical experience, and in the context of an increasingly multidisciplinary general practice workforce, risked deploying clinicians outside of their competence.
Acknowledging those concerns, participants emphasised competence to be a function of clinical practice rather than inferred by professional title, and recognised value in supervision structures that apply equally to all clinicians.

“... it doesn’t actually matter whether it’s a GP or not because we are all doing the same job, so we all have to be competent ...” GP6

Whilst CG may not provide a gold-standard of supervision for all clinicians, there was recognition that it represented an improvement on the perceived lack of consistent approaches in in-hours general practice.

“... [CG] gives a ... solidity to the service in terms of that there is a running check of records of every clinician. In-hours general practice is 55 miles from that.” SMT2

1.2b) Identification of clinicians in need of support

Whilst the number of performance outliers were noted to be low, CG was felt to be an effective mechanism to identify clinicians in need of support.

“if you get ... someone who is really not doing the things they should do, it's a really effective way of just picking that up.” CGPRT1

Continuous sampling of clinician practice was seen as a strength of CG, enabling the identification of patterns of behaviour which may highlight a need for support, and the universal application of CG ensured supervision of those that might not otherwise seek it.

1.2c) Appraisal & revalidation

Most clinicians supported the rationale for nationally standardised structures to ensure clinician competence, such as appraisal and revalidation. However, many did not feel such mechanisms were effective, and the reliance of appraisal on largely self-collated information was noted to create adverse incentives that may undermine it.

“... I am much less likely to pull out cases where to be honest I am pretty sure I haven’t done the best thing [in my appraisal], than I am ... with my colleagues” GP6
Clinicians indicated CG enhanced the quality of evidence they could submit for appraisal and was potentially less biased than other means of assessing clinician competence due to its risk-based case sampling and equal application to all clinician groups.

1.3) Organisational quality assurance

1.3a) Clinical governance

Participants with experience of working for more than one service provider noted interorganisational variation in clinical governance culture and practices, with patient safety incident reporting identified as an area of inconsistency. CG was seen to help standardise such approaches.

Participants indicated clinical governance could be better integrated between organisations and standardising approaches with the support of systems such as CG, was seen as a way to facilitate interorganisational learning.

1.3b) Organisational learning culture

For many, CG supported a positive learning culture and sense of organisational connectedness, which was noted to be harder to achieve in larger organisations. Some felt CG introduced a sense of hierarchy, however this viewpoint was not widely held, and sharing learning from CG reviews at an organisational level via meetings and emails facilitated the perception of CG learning as a team exercise. Investment in CG was felt to communicate organisational values to clinicians, external organisations and patients.

2.) Factors limiting the usefulness of CG

Factors limiting the usefulness of CG pertained to the intervention itself, and the clinician and organisational context.

2.1) Intervention Factors

2.1a) Feedback quality and frequency

Feedback containing written comments, rather than categorical grading was perceived most useful for clinician learning. CG was recognised to focus on those most in need of support, and therefore many did not receive detailed feedback regularly, attenuating its use to them as a learning tool.

Constructive feedback was recognised to be of greatest value in supporting learning, but a potential source of anxiety and defensiveness.
“It’s really easy to give positive feedback. It’s quite difficult to broach the thorny issue of trying to suggest somebody does things in a different way.” CGPRT1

These concerns were rationalised in terms of concerns about the opinion of peers, that their actions could have caused patient harm and the associated medicolegal implications.

2.1b) Selection of clinical cases
CGs use of random consultation record sampling was felt to reduce bias, however some highlighted learning-points may be more efficiently identified through more purposive case selection. Some noted when they had self-selected challenging cases for peer-review this was highly valued.

2.1c) Limitations of clinical note reviews
The CG peer-review process is principally conducted using consultation records. Interviewees recognised these to be a subjective representation of a clinical interaction from the clinician perspective, and therefore a potential limitation.

“… notes aren’t the whole picture, it’s the way that the GP documents the kind of transaction …” GP5

Consequently, clinical records were observed to be vulnerable to unintentional or intentional misrepresentation.

Overemphasis on the clinical note quality may neglect other important aspects of practice such as consulting speed, breadth of competence and quality of communication. Notes may also not adequately reflect the context of a clinical encounter, where difficult decisions may be made on a busy shift.

“… there’s always going to be a limitation where there’s only one person at a distance looking at something you’ve done without the context or the business of the shift …” GPT1

Despite these limitations, the strength of notes reviews to appraise the key points of a clinical interaction supported its role as a quality assurance tool.
“[CG is] not really digging into what’s actually going on in the consultation … but yet its useful because you can see … that they’re taking good sets of records, taking appropriate clinical observations, and taking an appropriate course of action for a defined clinical problem” SMT1

2.2) Clinician Factors

2.2a) Clinician experience

Less experienced clinicians appeared to find CG more useful as a consequence of having a greater proportion of their consultations reviewed than more experienced colleagues and being trained through a similar culture.

“… younger GPs who’ve come through … training where they’re used to reflecting, being observed, getting lots of feedback … in general seem to find [CG] more useful…” SMT3

Some more experienced clinicians felt they should be audited less, however most reflected they would value more feedback, and experience did not negate the need for scrutiny.

“there’s lots of GPs who maybe qualified 40, 45 years ago, don’t write very detailed notes. There has been a change in what is considered appropriate so hopefully [CG] encourages that.” GP7

2.2b) Clinician motivation

Clinicians were noted to be broadly receptive of peer-review interventions due to common professional traits.

“… doctors tend to get … very reflective … and very self-critical. They’re high achievers who’ve got quite high standards.” CGPRT1

Interviewees recognised the focus of CG was to support clinicians, rather than catch them out. Most reflected a preference for more peer-review of their practice, with those most committed to self-development finding CG most useful.

2.3) Organisational factors

2.3a) Organisational performance

The potential impact of CG was noted to be affected by the strength of wider governance structures and existing organisational performance.
2.3b) Learning culture

Whilst some felt monitoring their practice through CG was within the spectrum of assurance processes they would expect in any clinical service, others noted the potential impacts of such interventions on the health and retention of already stretched clinicians.

“...you have to balance, don’t you, patient safety and doctor morale ... being overly watched and scored is a big factor in doctor morale and going out and stress ...” GP3

These tensions highlighted the importance of learning culture in influencing perception of such interventions. Whilst CG was reported to promote many positive aspects of organisational learning culture, it was emphasised as a tool to support this, rather than a substitute, and the critical role of organisational leadership in setting such a culture was recurrently noted.

“... clinical governance [is] ... about culture and climate and permission to fail ... it is the senior people who set that climate for better or worse. If [CG] is ever going to be taken further, that has to be a focus.” SMT2

DISCUSSION

Summary

This study evaluated the usefulness and limitations of risk-based, continuous, consultation peer-review in identifying and minimising unwarranted variation in clinician practice. Our findings have been incorporated into the programme theory presented in Figure 2.

Interviewees indicated the intervention supported clinician learning through improved peer-feedback; highlighting learning needs and validating practice. It was compared favourably with existing structures of ensuring clinician competence; supporting standardisation of supervision, clinical governance and learning culture.

These benefits were potentially limited by intervention factors such as differential feedback quality between clinician groups, the efficiency of methods to identify learning needs, and limitations of assessments based on written clinical notes. Contextual factors such as clinician experience, motivation and organisational learning culture influenced the perception of the intervention as a support or stressor.
Strengths and limitations

This study interviewed clinicians involved in all aspects of this intervention which had been established for 10 years, representing an evaluation of embedded use. The structure, consistency and longevity of CG provides a valuable example to aid others to consider adopting or adapting such approaches.

Employees may have felt pressure not to criticise the intervention, however we sought to minimise this through reassurance of anonymisation. This study was undertaken in a single organisation and therefore contextual factors such as organisational size and learning culture should be considered before generalising findings.

Comparison with existing literature

Quality assurance in general practice

Participants’ reports of limited and inconsistent quality assurance processes in in-hours general practice were in-keeping with other studies\(^9\),\(^17\),\(^18\) and set in the context of evidence of a substantial burden of preventable patient harm in English primary care.\(^5\) Whilst our study has indicated the potential of CG to support an increasingly multidisciplinary primary care workforce to practise to its full potential, our findings also reflect the need to ensure such interventions do not become another stressor for a workforce dealing with a challenging and rising workload.\(^19\)

The impact of audit and feedback on clinician practice and patient outcomes

Consultation peer-review interventions such as CG are a form of clinical audit. Estimates of the effects of audit and feedback on professional practice and patient outcomes in healthcare are challenged by heterogeneity and the quality of studies in this area.\(^20\)-\(^24\) Despite this, characteristics associated with interventions that are most effective have been identified.\(^20\),\(^24\) Whilst the scope of our study did not encompass the analysis of CG feedback necessary for comprehensive comparisons with such frameworks, CG is consistent with many characteristics identified to be important, such as targeting of low baseline performance\(^20\), and providing contemporaneous, individualised, regular feedback, from a trusted source, with whom one can “socially interact” through reply.\(^24\) These synergies suggest some of the active mechanisms through which CG may be effective, reflecting the components of our programme theory (Figure 2), and along with more comprehensive theories of health-care feedback,\(^25\) providing a basis for future intervention development and evaluation.
The use of patient record review to measure and improve patient safety in general practice is longstanding, with most studies using a screening methodology to target the peer-review resource most efficiently at cases of interest. Studies using these methods to target consultations containing patient safety incidents in UK general practice settings have consistently found previously unidentified safety incidents and preventable harm. However, the impact of such interventions on patient outcomes is unclear.

CG differs from most patient record review approaches in its use of clinician risk to inform case sampling. Doing so is supported by evidence indicating relatively small proportions of clinicians account for a disproportionate burden of negative outcomes such as patient complaints. CG also differs from most peer-review interventions in its use of a trained peer-review team with regular protected time to perform this function, likely contributing to the unusual longevity and consistency of its use. Such an approach is supported by findings of previous studies which found uptake and consistency of peer-review interventions to be affected by time available, resources, peer-reviewer skills and the extent of integration with other activities.

**A focus on unwarranted variation**

Clinical audit involves the measurement of practice against professional standards or targets. The lack of explicit standards for numerous aspects of routine care, and breadth of reasons for appropriate deviation from such standards where they exist, highlights the value of a quality discourse that focuses on warranted and unwarranted variation, rather than measures of adherence to specific targets.

Sutherland et al have proposed a helpful framework to understand and analyse warranted and unwarranted variation in healthcare in terms of the use of evidence, allowance for individual agency, and clinician and service capacity. Their framework integrates patient, clinician, organisational and wider contextual factors, and emphasises the need to consider how variation is attributed and aggregated. CG enables such a nuanced approach through consensus peer-review by multiple reviewers to discern whether actions taken by a clinician, such as choosing whether to admit a patient to hospital or prescribe a particular medication, are likely to be warranted. Such systems accommodate the complexity and uncertainty of decisions in healthcare.

In-keeping with our proposed “mechanisms of change” (Figure 2), other commentators have hypothesised that interventions that facilitate professional collaboration through feedback enable
sharing of best practice, provide accountability through making “individual behaviour visible,” and reinforce organisational learning culture.\textsuperscript{35} Uncertainty regarding best practice has also been highlighted as a contributor to variation,\textsuperscript{35} and through continuous peer-review interventions such as CG help highlight areas of uncertainty to be targeted by organisational guidelines and further research.

\textbf{Implications for research and practice}

Effective and standardised systems to detect and minimise unwarranted variation in clinician practice are necessary to ensure clinicians in an increasingly multidisciplinary primary care workforce can be safely and efficiently deployed and supported to practise to their full potential. This study suggests that continuous, risk-based, consultation peer-review provides a potential mechanism to achieve this aim.

Such systems have the potential to transform the regulation of the healthcare workforce by shifting from an emphasis on historical training and professional identity,\textsuperscript{9} towards a focus on ensuring and developing clinician competence. This approach may provide a framework to reward skill development though alternative training routes or reduce the scope of practice of those in need of support.

Further research is needed to understand how CGs proposed “\textit{mechanisms of change}” (Figure 2) can be optimised. This will be achieved through development of an intervention to enable the identified “\textit{moderating intervention factors}” and a better understanding how the form of the intervention may be flexibly adapted to accommodate the “\textit{moderating contextual factors}” of each target environment.

Exploring and integrating factors such as the patient voice, wider clinician performance data, and the role of such systems in promoting continuous learning at the clinician, organisation and health-system level, may form the basis of the “more sophisticated conversations about audit and feedback to achieve substantial, data driven, continuous improvement”\textsuperscript{23} which are needed to revitalise this research area, minimise unwarranted variation and improve the efficiency and safety of healthcare.
TABLES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Role</th>
<th>Number of interviewees by CG role</th>
<th>Number of interviewees by clinical role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management Team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG Peer-Review Team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinicians Subject to CG:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-GP Clinicians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GP Trainees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Interviewee distribution by role

FIGURES:

Figure 1: The Clinical Guardian Intervention Cycle
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SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENT 1: CG INTERVENTION DESCRIPTION

Clinical Guardian\(^1\) (CG) is a continuous, risk-based, consultation peer-review system. The following summary of the CG methodology addresses each aspect of the process in turn. The methodology presented below represents that used by the out-of-hours general practice service provider at the time of the study (September 2018 to January 2019).

**Continuous**
All clinicians working within the out-of-hours general practice service, regardless of professional background, have a random sample of their clinical consultation notes from patient contacts reviewed weekly by a member of the CG peer-review team.

**Risk-based**
The proportion of cases sampled varies between each service clinician and is based on their clinical ‘risk-status’. ‘Risk-status’ is conceptualised as the degree of uncertainty regarding a clinician’s standard of practice and is informed initially by duration of employment and subsequently by ongoing performance.

Clinicians that are newly employed have 100% of their consultations from their first shift reviewed before they are allowed to undertake further work with the service. Those clinicians whose initial reviews were deemed acceptable are stepped down to having 10% of their consultations sampled weekly for the following 2 months. Thereafter the rates of consultation sampling are reduced to a 5% weekly baseline sample for clinicians whose practice has not triggered additional concerns. Concerns over an individual clinician’s practice, either via peer-review team findings, or patient complaints lead to a greater proportion of consultations to be sampled at each peer-review interval. For example, low-level concerns may trigger 15% of consultations to be reviewed for a trial period, and greater concerns may lead to a higher level of case monitoring (25%-100% at governance team discretion), or a pause in clinical contact whilst performance concerns were further investigated.

**Peer-review**
The peer-review team members are experienced out-of-hours general practice clinicians who work within the out-of-hours general practice service and are selected and trained for this purpose with regular, protected, paid time to perform this function.

Peer-reviewers are individually allocated a random sample of clinician cases to review via the online, secure, Clinical Guardian software platform.\(^1\) This software acts as a tool with which to undertake the peer-review process and a means of communicating and storing feedback to clinicians.

The initial reviews of sampled consultations are used as a screening process to decide whether or not a case “passes” or requires further assessment at a consensus peer-review meeting. Peer-reviewers specifically assess clinician cases against criteria based on the Royal College of General Practitioners Urgent and Emergency Care Clinical Audit Toolkit,\(^2\) reviewing domains of history taking, appropriateness of assessment, formulation, demonstration of empowering behaviour, prescribing, safety netting and the adequacy of record keeping. This allows a large number of cases to be reviewed for signs of unwarranted variation in practice, and to escalate only the cases most in need of additional attention to consensus peer-review team meetings. Where cases are assessed by individual peer-reviewers to have “passed,” reviewers are encouraged to give positive feedback. Constructive feedback which clinicians may perceive as challenging is given following consensus peer-review.
Consensus peer-review meetings occur at regular intervals. It is intended that three auditors would be present for the meeting to be quorate. This allows both a consensus decision regarding the appropriateness of actions taken by a clinician, and to ensure corporate, rather than individual feedback to a clinician on their practice. If necessary, telephone consultation audio recordings may be reviewed to as part of this process to gain additional information to inform the assessment.

Feedback to clinicians is communicated via the Clinical Guardian secure online software platform, unless the peer-review team feel there is a reason why this should be done by telephone or face to face. Clinicians are encouraged to reply to feedback through the Clinical Guardian system to improve learning and promote a positive learning culture. The Clinical Guardian software stores records of peer-review interactions and scores for the future use of clinicians and the peer-review team.

Following a case review in the consensus peer-review team meeting, clinicians’ risk status is reassessed by the peer-review team for future case sampling. Continuous modification of clinicians’ risk-status on the basis of their performance creates a feedback mechanism to focus the finite peer-review resource where it is most needed.
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**SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENT 2: INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDES**

**Interview topic guide:**

**Clinicians subject to peer review**

1. **Introduction**
   - Thank for time
   - Introduction to interviewer
   - Introduction to Clinical Guardian (CG)
   - Explain
     - Purpose of CG evaluation
     - Why participant invited
     - Optional participation, may withdraw consent at any time. Rights to access, change or move my information are limited, as my information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
     - Interview length, recording, transcription, anonymised analysis
     - £40 voucher as gift for time
     - Confidentiality and anonymity
     - Benefits and risks to participant
     - Funding source
     - Ethical approval
   - Invite questions

2. **Consent**
   - Participant to confirm:
     - Understand study as summarised, and described fully in patient information sheet previously emailed to participant
     - Has had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have these satisfactorily answered.
     - I understand participation is voluntary and participants are free to withdraw at any time. I understand that rights to access, change or move information are limited, as information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
     - Agrees to being audio recorded during the interview for this study and anonymised quotations from these recordings being used in publications and reports.
     - I understand that the information I give will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purposes of this study. My consent depends on the University of Bristol complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act
     - I understand that my anonymised research data will be stored for 7 years, and consent to the sharing of this data for further health research purposes following assessment of the justification and quality of the proposed work by members of the study team.
     - Agrees to take part in study

3. **Utility, acceptability and improvement**
   - How many times have you received feedback from CG?
   - How does it feel to get feedback?
     - How could it be improved?
   - How useful is CG feedback?
     - How could it be improved?
   - What do you think of CG overall?
     - Why?
How could it be improved?
- To what extent do you think CG has a role in:
  - Patient safety?
  - Quality of care?
  - Clinician learning?
  - Identifying clinicians in need of support?

4. Future applications
- Do you think CG has a potential role in “in-hours” general practice?
- What aspects of ‘in-hours” general practice do you think could benefit?
- How do you think clinicians would feel about their consultations being reviewed by a CG like system in “in-hours” general practice?
- What might make doctors more likely to engage in this?
  - Await responses, then:
    a. How do you think they would respond to badging/certification?
    b. How do you think they would respond to a potential reduction in indemnity?

5. Debrief
- Do you have any final comments or questions?
- Thank for taking the time to participate in study
- Would you like to be informed of the study outcome?
- Feel free to contact the study team at any time
- END RECORDING
- Arrange giving voucher to study participant (via email)

**Interview topic guide:**

**Peer Review Team Members**

1. Introduction
- Thank for time
- Introduction to interviewer
- Introduction to Clinical Guardian (CG)
- Explain
  - Purpose of CG evaluation
  - Why participant invited
  - Optional participation, may withdraw consent at any time. Rights to access, change or move my information are limited, as my information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
  - Interview length, recording, transcription, anonymised analysis
  - £40 voucher as gift for time
  - Confidentiality and anonymity
  - Benefits and risks to participant
  - Funding source
  - Ethical approval
- Invite questions

2. Consent
- Participant to confirm:
  - Understand study as summarised, and described fully in patient information sheet previously emailed to participant
Has had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have these satisfactorily answered.
I understand participation is voluntary and participants are free to withdraw at any time. I understand that rights to access, change or move information are limited, as information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
Agrees to being audio recorded during the interview for this study and anonymised quotations from these recordings being used in publications and reports.
I understand that the information I give will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purposes of this study. My consent depends on the University of Bristol complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act.
Agrees to take part in study.

3. Utility, acceptability and improvement
- How acceptable do you think clinicians find getting feedback from CG?
  - How could it be improved?
  - Is the CG team able to give honest feedback to clinicians?
  - To what extent do you think independence is a challenge for the peer review team when:
    - Assessing clinicians that are known to CG panel members
    - Reporting incidents that might have a negative impact for the organisation?
- How useful do you think clinicians find CG feedback?
  - How could it be improved?
- What do you think of CG overall?
  - How could it be improved?
- To what extent do you think CG has a role in:
  - Patient safety? examples?
  - Quality of care? examples?
  - Clinician learning? examples?
  - Identifying clinicians in need of support? examples?
- What do you think of its cost effectiveness?

4. Future applications
- Do you think CG has a potential role in “in-hours” general practice?
- What aspects of “in-hours” general practice do you think could benefit?
- How do you think doctors would feel about their consultations being reviewed by a CG like system in “in-hours” general practice?
- What might make doctors more likely to engage in this?
  - Await responses, then:
    a. How do you think they would respond to badging/certification?
    b. How do you think they would respond to a potential reduction in indemnity?

5. Debrief
- Do you have any final comments or questions?
- Thank for taking the time to participate in study
- Would you like to be kept updated of the study outcomes?
- Feel free to contact the study team at any time
- END RECORDING
- Arrange giving voucher to study participant (via email)
Interview topic guide: 
Senior Management Team Members

1. Introduction
- Thank for time
- Introduction to interviewer
- Introduction to Clinical Guardian (CG)
- Explain
  - Purpose of CG evaluation
  - Why participant invited
  - Optional participation, may withdraw consent at any time. Rights to access, change or move my information are limited, as my information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
  - Interview length, recording, transcription, anonymised analysis
  - £40 voucher as gift for time
  - Confidentiality and anonymity
  - Benefits and risks to participant
  - Funding source
  - Ethical approval
- Invite questions

2. Consent
- Participant to confirm:
  - Understand study as summarised, and described fully in patient information sheet previously emailed to participant
  - Has had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have these satisfactorily answered.
  - I understand participation is voluntary and participants are free to withdraw at any time. I understand that rights to access, change or move information are limited, as information is managed in specific ways in order for the research to be reliable and accurate.
  - Agrees to being audio recorded during the interview for this study and anonymised quotations from these recordings being used in publications and reports.
  - I understand that the information I give will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purposes of this study. My consent depends on the University of Bristol complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act
  - Agrees to take part in study

3. Utility, acceptability and improvement
- How acceptable do you think clinicians find getting feedback from CG?
  - How could it be improved?
  - Is the CG team able to give honest feedback to clinicians?
  - To what extent do you think independence a challenge for the peer review team when:
    - Assessing doctors that are known to CG panel members
    - Reporting incidents that might have a negative impact for the organisation?
- How useful do you think clinicians find CG feedback?
  - How could it be improved?
- What do you think of CG overall?
  - How could it be improved?
- To what extent do you think CG has a role in:
  - Patient safety? examples?
4. Future applications
- Do you think CG has a potential role in “in-hours” general practice?
- What aspects of “in-hours” general practice do you think could benefit?
- How do you think clinicians would feel about their consultations being reviewed by a CG like system in "in-hours" general practice?
- What might make doctors more likely to engage in this?
  - Await responses, then:
    a. How do you think they would respond to badging/certification?
    b. How do you think they would respond to a potential reduction in indemnity?

5. Debrief
- Do you have any final comments or questions?
- Thank for taking the time to participate in study
- Would you like to be kept updated of the study outcomes?
- Feel free to contact the study team at any time
- END RECORDING
- Arrange giving voucher to study participant (via email)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Frequency of feedback from CG</td>
<td>Comments relating to the frequency of feedback from clinical guardian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Existing feedback in General Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Adequacy of feedback in GP</td>
<td>Views on adequacy of existing feedback for clinicians in general practice outside of the CG intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Reasons for current levels of feedback</td>
<td>Explanations given for current levels of feedback outside of the CG intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Impact of Clinical Guardian (CG) on feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Impact of CG on feedback levels</td>
<td>Comments relating to the effect of CG on feedback quality and frequency and reasons for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Impact of CG feedback on clinician learning and practice</td>
<td>Observations on the effect of CG feedback on clinician learning and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Impact of CG on clinician satisfaction</td>
<td>Views on the effect of CG on clinician satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Factors affecting usefulness of Clinical Guardian (CG) feedback</td>
<td>Observations relating to how quality of feedback may affect the usefulness of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Quality of feedback</td>
<td>Observations relating to how the previous experience of the clinician assessed by CG may affect the usefulness of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Clinician experience</td>
<td>Observations relating to how the previous experience of the clinician assessed by CG may affect the usefulness of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Clinician activation</td>
<td>Observations relating to how the level of activation (motivation to improve/engage) affects the usefulness of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Feedback ownership</td>
<td>Observations relating to how feedback ownership can affect the usefulness of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Existing methods of ensuring and evidencing clinician competence in general practice</td>
<td>Observations on the adequacy of existing methods for ensuring clinician competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Adequacy of existing methods of ensuring and evidencing clinician competence</td>
<td>Observations on the adequacy of existing methods for ensuring clinician competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Impact of Clinical Guardian (CG) on ensuring and evidencing clinician competence</td>
<td>Observations regarding how CG impacts on existing quality assurance mechanisms such as appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Impact of CG on existing quality assurance mechanisms</td>
<td>Observations regarding how CG impacts on existing quality assurance mechanisms such as appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Observations regarding the impact of CG on accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Benchmarking</td>
<td>Views on how CG affects the ability of clinicians to benchmark their practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Standardisation of documentation</td>
<td>Observations regarding the impact of CG on clinical documentation standardisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Standardisation of clinical governance</td>
<td>Observations regarding the impact of CG on clinical governance standardisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Identification of clinicians in need of support</td>
<td>Views on the impact of CG on identification of clinicians in need of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Impact of Clinical Guardian (CG) on organisational quality and safety assurance</td>
<td>Views on the impact of CG on organisational learning culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Organisational learning culture</td>
<td>Views on the impact of CG on organisational learning culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>External value</td>
<td>Comments relating to the external value of CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Patient safety</td>
<td>Observations on the impact of CG on patient safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Quality of care</td>
<td>Views on the impact of CG on quality of care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>