



Continuity of Care Evaluation: The View of Patients and Professionals about Urban Family Physician Program

Vahid Kohpeima Jahromi^{1,2}, Mohammad Hossein Mehrolhassani³, Reza Dehnavieh⁴, Hosein Saberi Anari⁵

¹Department of Health Policy, Management and Economics, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran, ²Health Services Management Research Center, Institute for Futures Studies in Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran, ³Social Determinants of Health Research Center, Institute for Futures Studies in Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran, ⁴Medical Informatics Research Center, Institute for Futures Studies in Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran, ⁵Modeling in Health Research Center, Institute for Futures Studies in Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran

Correspondence to:

Prof. Reza Dehnavieh, Department of Health Policy, Management and Economics, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Haft Bagh Highway, Kerman, Iran. E-mail: rdehnavi@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Jahromi VK, Mehrolhassani MH, Dehnavieh R, Anari HS. Continuity of care evaluation: The view of patients and professionals about urban family physician program. *Int J Prev Med* 2017;8:7.

ABSTRACT

Background: A responsibility of the family physician (FP) and one of the four aspects of the delivery of primary care services is continuity of care (COC). This study aimed to determine the COC of health care in urban health centers.

Methods: Between September 2015 and March 2016, we conducted a cross-sectional study using Primary Care Evaluation Tool questionnaires with multistage stratified cluster sample of FPs ($n = 141$) and patients ($n = 710$) in two provinces in Iran, Fars and Mazandaran. The questionnaires contained essential dimensions of COC: Informational, interpersonal, and longitudinal COC.

Results: Almost all FPs had a computer. The FPs hadn't kept their patients' medical records routinely. The software had some problems, so the FPs couldn't produce lists of patients based on their health risk and they couldn't monitor their population. Almost 88% of FPs have written referral letters for all referred patients but 57% of them got medical feedback from specialists. About 80% of patients' consultation times were up to 10 min. 29% of FPs knew the past problems and illnesses of the patients. From 40% to 50% of the patients stated that their FPs asked them for their desire about prescribed medicine and gave clear explanation about their illnesses. On average, patients visited their doctor 5.5 times during the previous year. Generally, patients and FPs in Mazandaran could summarize their experiences better than Fars in most topics of COC.

Conclusions: It seems that after 3 years of using urban FP program in two pilot provinces, there were still some problems in COC. Strengthen software program, introducing incentives for FPs, and promoting patients' responsibility can be used by policy-makers when they seek to enhance COC.

Keywords: Continuity of care, family physician, Iran, Primary Care Evaluation Tool

Access this article online

Quick Response Code:



Website: www.ijpvmjournal.net/www.ijpm.ir

DOI:
10.4103/2008-7802.200525

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: reprints@medknow.com

INTRODUCTION

A responsibility of the family physician (FP) and one of the four aspects of the delivery of primary care services is continuity of care (COC).^[1-3] A good COC has been reported to be associated with increased use of preventive health services,^[4,5] fewer hospitalization rate, fewer emergency department visit, and improved health care outcome.^[6] In addition, numerous studies examined its effect to prevent several chronic diseases,^[7] positive consequences in weight control, diabetes,^[8] and their mortality.^[9] Several additional studies have proved that better COC is associated with improved patient-physician relationship, patient satisfaction,^[10] physician satisfaction and reduced health care cost.^[11,12]

The concept of COC is the “follow up from one visit to the next”^[3] and it consists of various elements including informational, interpersonal, longitudinal, management, family, and geographic COC.^[13,14] Each of these topics, is valued depends on the studied fields of healthcare. For FPs, “continuity implies a longitudinal relationship between patients and those who care for them that transcends multiple illness episodes and includes responsibility for preventive care and care coordination.”^[13] Therefore, having a FP that involve in caring patients with their values and history can lead to prevent clinical problems; moreover, a permanent FP, that accumulates information of the patients and their family needs; can improve the quality of care and their health outcome.

From this mentioned definition and the World Health Organization (WHO) definition,^[3] the first three dimensions in FP can be distinguished [Table 1]. Therefore, any experiences in evaluation of FP program (FPP) with COC need to measure these three dimensions. Although, the measurement of COC is difficult,^[15] but these dimensions are captured by the WHO using various tools in many countries.^[16,17]

In a previous study in Iran, COC was one of the weak points of primary health center (PHC) in urban areas. In that study, low patient satisfaction, low caregivers trust and change of physicians in any visits had led to weak

COC.^[18] Changing in Iran health care during the past decade from PHC to FP enabled patients to choose and remain with a FP which can improve COC. So, concerns have been raised regarding the evaluation of COC in the urban FPP (UFPP) reform. This case is becoming more important in Iran where UFPP is restricted into the pilot stage,^[19] the future of FP looks unclear, no longitudinal evaluation has been conducted,^[20] and the policymakers demand evidences of the reform progress. So, the evaluation of COC can provide valuable information about current reform services. The study aimed to determine the COC of patient care in UFPP in two pilot provinces in Iran. To achieve this aim, we used a presentable WHO framework with getting views of both patients and providers to insure that COC indicators are relevant and can cover all key topics properly.

METHODS

Study setting and selection criteria

This cross-sectional study was conducted between September 2015 and March 2016 in two provinces in Iran, including Fars and Mazandaran. The two selected provinces began the UFPP as a pilot project in cities with more than 20,000 inhabits. Fars province is situated in South with three medical universities and Mazandaran province is situated in North with two medical universities. They have a population of 7,600,000 which is about 10% of Iran population. A multistage stratified cluster sampling strategy was employed based on the cities that implemented the UFPP and lists of active FPs in Fars and Mazandaran provinces provided by the related University of Medical Sciences. The lists had the names of doctors in both public and private health centers. In the case of absence, the next FP on the list was included. The estimated required sample size for FPs was 141 considering an effect size of 15%, a confidence level of 95%, and the critical value of 1.96 and a power of 75%. Response rate was 94% (distributed: 150, completed: 141). To increase the response rate, one of the researchers (VKJ) traveled to these two provinces and visited the urban health centers for FPs questionnaires. For the patients, the sample size was

Table 1: Types of continuity of care and tools used for measurement

| Types of COC | Description | Measurement tools |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Informational | Availability of accurate patients' information to providers throughout a healthcare system | Medical record keeping of patients Computerization of the practice Communication between FP and other physicians |
| Interpersonal (relational) | Ongoing personal relationship between the patient and the care provider | Seeing the same FP at each visit Time of consultation Patients' satisfaction |
| Longitudinal | Care provided to a patient over time | Length of time that patients have been with their FP Visiting rate in a year |

COC=Continuity of care, FP=Family physician

calculated as 710 considering an effect size of 7%. It was decided to complete for five patients of each selected FPs in two provinces. From the 900 distributed questionnaires, 710 completed questionnaires were returned (response rate was 78%). The personnel working in the practices/centers asked patients to cooperate with the survey and complete the questionnaire. For both questionnaires, the actual response rate covered our required sample size.

Data collection and measurement tool

The Primary Care Evaluation Tool (PCET) that consists of two questionnaires, was used to examine both FP's views and patients' experiences. These two questionnaires were introduced from the Regional Office for Europe of the WHO and the Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research (NIVEL).^[3] PCET encompasses the four key characteristics of a good PHC system that are parts of service delivery: continuity, accessibility, comprehensiveness, and coordination. To assess the COC, we applied the continuity section. The questionnaires were prestructured with precoded answers. The survey approach implies that results related to both studied groups show their self-reported experiences. The FP questionnaire contained 18 items and patient questionnaire contained 27 items on essential dimensions of COC. Both questionnaires made the close-ended questions started by demographic part.

Validity and reliability of measurement tools

After the questionnaires were taken from NIVEL via the WHO Representative Office in Iran, validity and reliability were explored with cooperation of the Institute for Future Studies in Health. The questionnaires were translated from the English version to Persian. The validity of the content was explored by experts including the faculty members of healthcare management, policy-makers, officials, FPs and national experts. The tools were discussed by the experts and successfully tested in pilot survey in both provinces. The main content of the tools didn't change. Based on the pilot survey and the extensive feedback given from the experts, changes have been made to the tools and the reliability and the validity were approved. The reliability of the both instruments were high (Cronbach's alpha = 0.82 for FP questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha = 0.88 for patient questionnaire).

Data analysis

The data were entered in the computer using the IBM-SPSS 20 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). Descriptive statistics were computed using PCET guideline. The Chi-square test was used to determine the significant differences of categorical variables, and the Student's *t*-test was used for continuous variables. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. We calculated the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the scales with the software.

Ethical consideration

FPs and patients were asked to complete the questionnaires anonymously. This study was accepted by university authorities in studied provinces.

RESULTS

Respondents' characteristics

The survey included 141 FPs (87 in Fars and 54 in Mazandaran). Sixty-six percent of the FPs were male. The average age was 46.7 (standard deviation [SD] = 8.6). Since FPP was started 3 years ago, FPs' experiences as family doctor was 2.8 years and their experiences as general practitioner were 14.9 years. Almost 58% of FPs worked in private practice (67% in Mazandaran and 43% in Fars). In both provinces, few FPs were state employed (17%). Only 24% of them had followed any FP formal training [Table 2]. The total number of patients was 710 (431 in Fars and 279 in Mazandaran). The average age of the attending patients was 38 (SD = 15.5). In total, about 70% of patients were women. 47.5% and 43% of patients in Fars and Mazandaran provinces had academic education, respectively. In two regions, 44% of patients who filled in the questionnaires were employee. Only a few respondents were unemployed (7%), retirees (6%) or unable to work (1.3%). Almost half of the patients were living with their spouse and their children. All of the patients were Muslim [Table 2].

Informational continuity

Clinical record keeping, using the software program and computer, and capacity to obtain health information and analyze them, referral, etc., are requirements for COC. Patients' records were well kept in the Mazandaran by FPs and regional differences were obvious [Table 3]. Computer was usually used in both provinces but there was no software program (43.3%) or it had poor capability (31.9%). Fewer FPs in Fars find that lists of patients by diagnosis or health risk could easily be made by their current record system. Almost 88% of FPs declared that they have written referral letters for all referred patients but 57% of them got medical feedback from specialists.

Interpersonal continuity

This part is about patients' evaluations of their FPs competence: Medical, communication, information skills; the patients' trust and confidence. Therefore, Table 4 includes topics of patients' perception for a patient-physician relationship. Time of consultation was no more than 5 min for one-third of respondents. This time was different within provinces. About 80% of patients' consultation times were up to 10 min. A few FPs were familiar with patients' personal situations. Findings also indicated that 29% of FPs knew the past problems and illnesses of the patients. Most patients were satisfied

Table 2: Characteristics of respondents in Fars and Mazandaran provinces

| Respondent | Item | Amount or n (%) | | P |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------|--------|
| | | Fars (n=87) | Mazandaran (n=54) | |
| FPs (n=141) | Age (year) | 47.2±8.6 | 45.9±8.5 | 0.4 |
| | Experience (year) | | | |
| | Mean of working as GP | 15.9±7.3 | 13.2±0.6 | 0.04 |
| | Mean of working as FP | 3±6.4 | 2.5±1.1 | <0.001 |
| | Gender | | | |
| | Male | 59 (68) | 34 (63) | 0.5 |
| | Female | 28 (32) | 20 (37) | |
| | Employment status | | | |
| | Employed by the state | 13 (15) | 11 (20) | 0.3 |
| | Independent/self-employed | 36 (41) | 21 (39) | |
| | Contract with insurance organization | 21 (24) | 15 (28) | |
| | Contract with medical university | 17 (20) | 7 (13) | |
| | Postgraduate training or retraining course | | | |
| | Completed the postgraduate training | 1 (1) | 3 (6) | 0.5 |
| | Still following postgraduate training | 9 (10) | 1 (2) | |
| | Completed a retraining program | 16 (18) | 8 (14) | |
| | No training | 61 (71) | 42 (78) | |
| | Area of employment | | | |
| | Private practice | 37 (43) | 36 (67) | 0.7 |
| | Private clinics | 21 (24) | 7 (13) | |
| Public health center | 29 (33) | 11 (20) | | |
| Respondent | Item | Fars (n=431) | Mazandaran (n=279) | P |
| Patients (n=710) | Age (year) | 37.1±17 | 39.4±12.7 | 0.05 |
| | Gender | | | |
| | Male | 111 (26) | 113 (40.5) | <0.001 |
| | Female | 320 (74) | 166 (59.5) | |
| | Education | | | |
| | Literate/primary school | 35 (10) | 24 (11) | 0.3 |
| | Secondary school | 27 (7.5) | 45 (21) | |
| | High school | 126 (35) | 53 (25) | |
| | Higher education/university | 171 (47.5) | 91 (43) | |
| | Occupation | | | |
| | In school | 52 (12) | 9 (3) | 0.5 |
| | Unable to work | 7 (1.5) | 2 (0.5) | |
| | Employee | 174 (40.5) | 142 (51) | |
| | Retired | 29 (6.5) | 14 (5) | |
| | Looking for job | 36 (8.5) | 15 (5.5) | |
| | Other | 133 (31) | 97 (35) | |
| | Living situation | | | |
| Alone | 21 (5) | 7 (2.5) | 0.001 | |
| With parents | 102 (23.5) | 33 (12) | | |
| With husband/wife | 94 (22) | 74 (26.5) | | |
| With family (include children) | 194 (45) | 162 (58) | | |
| Other | 20 (4.5) | 3 (1) | | |

Variables were expressed as mean±SD and frequency (%). FP=Family physician, GP=General practitioner, SD=Standard deviation

with a way that their FPs treated them. But also from 40% to 50% of the patients stated that the FPs asked them for their desire about prescribed medicine and gave clear explanation about their illnesses. Only a few FPs

would visit the patients at home if they were asked for it. Generally, patients in Mazandaran could summarize their experiences better than Fars in all topics of interpersonal continuity.

Table 3: Availability and use of clinical information and computers by family physicians

| Topics | Fars (n=87), n (%) | Mazandaran (n=54), n (%) | Total (n=141), n (%) | P* |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Keeping patients' medical records | | | | |
| Routinely of all patient contacts | 33 (61.1) | 11 (12.6) | 44 (31.2) | <0.001 |
| Unless it is too busy | 4 (7.4) | 29 (33.3) | 33 (23.4) | |
| For frequent patients only | 0 | 10 (11.5) | 10 (7.1) | |
| Except for minor or trivial complaints and illnesses | 13 (24.1) | 20 (23) | 33 (23.4) | |
| Not keeping | 4 (7.4) | 17 (19.5) | 21 (14.9) | |
| Having software program for medical records | | | | |
| With appropriate capability | 17 (31.5) | 18 (20.7) | 35 (24.8) | 0.2 |
| With poor capability | 14 (25.9) | 31 (35.6) | 45 (31.9) | |
| Not having (not need) | 23 (42.6) | 38 (43.6) | 61 (43.3) | |
| Using the computer for | | | | |
| Booking appointments | 3 (3.4) | 0 | 3 (1.5) | 0.003 |
| Writing bills/financial administration | 4 (4.5) | 7 (6.1) | 11 (5.4) | |
| Prescription of medicines | 8 (9) | 3 (2.6) | 11 (5.4) | |
| Keeping medical records | 32 (36) | 45 (39.1) | 77 (37.7) | |
| Writing referral letters | 3 (3.4) | 3 (2.6) | 6 (2.9) | |
| Searching information | 39 (43.8) | 50 (43.5) | 89 (43.6) | |
| Not using | 0 | 7 (6.1) | 7 (3.4) | |
| Easy to generate a list of patients by diagnosis or health risk | 31 (57.4) | 9 (10.3) | 40 (28.4) | <0.001 |
| Referral letters for all or most referred patients to specialists | 48 (90.6) | 72 (86.7) | 120 (88.2) | 0.4 |
| Medical feedback (almost) always from specialists | 42 (79.2) | 38 (43.7) | 80 (57) | 0.001 |

Values were expressed as frequency (%). *The categorical variables were compared by Chi-square test

Table 4: Patients' experiences with their family physicians

| Patients' experiences | Fars (n=431), n (%) | Mazandaran (n=279), n (%) | Total (n=710), n (%) | P** |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| I see the same FP at each visit | 292 (70) | 211 (80) | 503 (74) | <0.001 |
| Estimated duration of a consultation (min) | | | | |
| Up to 5 | 193 (45) | 55 (20) | 248 (35) | <0.001 |
| 6-10 | 165 (38) | 148 (53) | 313 (44) | |
| 11-15 | 48 (11) | 51 (18) | 99 (14) | |
| > 15 | 25 (6) | 25 (9) | 50 (7) | |
| My FP knows my personal situation (e.g., work or home situation)* | 64 (15) | 71 (25.5) | 135 (19) | <0.001 |
| My FP knows the problems and illnesses that I had in the past* | 107 (25) | 98 (35) | 205 (29) | 0.009 |
| My FP takes sufficient time to talk to me* | 169 (39) | 159 (57) | 328 (46) | <0.001 |
| My FP listens well to me* | 210 (49) | 183 (66) | 393 (55) | <0.001 |
| My FP respects me* | 302 (70) | 200 (72) | 502 (71) | 0.1 |
| My FP not just deals with medical problems but can also help with personal problems and worries* | 82 (19) | 85 (30) | 167 (24) | <0.001 |
| My FP gives clear explanation about my illnesses and prescribed medicines* | 181 (42) | 176 (63) | 357 (50) | <0.001 |
| My FP asks for my desires and habits about my prescribed medicines* | 142 (33) | 149 (53) | 291 (41) | <0.001 |
| My FP would visit me at home if I would ask for it* | 29 (7) | 31 (11) | 60 (8.5) | <0.001 |
| After a visit to my FP, I feel able to cope better with my health problem* | 131 (30) | 133 (48) | 264 (37) | <0.001 |
| When I have a new health problem, I go to my FP before going to a specialist* | 218 (51) | 171 (61) | 389 (55) | 0.002 |

Values were expressed as frequency (%). *Numbers and percentages refer to those answering "yes, I agree" (yes, I agree, I agree somewhat, I don't agree, I don't now), **The categorical variables were compared by Chi-square test. FP=Family physician

Longitudinal continuity

Because the FPP has been introduced recently (2013) in the two provinces, length of registration time with an FP was a relatively short time. On average, patients visited their doctors 5.5 times (SD = 6.7) and visited the health care team three times (SD = 3.7) in a year. The averages in Mazandaran were slightly higher than in Fars [Table 5]. In both provinces, the frequency of visits with FP was higher than the frequency of visits with health care team. About 23% reported no annual visits with health care team and there was a significant difference in this range between two studied provinces (34% in Fars, 7% in Mazandaran).

DISCUSSION

This is one of the first studies that evaluate FPs and patients' experience of COC in UFPP. While previous study has reported poor COC received by patients with different socioeconomic background in urban areas, it seems that after 3 years of using UFPP, there were still some problems in informational, interpersonal, and longitudinal nature of COC.

For more than a decade there has been agreement about potential benefits in continuous connectivity between physician and patients with Information Technology (IT). IT can help health organizations for achieving informational continuity. Continuous patient-physician connectivity is recognized to be of

great value for physicians, patients and their families, and health organizations.^[21] Also, it was beneficial to chronic patients and their prevention plans.^[11] A systematic review identified, the information transfer during patients' visits is an important feature of COC.^[22] Another aspect of informational COC is information flow through levels of care. The FPs are centrally involved in establishing the information flow across COC. In our study, routinely keeping patients' medical records and using software program is not in good condition in the health centers but there is a good condition in information flow between the primary and secondary levels of health care through referral systems. It was positive that almost all FPs were working with computer. However, the problem was lack of appropriate software for using computers properly. With an application software, the FPs can produce lists of patients based on their health risk and monitor their population for preparing preventive activities.^[3] Lastly, the results indicated that the majority of medical record keeping and communications can be done by FPs with papers not IT. Despite the rising desire to shift to computerized medical record keeping in health systems, it looks the UFPP implementers didn't figure on it as mentioned in a previous study.^[23] Coordinating role of the FP can be enhanced if clear reporting rules are introduced and link it to the new software. In referral system process, it seems that with the implementation of the UFPP, medical feedback from specialist hasn't changed compared to previous studied in Iran.^[24,25]

Table 5: Duration and intensity of patient-provider affiliation

| Topics | Amount or n (%) | | | P* |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| | Fars (n=431) | Mazandaran (n=279) | Total (n=710) | |
| Length of time as a patient with this FP (year) | | | | |
| <1 | 75 (17.4) | 70 (25) | 145 (20.4) | <0.001 |
| 1-3 | 199 (46.2) | 165 (59) | 364 (51.3) | |
| >3 | 157 (36.4) | 44 (16) | 201 (28.3) | |
| Patients' frequency of visits with FP in a year | | | | |
| No visit | 13 (3) | 3 (1) | 16 (2) | 0.5 |
| 1-3 | 191 (44.3) | 108 (39) | 299 (42) | |
| 4-6 | 143 (33.2) | 102 (36.5) | 245 (34) | |
| 7-9 | 23 (5.3) | 18 (6.5) | 41 (6) | |
| 10-13 | 35 (8) | 34 (12) | 69 (10) | |
| >13 | 26 (6) | 14 (5) | 40 (6) | |
| Average visit in a year with FP | 5.3±7.5 (0-100) | 5.7±6.2 (0-56) | 5.5±7 (0-100) | 0.2 |
| Patients' frequency of visits with health care team in a year | | | | |
| No visit | 146 (34) | 19 (7) | 165 (23) | <0.001 |
| 1-3 | 212 (49) | 197 (70.5) | 409 (58) | |
| 4-6 | 40 (9.2) | 34 (12) | 74 (10.5) | |
| 7-9 | 11 (2.6) | 14 (5) | 25 (3.5) | |
| 10-13 | 11 (2.6) | 4 (1.5) | 15 (2) | |
| >13 | 11 (2.6) | 11 (4) | 22 (3) | |
| Average visit in a year with health care team | 2.5±3.2 (0-30) | 3.6±3.8 (0-30) | 3±3.4 (0-30) | <0.001 |

Values were expressed as frequency (%) and mean±SD (minimum-maximum). *The continuous variables were compared by Student's t-test. FP=Family physician, SD=Standard deviation

Many surveyors have been making great efforts to show the importance of interpersonal COC. COC per se influenced patient perception of physician knowledge and competence.^[26] Also, some surveys clarified an association between patient satisfaction, improved preventive care and interpersonal COC.^[15] In this study, patients have completed their treatment with their own doctors and FPs respected them. Patients that completed their treatment with one FP is more likely to be satisfied with their care than who received care from more than one FP as stated by Beattie *et al.*^[27] Patients weren't, however, satisfied with their physicians' social and communication skills and treatment provided. Moreover, most patients described the relationship with their FPs without any trust and confidence. This issue reported by Honarvar *et al.* as the main causes of dissatisfaction toward UFPP.^[28] Furthermore, the interpersonal aspects in Russia and Turkey; as neighboring countries; have had a better situation.^[3,29] The study also showed FPs didn't take sufficient time for their patients. The short consultation time maybe because of high patient visits in UFPP.^[23] In addition, FPs usually didn't know about the problems and illnesses that their patients had in the past that maybe due to the fragile medical record keeping and the software mentioned above. Patients also weren't reserved about home visits by their FPs. Home visits by FPs can help patients satisfaction especially elderly and disabilities.^[30] Training intervention for FPs in the case of patient-physician relationship can be effective in producing patient's satisfaction and interpersonal COC in UFPP.

In the past debate, we have divided the COC as three dimensions. However, when the issue was discussed in general texts, longitudinal continuity has been taken into account. So, this part is intrinsic part of COC. In several studies, there was a significant association between increased longitudinal COC and the decreased blood pressure in hypertensive patients and decreased level of fasting blood sugar in diabetic patients.^[9,31] Longitudinal COC was recognized with two tools titled: The length of time that patients have been with their FP and visiting rate in a year. In our study, length of time that patients had been enrolled by FPs was a rather short time since UFPP had been introduced 3 years ago. Compared with many countries that implemented FFP, the average annual frequency of visits for FP and health care team was low.^[3,29] However, the indicator should be adjusted to some other variables e.g., population size and age pyramid, but patients with chronic diseases may need more visit frequency. For example, based on a systematic review by Bayliss *et al.*, a population of multiple chronic conditions in primary care with three or more visits would admitted to hospital a 3% less than others.^[32]

Unfortunately, the design of our study does not help us to understand the differentiations in COC between the

studied cities and others where the UFPP has not yet been implemented. Thus, the first policy implication of the study is the need to expand the work to the other provinces. The other implication is to highlight underlying reasons related to the results that all three COC indicators have been better situation in Mazandaran. In this case the policymakers can make better decisions about their reform. However, the literature has identified three strategies to be used by policy maker when they seek to enhance COC. The first was to strengthen IT software program. By an appropriate IT software and link it to reporting program, the coordinating role of FPs should be enhanced. The second strategy was to introduce incentives for FPs good performance by payment schemes e.g., routine electronic patient record, continuous medical education, home visit, communicate training, patients' satisfaction.^[33] The third strategy was to promoting patients' responsibility in UFPP, for instance by improving complaint system, patients' prevention and self-care process, patients' adherence to referral rules.

CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation of health care COC in Iran showed that after 3 years of using UFPP in two pilot provinces, there are still some problems in informational, interpersonal, and longitudinal COC. Therefore, the three announced strategies could lead to better COC. Lessons from this evaluation could help policymakers when they seek to enhance COC before any decision to extend UFPP to other provinces.

Acknowledgments

This article is a part of PhD thesis entitled "Analysis of implementation of UFPP in Iran" which supported by Kerman University of Medical Sciences. The authors were sincerely grateful for the Dr. Behjoo, Shiraz Medical Council director and Mr. Bagheri, expert in Mazandaran Medical University for their good partnerships.

Financial support and sponsorship

This study was financially supported by Kerman University of Medical Sciences.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

Received: 02 Jun 16 **Accepted:** 19 Dec 16

Published: 20 Feb 17

REFERENCES

1. Guthrie B, Wyke S. Personal continuity and access in UK general practice: A qualitative study of general practitioners' and patients' perceptions of when and how they matter. *BMC Fam Pract* 2006;7:11.
2. Ridd M, Shaw A, Salisbury C. Two sides of the coin – The value of personal continuity to GPs: A qualitative interview study. *Fam Pract* 2006;23:461-8.
3. Kringos DS, Boerma WG, Spaan E, Pellny M, Karakaya K. Evaluation of the Organizational Model of Primary Care in Turkey: A Survey-Based Pilot Project in Two Provinces of Turkey. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2008.

4. Parchman ML, Burge SK. The patient-physician relationship, primary care attributes, and preventive services. *Fam Med* 2004;36:22-7.
5. Atlas SJ, Grant RW, Ferris TG, Chang Y, Barry MJ. Patient-physician connectedness and quality of primary care. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;150:325-35.
6. Cheng SH, Hou YF, Chen CC. Does continuity of care matter in a health care system that lacks referral arrangements? *Health Policy Plan* 2011;26:157-62.
7. Hong JS, Kang HC, Kim J. Continuity of care for elderly patients with diabetes mellitus, hypertension, asthma, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci* 2010;25:1259-71.
8. Hsu CH, Chou YJ, Pu C. The effect of continuity of care on emergency room use for diabetic patients varies by disease severity. *J Epidemiol* 2016;26:413-9.
9. Shin DW, Cho J, Yang HK, Park JH, Lee H, Kim H, et al. Impact of continuity of care on mortality and health care costs: A nationwide cohort study in Korea. *Ann Fam Med* 2014;12:534-41.
10. Hanafi NS, Abdullah A, Lee PY, Liew SM, Chia YC, Khoo EM. Personal continuity of care in a university-based primary care practice: Impact on blood pressure control. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0134030.
11. Gray DP, Evans P, Sweeney K, Lings P, Seamark D, Seamark C, et al. Towards a theory of continuity of care. *J R Soc Med* 2003;96:160-6.
12. Hollander MJ, Kadlec H. Financial implications of the continuity of primary care. *Perm J* 2015;19:4-10.
13. Saultz JW. Defining and measuring interpersonal continuity of care. *Ann Fam Med* 2003;1:134-43.
14. Jee SH, Cabana MD. Indices for continuity of care: A systematic review of the literature. *Med Care Res Rev* 2006;63:158-88.
15. Boerma WG, Snoeijs S, Wiegers TA, Baltag V. Evaluation of the Structure and Provision of Primary Care in the Republic of Moldova: A Survey-Based Project. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2012.
16. Schultz K, Delva D, Kerr J. Emotional effects of continuity of care on family physicians and the therapeutic relationship. *Can Fam Physician* 2012;58:178-85.
17. Sohrabi MR, Albalushi RM. Clients' satisfaction with primary health care in Tehran: A cross-sectional study on Iranian Health Centers. *J Res Med Sci* 2011;16:756-62.
18. Heshmati B, Joulaei H. Iran's health-care system in transition. *Lancet* 2016;387:29-30.
19. Khayat-zadeh-Mahani A, Takian A. Family physician program in Iran: Considerations for adapting the policy in urban settings. *Arch Iran Med* 2014;17:776-8.
20. Kibbe DC, Phillips RL Jr., Green LA. The continuity of care record. *Am Fam Physician* 2004;70:1220, 1222-3.
21. Crooks VA, Agarwal G. What are the roles involved in establishing and maintaining informational continuity of care within family practice? A systematic review. *BMC Fam Pract* 2008;9:65.
22. Shirvani DN, Amiri HA, Motlagh ME, Kabir MJ, Maleki MR, Monfared AS, et al. Evaluation of the function of referral system in family physician program in Northern provinces of Iran: 2008. *J Babol Univ Med Sci* 2010;11:46-52.
23. Honarvar B, Lankarani KB, Rostami S, Honarvar F, Akbarzadeh A, Odoomi N, et al. Knowledge and practice of people toward their rights in urban family physician program: A population-based study in Shiraz, Southern Iran. *Int J Prev Med* 2015;6:46.
24. Chaman R, Amiri M, Raei DM. The national family physician and the quality of referral system. *Payesh* 2012;11:758-90.
25. Wasson JH. Primary care physician visit continuity. *J Gen Intern Med* 2009;24:142.
26. Saultz JW, Lochner J. Interpersonal continuity of care and care outcomes: A critical review. *Ann Fam Med* 2005;3:159-66.
27. Beattie P, Dowda M, Turner C, Michener L, Nelson R. Longitudinal continuity of care is associated with high patient satisfaction with physical therapy. *Phys Ther* 2005;85:1046-52.
28. Honarvar B, Lankarani KB, Ghahramani S, Akbari M, Tabrizi R, Bagheri Z, et al. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction toward urban family physician program: A population based study in Shiraz, Southern Iran. *Int J Prev Med* 2016;7:3.
29. Boerma WG, Snoeijs S, Wiegers TA, Baltag V. Evaluation of the Structure and Provision of Primary Care in Russian Federation: A Survey-Based Pilot Project in Two Rayons of Moscow Oblast. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2009.
30. Kersnik J. Determinants of customer satisfaction with the health care system, with the possibility to choose a personal physician and with a family doctor in a transition country. *Health Policy* 2001;57:155-64.
31. Parchman ML, Pugh JA, Noël PH, Larne AC. Continuity of care, self-management behaviors, and glucose control in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Med Care* 2002;40:137-44.
32. Bayliss EA, Ellis JL, Shoup JA, Zeng C, McQuillan DB, Steiner JF. Effect of continuity of care on hospital utilization for seniors with multiple medical conditions in an integrated health care system. *Ann Fam Med* 2015;13:123-9.
33. Dehnavieh R, Kalantari AR, Sirizi MJ. Urban family physician plan in Iran: challenges of implementation in Kerman. *Med J Islam Repub Iran* 2015;29:303.