

BJGP OPEN

Ideas, Concerns, Expectations and Effects on life (ICEE) in GP consultations: an observational study using video-recorded UK consultations

Edwards, Peter; Sellers, Grace Matilda; Leach, Isabel; Holt, Lydia; Ridd, Matthew; Payne, Rupert; Barnes, Rebecca Kate

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGPO.2023.0008>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 15 January 2023

Revised 24 May 2023

Accepted 31 May 2023

© 2023 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by BJGP Open. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgpopen.org/authors/bjgp-open-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

Author Accepted Manuscript

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in BJGP Open, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

Ideas, Concerns, Expectations and Effects on life (ICEE) in GP consultations: an observational study using video-recorded UK consultations

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Peter J Edwards, MRCP, MBBCh, BSc, AFHEA
NIHR Clinical Research Fellow¹
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6999-753X>

Grace M Sellers, MBChB, MChem
Foundation Year 1 Doctor²
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6089-3574>

Isabel Leach, BSc
Fourth Year Medical Student³
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8472-9119>

Lydia Holt, BA (Hons), MA, MSc, MRes
Research Associate¹ & PhD Student⁴
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6741-2611>

Matthew J Ridd, MBChB, BMedSc(Hons), DRCOG, FHEA, FRCGP, PhD
Professor of Primary Health Care¹
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7954-8823>

Rupert A Payne, MBChB PhD MRCP FRCPE FBPhS FHEA
Professor of Primary Care & Clinical Pharmacology⁵
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5842-4645>

Rebecca K Barnes, PhD, PgDip, BSc(Hons)
Honorary Senior Research Fellow¹, Associate Professor & NIHR Research Fellow⁶
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8844-7496>

Affiliations

1. Centre for Academic Primary Care, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol
2. Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
3. University of Sheffield Medical School
4. NIHR Health Protection Research Unit, University of Bristol
5. Exeter Collaboration for Academic Primary Care, University of Exeter Medical School
6. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford

Address for correspondence

Peter Edwards, Office G0.6d, Canynge Hall, 39 Whatley Road, Bristol, BS8 2PS
E-mail: peter.edwards@bristol.ac.uk

Main text word count: 2749

Number of Tables: 5 **Number of Figures:** 1

Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open - BJGPO-2023-0098

Abstract

Word count: 261

Background: Eliciting patients' Ideas, Concerns, Expectations, and whether a problem has an Effect on their life (ICEE), is a widely recommended communication technique. However, it is not known how frequently ICEE components are raised in UK GP consultations.

Aim: Assess the frequency of ICEE in routine GP consultations with adult patients and explore variables associated with ICEE.

Design and setting: Secondary analysis of face-to-face video-recorded GP consultations archive.

Method: Observational coding of 92 consultations. Associations were assessed using binomial and ordered logistic regression.

Results: Most consultations included at least one ICEE component (90.2%). The most common ICEE component per consultation was patient ideas (79.3%), followed by concerns (55.4%), expectations (51.1%) and then effects on life (42.4%). For all ICEE components, patients more commonly initiated the ICEE dialogue and in only 3 consultations (3.3%) GPs directly asked patients about their expectations.

Problems that were acute (OR 2.98, 95% confidence interval [CI]=1.36-6.53, $p=0.007$) or assessed by GPs ≥ 50 years (OR 2.10, CI=1.07-4.13, $p=0.030$) were associated with more ICEE components. Problems assessed later in the consultation (OR 0.60 per problem order increase, CI=0.41-0.87, $p=0.007$), by patients ≥ 75 years (OR 0.40, CI=0.16-0.98, $p=0.046$) and from the most deprived cohort were associated with fewer ICEE components (OR 0.39, CI=0.17-0.92, $p=0.032$). Patient ideas were associated with more patients being 'very satisfied' post-consultation (OR 10.74, CI=1.60-72.0, $p=0.014$) and the opposite was true of concerns (OR 0.14, CI=0.02-0.86, $p=0.034$).

Conclusion: ICEE components were associated with patient satisfaction and demographic variables. Further research is required to assess if the way ICEE are communicated affects these associations and other potential confounders.

How this fits in

- Eliciting patients' Ideas, Concerns, Expectations and whether their medical problem or associated treatment has an Effect on their activities of daily living (ICEE), is widely recommended in 'patient-centred' consulting. However, it is not known how often ICEE occurs in UK GP consultations, and the international evidence on whether this affects patient outcomes is mixed.
- In this study, 9-in-10 GP consultations with adult patients presenting with at least one new problem included one or more ICEE components, although it was far more common for the patient to raise an ICEE component themselves rather than the GP directly asking about them.
- There were more ICEE components mentioned for problems that were acute and assessed by older GPs, and there were less ICEE components for problems assessed later in the consultation, by patients aged ≥ 75 years and living in the most deprived neighbourhoods, compared to the least deprived.
- The voicing of patient ideas was associated with increased patient satisfaction scores, whereas the opposite was true for patient concerns.

Introduction

Contemporary evidence-based medicine involves using the best available evidence to create tailored management plans that consider individual patient preferences and values.¹ Byrne and Long's seminal work in 1976,² was one of the earliest studies to highlight the importance of discovering the patient's agenda for the visit.³

Subsequently, multiple consultation models including Pendleton's,⁴ Neighbour's,⁵ and the Calgary-Cambridge model,⁶ have described a structured approach to understanding the patient perspective within healthcare encounters. Common to all these models is exploring patients' Ideas, Concerns, and Expectations (ICE). How the condition has 'Effects' on the patient's day-to-day life is sometimes considered as an additional element of patient-centred consulting (ICEE).⁷

Initial reports suggested patient-centred consulting was associated with increased patient satisfaction.⁸ However, a 2012 Cochrane review concluded that interventions teaching clinicians patient-centred communication skills had mixed effects on satisfaction and health behaviour.⁹ One difficulty uncovered in this review was knowing which component(s) of patient-centred care were having an effect.

Additionally, patients and doctors have voiced dissatisfaction with the tick-box use of ICE.^{10, 11} This is consistent with a 2021 study conducted in Germany which found no correlation between patient-centred communication and patient satisfaction.¹²

Previous observational studies have reported on the utility of ICE in primary care consultations from Canada¹³ and Belgium.¹⁴ While exploring ICEE is considered best-practice in UK GP training,¹⁵ its frequency in practice remains unknown. This study aimed to develop a standardised framework for reporting and classifying talk about ICEE during healthcare encounters. Using this framework, we aimed to determine the frequency of ICEE in video-recorded face-to-face GP consultations, compare verbal interactions with medical records, explore factors associated with ICEE, and explore its relationship with patient satisfaction. These findings could then inform clinical practice and future research, including identifying populations less likely to communicate ICEE and how closely medical records reflect what has happened in the consultation.

Methods

Study Design

This was an observational study involving secondary analysis of a pre-existing archive of video-recorded, face-to-face UK GP consultations with linked electronic health records (EHR) and survey data.

Data

Data were obtained from the One in a Million Primary Care Consultations Archive.¹⁶ Full details of the archive are reported elsewhere.¹⁷ In brief, of 421 adult patients (≥ 18 years) invited to participate, 327 recordings of unselected routine consultations with 23 different GPs working across 12 West of England practices were obtained between 2014-15. 318 patients gave consent for their consultation data to be reused by the original research team. All consultations that included at least one 'new' (first presentation) problem were included ($n=97$). Consultations where patients were only presenting for routine health examinations or contraceptive procedures/referrals were excluded ($n=5$), leaving a total of 92 consultations. Whether patients saw their 'usual GP' and satisfaction scores were obtained from a post-consultation questionnaire. Problem categories were coded in a previous study.¹⁸

Screening for ICEE

We used Matthys' definitions of ICE,¹⁴ with minor amendments (table 1). One author screened the consultations for 'ICEE events' which were utterances that included any of the ICEE components. A low threshold for including anything that could be counted as an ICEE event was used in the screening process. All ICEE events were then reviewed by a second author and any disagreements discussed with an additional author, until consensus was reached. The EHRs for the consultation were also screened independently for evidence of ICEE by two authors, and disagreements reviewed by a senior author.

Coding

Where two or more ICEE components were mentioned in one sentence (e.g. “*I think it’s just a cyst, but I’m concerned it might be cancer*”), an ICEE event for each component was recorded. One author coded the stage of the consultation that the event took place (adapted from Byrne and Long),¹⁹ ICEE subtypes, and who initiated the event (i.e. asked by GP or volunteered by patient). Effects on activities of daily living (ADLs) were further classified into ‘basic’ (e.g. washing, eating) and more complex ‘instrumental’ ADLs (e.g. transportation, housekeeping).²⁰

Statistical Analysis

Analysis was conducted in Stata 17.0. Each problem and consultation were given an ICEE score, calculated from the number of individual components of ICEE identified (maximum 4/4).

Multilevel mixed-effects binary and ordered logistic regression were used to assess associations (see supplementary tables for details including handling of missing data) and generate odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). For ‘in-consultation’ outcome measures (ICEE scores or components, prescriptions) clusters were problems raised by the same patient nested in patients seen by the same GP. For patient satisfaction outcomes, an additional clustering of GPs from the same practice was included, as satisfaction may have been influenced by factors outside of the consultation, such as waiting room facilities. Multivariable modelling was used to adjust for covariables, and factors known to be associated with patient satisfaction.²¹

Results

Participant and consultation characteristics

A summary of participant characteristics is provided in table 2. The mean patient and GP ages were 50 years (range 18-96) and 46 years (range 32-62), respectively. There were slightly more female patients (57.6%) and GPs (56.5%). All GPs and most (87.0%) patients were 'white' ethnicity.

In the 92 consultations, 190 problems were raised, of which 58% (110/190) were new. Two of these new problems were requests for routine health checks (e.g. 'well man' check) and excluded from the 'new problem' subgroup analysis (n=108 problems). The mean number of problems raised in each consultation was 2.1 (range 1-6).

ICEE per consultation and per problem

Figure 1 and table 3 demonstrates the frequencies of ICEE components. Most consultations had at least one ICEE event 83/92 (90.2%). The most frequent ICEE component per consultation was ideas (79.3%), followed by concerns (55.4%), expectations (51.1%), and effects on life (42.4%). For every ICEE component it was more common for patients to initiate the ICEE talk, most notably for expectations, raised by patients in 48.9% of consultations and by GPs in only 3.3% of consultations. Approximately three quarters of all problems assessed had a least one ICEE component (74.2%) although this was slightly higher for new problems (82.4%).

ICEE events

A total of 487 utterances were put forward for a second reviewer opinion, with 400 events included in the final analysis (Table 4). Ideas (n=151, 37.8%) were the most common, followed by concerns (n=97, 24.3%), expectations (n=86, 21.5%) and finally effects on life (n=66, 16.5%).

Most ICEE events were initiated by the patient (n=338, 84.5%) (e.g. *"I think it's possibly to do with stress at work"*), rather than the GP (n=56, 14%) (e.g. *"Have you got any idea what it is yourself?"*). Occasionally events were raised by a third-party present in the room (n=6, 1.5%) (e.g. *"She's stopped doing her activities because*

she's constantly going to the loo”), although more frequently, patients themselves referred to a third party (n=21) (e.g. *“He said it was probably just like lactic acid or something”*).

Most ICEE events were observed in the ‘gathering information’ stage of the consultation (54.0%, Table 5). However, patient expectations – which were almost entirely initiated by the patient or a third party (83/86) - were mostly raised in the ‘treatment planning’ stage (37.2%).

Problem & consultation variables and ICEE scores

The number of problems raised in a consultation was associated with an increased overall consultation ICEE score (OR 2.09 per increase in problems raised, CI=1.33-3.29, p=0.001; model S1). Similar results were found when only patient-initiated consultation ICEE scores were included (OR 2.13, CI=1.32-3.44, p=0.002; model S2) but not for GP-initiated consultation ICEE scores (p=0.33; model S3).

The order a problem was assessed by the GP was associated with ICEE scores, with problems assessed later in the consultation having lower overall problem ICEE scores (OR 0.60 per unit increase, CI=0.41-0.87, p=0.007; model S4a). This finding was repeated for both patient-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 0.62 per unit increase, CI=0.42-0.90, p=0.011; model S5) and GP-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 0.44 per unit increase, CI=0.23-0.84, p=0.013; model S6), and when only problems from consultations containing multiple problems were analysed (OR 0.59, CI=0.40-0.88, p=0.009; model S4b)

Whether problems were new was not associated with ICEE scores, but acute problems were associated with higher overall problem ICEE scores than chronic problems (OR 2.98, CI=1.36-6.53, p=0.007; model S4a). This finding was reproduced in patient-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 2.62, CI=1.19-5.77, p=0.017; model S5) but not GP-initiated problem ICEE scores (p=0.54; model S6).

GP variables and ICEE scores

Problems assessed by GPs aged ≥ 50 years had higher overall problem ICEE scores (OR 2.10, CI=1.07-4.13, p=0.030; model S4a). Evidence for this association was

similar for GP-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 2.96, CI=1.11-7.93, $p=0.030$; model S6), but weaker for patient-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 1.90, CI=0.97-3.71, $p=0.060$; model S5). Whether patients reported they were seeing their usual GP was not associated with any ICEE scores (models S1-6).

Patient variables and ICEE scores

Patient gender and ethnicity were not associated with ICEE scores (models S1-6). Problems raised in consultation with older patients (≥ 75 years) were associated with lower overall problem ICEE scores (OR 0.40, CI=0.16-0.98, $p=0.046$; model S4a); evidence for this association was much weaker for patient-initiated ICEE scores (OR 0.50, CI=0.20-1.24, $p=0.13$; model S5), and no association was seen with GP-initiated ICEE scores ($p=0.93$; model S6). This pattern was replicated when comparing the most socioeconomically deprived group to the least for overall problem ICEE scores (OR 0.39, CI=0.17-0.92, $p=0.032$; model S4a), with only very weak evidence for patient-initiated problem ICEE scores (OR 0.49, CI=0.21-1.15, $p=0.10$; model S5) and no evidence observed for GP-initiated problem ICEE scores ($p=0.62$; model S6).

ICEE documentation & prescriptions

Despite being the least frequently raised component of ICEE, effects on life were the most frequently documented in the patient medical records (see table 3). There were no significant associations between the presence of any ICEE components and prescription frequencies for new problems (model S7).

ICEE and patient satisfaction

There were no associations between post-consultation patient satisfaction and any consultation ICEE scores (models S8-10). In multivariable modelling with each of the separate ICEE components, patient ideas were associated with increased satisfaction (OR 10.74, CI=1.60-72.0 $p=0.014$; model S11), whereas the opposite was true for concerns (OR 0.14, CI=0.02-0.86 $p=0.034$; model S11). The association of higher satisfaction remained when only patient-initiated ideas were assessed (OR 6.36, CI=1.16-34.86 $p=0.033$; model S12) but not for GP-initiated ideas ($p=0.20$; model S13). There was no association when only patient-initiated or GP-initiated concerns were analysed ($p=0.10$ and $p=0.58$, models S12-13).

Discussion

Summary

In most consultations, patients raised at least one ICEE component, most commonly ideas about the cause of their symptoms. Most ICEE events occurred in the 'gathering information' stage of the consultation. GPs initiated ICEE dialogue in less than half of the consultations, asking mostly about patient ideas and concerns but rarely about expectations. The larger the number of problems discussed in a consultation, the more likely it was for more ICEE components to be raised. Problems that were acute, assessed by older GPs, or assessed earlier in the consultation, were associated with higher ICEE scores. There was weak evidence that problems raised by older or more deprived patients had lower ICEE scores. Mentions of patients' ideas and patients' concerns were associated respectively with increased and decreased post-consultation satisfaction.

Strengths and limitations

Our screening for ICEE events was robust, with a low threshold for a second review of anything that could be an ICEE event. Using recordings and transcripts is advantageous over direct field observation¹⁴ as it allows multiple reviews of consultation content by multiple coders.

Whilst our study demonstrated associations between patient satisfaction and the presence of ideas and concerns, these results should be interpreted with caution. Firstly, all apart from one patient were satisfied or very satisfied with their consultation and one can question the relevance of comparing these two ratings. However, an interview study of patients reporting these two post-consultation scores has shown a meaningful difference akin to "acceptable" (satisfied) and "outstanding" ("very satisfied").²² Given previous research²³ has reported very similar skewed post-GP-consultation satisfaction distributions (77% 'very satisfied') we felt our dichotomous analysis of 'very satisfied' or not was appropriate for this distribution. Secondly neither association was detected when only GP-initiated ICEE components were assessed, so these associations may have been related to how ICEE were subsequently dealt with by the clinician. Thirdly, our models were limited by the

sample size available, and the development of multiple exploratory models increases the probability of producing a spuriously significant result. Most attention should be paid to the overall ICEE models rather than patient or GP initiated specific results that could be impacted by one another (e.g. if a patient has already vocalised their ideas there would be no need for GPs to directly ask this question). Finally, patient satisfaction is known to be affected by factors both within and outside the consultation, such as the helpfulness of reception staff.²⁴ Whilst adjustments for co-variables were made, there may have been additional confounding factors such as, patients' health literacy,²⁵ clinicians' 'positive approach', and display of empathy, which have been linked to increased satisfaction.²⁶

Our analysis was limited to consultations that contained at least one new problem from 23 GPs in the West of England and therefore is only reflective of a subset of GP-patient interactions. We did not find an association between ICEE scores and if patients were consulting their usual GP. However, analysis of this data was limited by almost one third of patients reported either not having a regular GP or not knowing who their regular GP was. A larger sample size is required to draw more firm conclusions on the relationship between ICEE and other patient or clinician factors.

Comparison with existing literature

Observational studies of ICEE have been reported outside of the UK. In 2005, Matthys¹⁴ reported on ICE in 613 GP-patient consultations in 36 Belgian practices. They found that in only 20% of consultations were all three ICE components expressed, compared to 34% in our study. Unlike Matthys, we did not find an association between the presence of concerns or expectations and fewer prescriptions.

In 2006, Towle¹³ examined audio-recorded consultations involving 198 patients and six family clinicians in Canada. Most ICE events occurred in the 'problem identification', rather than 'problem management' phase, consistent with our study. Although Towle found clinicians were competent at eliciting ICE, 'rarely' were all three components explicitly addressed. Clinicians reported they made a conscious decision whether to ask these questions citing a lack of time, concerns about

repetition, discomfort dealing with patients' emotional state, and that it could be equivalent to opening 'Pandora's box'.

Freilich²⁷ used questionnaires in 2015, to compare perceptions of whether ICE emerged during consultations with GPs, district nurses and physiotherapists in Sweden. Patient and GP assessments of ICE components were roughly concordant: ideas (76% patient vs 73% GP), concerns (23% vs 17%), expectations (31% vs 40%). These percentages are lower than our findings for concerns (55%) and expectations (51%) but similar for ideas (79%).

Implications for research and practice

Future studies could use patient post-consultation questionnaires to explicitly ask whether patients thought they had discussed their ICEE and whether these were adequately assessed. Likewise, a clinician post-consultation questionnaire could be used to evaluate researchers' and clinicians' concordance with respect to classifying ICEE.

Post-covid-19 pandemic, alternatives to face-to-face consultation in primary care have become more common.²⁸ This study provides a benchmark of ICEE frequencies in face-to-face consultations which could be compared to other consultation modalities.

Further research on how ICEE components are initiated and responded to, rather than just their presence, may provide deeper insights into their impact on patient outcomes. Further analysis to understand why patients in our study who mentioned their concerns were less satisfied would be helpful when training new GPs. One possible explanation is that patients voicing concerns were more anxious pre-consultation, and less easy to reassure. Another explanation could be dissatisfaction with how their concerns were subsequently addressed. The use of concise pre-consultation forms has shown promising initial results in identifying patients' concerns, enabling clinicians to pro-actively address them and improve satisfaction.²⁹

Our finding that problems assessed later in the consultation had less ICEE components raised aligns with previous research demonstrating additional problems had less safety-netting advice³⁰ and only increased consultation duration by 2 minutes per extra problem,³¹ adding to the evidence multi-problem consultations may be higher risk or less satisfactory for patients and GPs.

Finally, our finding that older GPs discussed more ICEE components per problem than their younger counterparts, contrasts with a previous study that showed that younger GPs provided more 'safety-netting advice'.¹⁸ This warrants further investigation into how routine practice is changing with time and any impacts this will have on the quality and safety of consultations.

Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open - BJGP:2023-0008

Funding

PJE's time was funded by a National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) badged GP Academic Clinical Fellow funded by Health Education England South West / Severn Postgraduate Medical Education (ACF-2018-25-502) and an NIHR In-Practice Fellowship (NIHR302692). GS and IL time was funded by the NIHR School for Primary Care Research (SPCR) on medical student summer research bursaries. MJR, and RKB received no funding related to this project. The One in a Million archive was funded by the NIHR SPCR (208) and the South West GP Trust.

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Ethical approval

NHS ethical approval was obtained for this study from the South Central Oxford C Research Ethics Committee (REC 20/SC/0383).

Competing interests

None declared.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the doctors and patients who participated in the original One in a Million study and Dr Barbara Caddick for her administrative support. The authors would also like to thank both peer reviewers, Dr Georgia Black and Dr Yasemin Hirst who contributed towards improving our manuscript.

References

1. Guyatt G, Cairns J, Churchill D, et al. Evidence-Based Medicine: A New Approach to Teaching the Practice of Medicine. *JAMA*. 1992;268(17):2420-5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1992.03490170092032>
2. Byrne PS, Long BEL. *Doctors Talking to Patients*. London: HMSO; 1976.
3. Moulton L. *The Naked Consultation: A Practical Guide to Primary Care Consultation Skills*. Oxford, UK: Radcliffe Publishing Ltd; 2007.
4. Pendleton D, Schofield T, Tate P, Havelock P. *The Consultation: An Approach to Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1984.
5. Neighbour R. *The Inner Consultation*. Lancaster: MTP Press; 1987.
6. Silverman J, Kurtz S, Draper J. *Skills for communicating with patients*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Radcliffe; 2013.
7. Thompson T, Grove L, Brown J, Buchan J, Kerry AL, Burge S. COGConnect: A new visual resource for teaching and learning effective consulting. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2021;104(8):2126-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.12.016>
8. Kinnersley P, Stott N, Peters TJ, Harvey I. The patient-centredness of consultations and outcome in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 1999;49(446):711-6.
9. Dwamena F, Holmes-Rovner M, Gauden CM, et al. Interventions for providers to promote a patient-centred approach in clinical consultations. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012(12). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD003267.pub2>
10. Snow R. I never asked to be ICE'd. *BMJ*. 2016;354:i3729. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i3729>
11. Whitaker P. Ticking the ICE box: the future of doctor-patient communication in a post-covid world. *BMJ*. 2021;373:n870. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n870>
12. Stark S, Worm L, Kluge M, Roos M, Burggraf L. The patient satisfaction in primary care consultation—Questionnaire (PIC): An instrument to assess the impact of patient-centred communication on patient satisfaction. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(7):e0254644. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254644>
13. Towle A, Godolphin W, Grams G, Lamarre A. Putting informed and shared decision making into practice. *Health Expect*. 2006;9(4):321-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2006.00404.x>
14. Matthys J, Elwyn G, Van Nuland M, et al. Patients' ideas, concerns, and expectations (ICE) in general practice: impact on prescribing. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2009;59(558):29-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp09X394833>
15. Royal college of general Practitioners. The RCGP Curriculum: The Curriculum Topic Guides. 2022. Available from: https://www.rcgp.org.uk/getmedia/16f67392-7b34-4039-9251-d8181d415273/Curriculum-Topic-Guides_26-10-22.pdf (accessed 26/04/2023)
16. Barnes RK. One in a Million: A study of primary care consultations. 2017. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5523/bris.l3sq4s0w66ln1x20sy7s47wy> (accessed 17/03/19)
17. Jepson M, Salisbury C, Ridd MJ, Metcalfe C, Garside L, Barnes RK. The 'One in a Million' study: creating a database of UK primary care consultations. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2017;67(658):e345. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp17X690521>
18. Edwards PJ, Ridd MJ, Sanderson E, Barnes RK. Safety netting in routine primary care consultations: an observational study using video-recorded UK consultations. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(689):e878. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp19X706601>
19. Edwards PJ, Ridd MJ, Sanderson E, Barnes RK. Development of a tool for coding safety-netting behaviours in primary care: a mixed-methods study using existing UK consultation recordings. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(689):e869. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp19X706589>
20. Katz S. Assessing Self-maintenance: Activities of Daily Living, Mobility, and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1983;31(12):721-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.1983.tb03391.x>

21. Forbes LJJ, Forbes H, Sutton M, Checkland K, Peckham S. Changes in patient experience associated with growth and collaboration in general practice: observational study using data from the UK GP Patient Survey. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2020;70(701):e906. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp20X713429>
22. Collins K, O’Cathain A. The continuum of patient satisfaction—from satisfied to very satisfied. *Soc Sci Med.* 2003;57(12):2465-70. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00098-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00098-4)
23. Vari MD, Mary H, Louise J, et al. Physician associates and GPs in primary care: a comparison. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2015;65(634):e344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp15X684877>
24. Paddison CAM, Abel GA, Roland MO, Elliott MN, Lyratzopoulos G, Campbell JL. Drivers of overall satisfaction with primary care: evidence from the English General Practice Patient Survey. *Health Expect.* 2015;18(5):1081-92. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12081>
25. Altin SV, Stock S. The impact of health literacy, patient-centered communication and shared decision-making on patients’ satisfaction with care received in German primary care practices. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2016;16(1):450. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-016-1693-y>
26. Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, et al. Observational study of effect of patient centredness and positive approach on outcomes of general practice consultations. *BMJ.* 2001;323(7318):908-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7318.908>
27. Freilich J, Wiking E, Nilsson GH, Olsson C. Patients’ ideas, concerns, expectations and satisfaction in primary health care – a questionnaire study of patients and health care professionals’ perspectives. *Scand J Prim Health Care.* 2019;37(4):468-75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02813432.2019.1684430>
28. Fraser C, Beech J. General practice tracker: Monitoring data on GP appointments and workforce. 2023. Available from: <https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/general-practice-tracker> (accessed 09/05/23)
29. Murphy M, Salisbury C, Scott A, Sollazzi-Davies L, Wong G. The person-based development and realist evaluation of a pre-consultation form for GP consultations [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *NIHR Open Res.* 2022;2(19). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3310/nihropenres.13249.2>
30. Edwards PJ, Bennett-Britton I, Ridd MJ, Booker M, Barnes RK. Factors affecting the documentation of spoken safety-netting advice in routine GP consultations: a cross-sectional study. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2021:BJGP.2021.0195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGP.2021.0195>
31. Salisbury C, Procter S, Stewart K, et al. The content of general practice consultations: cross-sectional study based on video recordings. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2013;63(616):e751. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp13X674431>

Tables

Table 1. ICEE Definitions

Term	Definition (Adapted from Matthys et al.)
Idea	Are the ideas of the patient about a possible diagnosis, treatment, or prognosis expressed in the consultation? <i>This may include what the patient thinks might be the cause of their symptoms.</i>
Concern	Is concern (fear/worry) of the patient about a possible diagnosis, test or therapy present in the consultation?
Expectation	Is the expectation (what the patient wants) for <i>assessment</i> , treatment, a diagnosis, or a therapy present in the consultation?
Effects on life (Not included in Matthys et al.)	<i>Does the condition / treatment have an effect on the patient's activities of daily living such as washing, dressing, shopping, working, sleeping, relationships, or similar.</i>

New additions compared to Matthys et al.¹⁴ are marked in italic font. An extended version with examples of this table is provided in Supplementary Table 1.

Table 2. Characteristics of patients and GPs

Patients (n=92)		n	%	GPs (n=23)		n	%
Patient sex				Doctor sex			
Male		39	42.4	Male		10	43.5
Female		53	57.6	Female		13	56.5
Patient age				Doctor age			
18-34		28	30.4	18-34		3	13.0
35-49		14	15.2	35-49		11	47.8
50-64		28	30.4	50-64		9	39.1
≥65		20	21.7				
Not reported		2	2.2				
IMD quintile				Doctor role			
1 st (least deprived)		24	26.1	Partner		19	82.6
2 nd		19	20.7	Salaried		4	17.4
3 rd		13	14.1				
4 th		13	14.1				
5 th (most deprived)		22	23.9				
Not reported [§]		1	1.1				
Seeing usual GP							
Yes		27	29.3				
No		22	23.9				
Not sure		2	2.2				
I don't have a regular GP		26	28.3				
Not reported		15	16.3				
Post-consultation satisfaction							
Very satisfied		63	68.5				
Satisfied		15	16.3				
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		0	0				
Dissatisfied		1	1.1				
Very dissatisfied		0	0				
Not reported		13	14.1				

IMD = Index of Multiple Deprivation. [§]from a consultation with a practice level median IMD category of 1st quintile.

Table 3. Frequency of ICEE per consultation and per problem

Consultations (n=92 total) (n=82 with EHR)	Both Patient & GP Initiated		GP Initiated		Patient* Initiated		Documented in EHR	
	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)	(n)	(%)
Idea	73	79.3	17	18.5	72	78.3	15	18.3
Concern	51	55.4	17	18.5	42	45.7	14	17.1
Expectation	47	51.1	3	3.3	45	48.9	13	15.9
Effects on life	39	42.4	13	14.1	34	37.0	20	24.4
Any	83	90.2	37	40.2	81	88.0	44	53.7
All Problems (n=190 total) (n=170 with EHR)								
Idea	91	47.9	17	8.9	88	46.3	17	10.0
Concern	63	33.2	18	9.5	53	27.9	15	8.8
Expectation	66	34.7	3	1.6	64	33.7	15	8.8
Effects on life	45	23.7	14	7.4	36	18.9	21	12.4
Any	141	74.2	41	21.6	135	71.1	56	32.9
New[§] Problems (n=108 total) (n=97 with EHR)								
Idea	65	60.2	11	10.2	64	59.3	11	11.3
Concern	44	40.7	12	11.1	36	33.3	11	11.3
Expectation	36	33.3	2	1.9	34	31.5	4	4.1
Effects on life	25	23.1	7	6.5	20	18.5	12	12.4
Any	89	82.4	24	22.2	86	79.6	32	33.0

*Includes ICEE events raised by a third party accompanying the patient to the consultation.

§excludes 2 'new' problems that were requests for routine health checks. Whether problems were new ('first presentations') or not were coded in a previous study.¹⁸ EMR = Electronic Medical Records

Table 4. Subcategories of ICEE events

	Subcategory	n	%	Example verbatim
Ideas	Cause of symptom(s)	85	56.7	<i>"I've just felt so tired, and I just wonder if I'm depleted in anything?"</i>
	Specific diagnosis	50	33.3	<i>"I think I may have torn a muscle in my shoulder."</i>
	Treatment / medication	14	9.3	<i>"I don't know if that is down to the medication, like where I'm not so aggressive towards people."</i>
	Questioned but none	2	1.3	GP: <i>"Have you got any idea what it is yourself?"</i> Patient: <i>"No, I haven't."</i>
Concerns	Symptom(s)	35	36.1	<i>"I looked at my tongue and it scared me stiff. I got black dots; I don't know if that's normal or what."</i>
	Severity of condition	23	23.7	GP: <i>"Yeah. But you want to make sure it's not anything else untoward going on?"</i> Patient: <i>"Yeah, or that it's not a serious issue."</i>
	Medication related	16	16.5	<i>"I don't want to have steroids and put on weight again. I'm worrying about that."</i>
	Future health	11	11.3	<i>"If I did get rid of the baby, could it affect me conceiving in the future?"</i>
	Other: ADLs (n=3) test results (n=2)	5	5.2	<i>"There was one more as well that I was worried about. When I saw the immunologist, over the summer, they said that my T cells were up"</i>
Expectations	Questioned but none	7	7.2	GP: <i>"You are not worried that it is anything else going on?"</i> Patient: <i>"No."</i>
	Medication related	26	30.2	<i>"My friend takes them [Migrave], and she swears by them. I thought, I'll ask the doctor, she knows, and we can go from there."</i>
	Investigation(s)	19	22.1	<i>"She's on about, 'Ask whether you could have a check for a PSA' whatever that is."</i>
	For other treatment	19	22.1	<i>"All I want is to get it done. I'd put up with the operation."</i>
	Physical Exam	11	12.8	<i>"I just wondered if it would be worth just having a quick listen to my chest."</i>
	Diagnosis	4	4.7	<i>"I would like to know what's happening with my arm."</i>
Effects on life	Other: referral (n=3), fit note (n=2), general advice (n=2)	7	8.1	<i>"But I would appreciate now if you could get me in to see the gynaecologist."</i>
	Work related	18	27.3	<i>"I'm a taxi driver" ... "I can drive, but it's painful."</i>
	Basic ADLs	16	24.2	<i>"I find it more difficult to cut my food, to slice the chicken last night."</i>
	Instrumental ADLs	12	18.2	<i>"I can't go to the gym, which is annoying. I can't even- I used to cycle a lot and I can't even do that."</i>
	Sleep	10	15.2	<i>"I had to sleep downstairs, upright, in the night; I never had any choice in it."</i>
	Mood	6	9.1	<i>"With my thrush and everything else, it's bringing me down."</i>
	Questioned but none	4	6.1	GP: <i>"Does the pain stop you doing things?"</i> Patient: <i>"I'm doing everything. I'm still carrying on. I just try to ignore it."</i>

Unless stated otherwise, quotes are from patient verbatim. n = number of ICEE events. % = within category percentage.

Table 5. ICEE events by consultation stage

ICEE Type	Consultation Stage										Total
	Establishing Reason		Gathering Information		Delivering Diagnoses		Treatment Planning		Closing		
	n	row (%)	n	row (%)	n	row (%)	n	row (%)	n	row (%)	
Idea	42	27.8	87	57.6	5	3.3	15	9.9	2	1.3	151
Concern	17	17.5	53	54.6	6	6.2	19	19.6	2	2.1	97
Expectation	22	25.6	28	32.6	2	2.3	32	37.2	2	2.3	86
Effects on life	10	15.2	48	72.7	1	1.5	7	10.6	0	0.0	66
Total	91	22.8	216	54.0	14	3.5	73	18.3	6	1.5	400


Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open - P

0008

3JGPO.2023.0008

Figures

Figure 1. Frequency of ICEE per consultation and per problem



Accepted Manuscript