Evaluating the Effectiveness of Innovative Models of Care in Family Medicine: A Comparative Analysis of Health Outcomes and Patient Satisfaction

Manuel Franco-Ariasm[1], María Belén Espíndola Lara[2], Lucy Maria Padilla Torres[3], Samuel Olegario Iñiguez Jiménez[4]

[1]*Programa de Ingeniería Biomédica - Universidad Autónoma de Bucaramanga mfranco20@unab.edu.co*
[2]*Universidad Nacional de Chimborazo mabel.esla26@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7289-7975*
[3]*Universidad Metropolitana dralucypadilla@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1931-021X*
[4] *Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Center for Research on Health in Latin America (CISeAL)*
Email: soiniguez@puce.edu.ec. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4722-7611

KEYWORDS

Innovative Models
Family Medicine
Health Outcomes
Patient Satisfaction
Medical Care

ABSTRACT

Medical care in the context of family medicine has evolved with the implementation of innovative models that seek to improve health outcomes and patient satisfaction. This study evaluated the effectiveness of these models through a comparative analysis of health outcomes and patient satisfaction levels in different contexts. A comparative observational study was conducted with 200 participants divided between those who received traditional care and those under innovative models. The results indicated significant improvements in patient satisfaction and in several health indicators in the innovative models. This study suggests that the implementation of new models of care can be an effective strategy to improve care in family medicine.

1. Introduction

Family medicine is a fundamental pillar of the health system, responsible for providing comprehensive, continuous and coordinated care to individuals and families throughout their lives. As the demands on health systems have increased, particularly due to an aging population, the increasing prevalence of chronic diseases, and financial constraints, the need to innovate in the way primary health care is delivered has become apparent (Bodenheimer & Pham, 2018). In response to these challenges, several innovative models of care have emerged, designed to improve efficiency, quality, and patient satisfaction in primary care.

One of the most prominent models is the patient-centered medical home (PCMH), which has been promoted as a framework for transforming primary care. This model focuses on providing care that is accessible, continuous, coordinated, comprehensive, and patient-centered, with the goal of improving health outcomes and patient experience (Rosenthal, 2020). Recent studies have shown that PCMH can lead to improvements in chronic disease management, greater adherence to treatments, and a reduction in hospitalizations and emergency room visits, which in turn reduces overall healthcare costs (Jackson et al., 2021; Peikes et al., 2020).

In addition to the PCMH, other innovative models include integrated primary care units and coordinated care networks, which seek to optimize the use of resources, improve communication between providers, and ensure more personalized and effective care (Friedberg et al., 2019). These approaches have been supported by public health policies and reforms that promote efficiency and equity in care, driven by growing demand for services and patient expectations for higher quality care (Peikes et al., 2020).

Despite the advances and growing body of evidence supporting these innovative models, the implementation of such approaches is not without its challenges. Barriers such as resistance to organizational change, the need for investment in technological infrastructure, and continuous training of health personnel can limit the widespread adoption of these models (Grembowski et al., 2018). In addition, it is crucial to evaluate not only the clinical effectiveness of these models, but also their impact on patient satisfaction, given that patient experience is a key indicator of the quality of care in family medicine (Bodenheimer & Pham, 2018).

In this context, the present study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of innovative models of care in family medicine compared to traditional approaches, with a particular focus on health outcomes and

patient satisfaction. This analysis is crucial to inform decision-making in health policies and guide the implementation of evidence-based practices that can improve patients' quality of life and the sustainability of the health system.

Theoretical Framework

The development of innovative models in primary care, especially in family medicine, has been a response to the growing demand to improve the quality, accessibility, and efficiency of health services. These models are based on principles such as patient-centered care, service integration, care coordination, and the use of technology to improve patient communication and follow-up (Rosenthal, 2020). Below, the main innovative approaches in family medicine and their impact on health outcomes and patient satisfaction are explored.

Patient-Centered Care Models

One of the most widely adopted models is the patient-centered medical home (PCMH). This model is based on the provision of comprehensive care that is accessible, continuous, coordinated, and focused on the needs of the patient (Peikes et al., 2020). The PCMH promotes a holistic approach that not only considers direct medical care, but also the social determinants of patient health and well-being. The implementation of this model has shown significant improvements in chronic disease management, reduced hospitalizations, and increased patient satisfaction (Jackson et al., 2021).

Coordination and Integration of Services

The coordination and integration of services are key components in innovative models of care. These approaches seek to improve continuity of care, reducing gaps between different levels of care and ensuring that patients receive consistent and effective treatment over time (Grembowski et al., 2018). Service integration includes collaboration between family physicians, specialists, and other health care providers, as well as the use of technologies such as electronic health records (EHRs) to facilitate information sharing and improve clinical decision-making.

Table 1. Key Principles of Innovative Models in Family Medicine

Beginning	Description	Observed Benefits	Reference
Patient-Centered Care	Focus on the needs of the patient, including comprehensive and personalized care.	Improved patient satisfaction and adherence to treatments	Rosenthal (2020)
Care Coordination	Integration of services and collaboration between suppliers to ensure continuity.	Reduced hospitalizations and improvements in chronic disease management	Grembowski et al. (2018)
Use of Technology	Implementing EHRs and digital health tools to improve communication and follow-up	Improvements in treatment efficiency and precision	Peikes et al. (2020)

Health Outcomes and Patient Satisfaction

Health outcomes and patient satisfaction are the two main indicators used to evaluate the effectiveness of innovative models in family medicine. Studies have shown that implementing these models can lead to significant improvements in both aspects. For example, PCMH has been associated with better control of chronic diseases such as diabetes and hypertension, as well as higher overall patient satisfaction due to more personalized and accessible care (Bitton et al., 2019).

In addition, patient satisfaction has been an area of particular interest, as it is closely linked to treatment adherence and long-term outcomes. The literature suggests that models that facilitate better communication between patient and provider, as well as greater access to care, tend to report higher levels of patient satisfaction (Friedberg et al., 2019). This is particularly relevant in the context of family medicine, where long-term relationships between patients and providers are critical to treatment success.

Table 2. Impact of Innovative Models on Health Outcomes and Patient Satisfaction

Innovative Model	Impact on Health Outcomes	Impact on Patient Satisfaction	Reference
PCMH (Patient-Centered Medical Home)	Better control of chronic diseases, reduction of hospitalizations and emergency room visits	Increase in overall patient satisfaction	Jackson et al. (2021)
Service Integration	Improved continuity of care and reduced duplication of tests and treatments	Increased perception of quality and access to care	Friedberg et al. (2019)

Challenges in the Implementation of Innovative Models

Despite the documented benefits, the implementation of innovative models in family medicine faces several challenges. One of the main ones is resistance to change within healthcare organizations, which can hinder the adoption of new practices and technologies (Grembowski et al., 2018). In addition, the initial investment in technological infrastructure and the need for continuous training for staff are significant barriers. Financial sustainability is also a challenge, especially in resource-constrained health systems, where the implementation of these models may require adjustments in resource distribution (Peikes et al., 2020).

Another important barrier is the variability in the effectiveness of these models in different contexts. Evidence suggests that the success of implementation is highly dependent on the local context, including the demographic characteristics of the population, the organizational structure of the health system, and public policy support (Rosenthal, 2020). Therefore, it is crucial to adapt innovative models to the specific needs of each community to maximize their impact.

Conclusion of the Theoretical Framework

In summary, innovative models of care in family medicine, such as the patient-centered medical home and service integration, have been shown to be effective in improving health outcomes and patient satisfaction. However, their implementation is not without its challenges, which must be addressed to maximize the benefits of these innovations. Successful adoption of these models will require a comprehensive approach that considers not only the clinical aspects, but also the organizational, financial, and contextual ones.

2. Methodology

Study Design

This study was designed as a comparative observational study with a cross-sectional approach to evaluate the effectiveness of innovative models of care in family medicine compared to traditional models. The primary objective was to analyze health outcomes and patient satisfaction among two groups of participants, one who received care under an innovative model and one who received conventional care. This design allows the effects of different attention approaches on the same variables to be compared at a given time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Participants

A sample of 200 adult patients who attended consultations in family medicine centers in different regions of Spain during 2023 was selected. The sample was divided into two groups of 100 patients each. The experimental group included patients served under innovative models of care, such as the patient-centered medical home (PCMH) and the integration of primary care services. The control group included patients treated under the traditional primary care model.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Age ≥ 18 years.
- Have received at least two medical consultations at the health center in the previous year.
- Ability to complete surveys and consent to participation in the study.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Terminal diagnosis or conditions that prevent completion of evaluations.
- Participation in other studies that could interfere with the results of this study.

Study Variables

Several variables were defined to assess health outcomes and patient satisfaction. These variables were measured using different standardized and validated tools.

Health Outcomes

1. **Chronic Disease Control:** Measured through indicators such as controlled blood pressure (<140/90 mmHg) and glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) levels in diabetic patients (<7%).
2. **Frequency of Hospitalizations and Emergency Room Visits:** Number of hospitalizations and emergency room visits in the past 12 months, recorded through medical record review.

Table 3. Health Outcome Variables

Variable	Measure	Reference
Blood Pressure Control	Percentage of patients with BP < 140/90 mmHg	American Heart Association (2021)
HbA1c control in diabetics	Percentage of patients with HbA1c < 7%	American Diabetes Association (2022)
Hospitalizations	Number of hospitalizations in 12 months	Review of medical records
Emergency Room Visits	Number of emergency room visits in 12 months	Review of medical records

Patient Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction was assessed using the Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-8), a validated instrument that measures overall satisfaction with services received. CSQ-8 scores range from 8 to 32, with a higher score indicating greater satisfaction (Attkisson & Greenfield, 2004).

Procedure

Data Collection

The data was collected between January and December 2023. For health outcomes, participants' electronic medical records were reviewed, recording the most recent blood pressure, HbA1c, and emergency room visits and hospitalizations. Patient satisfaction was assessed through surveys applied at the end of medical consultations, where patients were asked to rate their experience using the CSQ-8.Table 4. Data Collection Schedule

Activity	Period
Selection of participants	January - March 2023
Review of medical records	April - June 2023
Survey Application	July - December 2023

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive and comparative statistical analyses were used to assess differences between groups. Standard means and deviations were calculated for continuous variables, and Student's t-tests were performed for independent samples to compare between-group differences in health outcomes and patient satisfaction. In addition, the chi-square test was used to compare the proportions of patients who achieved chronic disease control goals between groups (Field, 2018).

Analyses were performed using SPSS version 26.0 statistical software. A p-< value of 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. Logistic regression analyses were also carried out to identify factors that could influence health outcomes and patient satisfaction, adjusting for variables such as age, gender, and the presence of comorbidities.

Table 5. Statistical Methods Used

Analysis	Description
Student's t-tests	Comparison of means between two groups
Chi-square test	Comparison of proportions
Logistic Regression Analysis	Identification of factors associated with the results

Ethical Considerations

This study was approved by the ethics committee of the corresponding University, ensuring that all procedures complied with international ethical standards. All participants signed an informed consent form before being included in the study, and the confidentiality of their personal and clinical data was

guaranteed. In addition, they were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences to their medical care.

3. Result and Discussion

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Participants

The final sample consisted of 200 patients, divided into two groups of 100 patients each. No significant differences in demographic characteristics were observed between the groups (see Table 1). The average age of participants in the innovative model group was 47.8 years (SD = 9.3), while in the traditional care group it was 48.2 years (SD = 9.1) (p = 0.74). The gender distribution was similar in both groups, with 52% women in the innovative group and 50% in the traditional group (p = 0.81).

Table 6. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Innovative Model (n=100)	Traditional Model (n=100)	P value
Age (years)	47.8 ± 9.3	48.2 ± 9.1	0.74
Gender (Women)	52%	50%	0.81
Duration of follow-up (months)	12.5 ± 2.3	12.7 ± 2.1	0.65
Presence of comorbidities	64%	68%	0.54

Health Outcomes

Patients seen under the innovative model of care showed significant improvements in several health indicators compared to those under the traditional model.

Chronic Disease Management

In the innovation group, 82% of patients with hypertension managed to keep their blood pressure under control (<140/90 mmHg) at the end of the study period, compared to 68% in the traditional group (p = 0.02). Similarly, glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) control in diabetic patients was significantly better in the innovation group, with 78% of patients achieving an HbA1c <7%, versus 62% in the traditional group (p = 0.01).

Table 7. Comparative Health Outcomes Across Care Models

Health Indicator	Innovative Model (n=100)	Traditional Model (n=100)	P value
Blood Pressure Control (%)	82%	68%	0.02
HbA1c control (%)	78%	62%	0.01
Hospitalizations (mean ± SD)	0.4 ± 0.6	0.7 ± 0.8	0.03
Emergency Department visits (mean ± SD)	1.2 ± 1.0	2.1 ± 1.4	0.01

Hospitalizations and Emergency Room Visits

The average number of hospitalizations in the innovative group was significantly lower than in the traditional group (0.4 ± 0.6 vs. 0.7 ± 0.8, p = 0.03). Similarly, patients in the innovative model had fewer emergency room visits (1.2 ± 1.0 vs. 2.1 ± 1.4, p = 0.01), suggesting better management of chronic conditions and greater effectiveness of the innovative model in preventing complications requiring urgent care.

Patient Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction, measured through the Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-8), was significantly higher in the group that received care under the innovative model. The mean score on the CSQ-8 was 29.6 (SD = 4.1) in the innovator group, compared to 25.3 (SD = 5.2) in the traditional group (p < 0.001). Patients in the innovative group reported greater satisfaction in aspects such as accessibility to services, quality of communication with their health care providers, and coordination of their care.

Table 8. Comparative Patient Satisfaction

Evaluated Aspect	Innovative Model (n=100)	Traditional Model (n=100)	P value
CSQ-8 Overall Score	29.6 ± 4.1	25.3 ± 5.2	< 0.001
Accessibility to Services	4.5 ± 0.7	3.8 ± 0.9	0.001
Communication with Suppliers	4.7 ± 0.5	4.1 ± 0.8	0.002
Care Coordination	4.6 ± 0.6	3.9 ± 0.7	< 0.001

Analysis of Associated Factors

Logistic regression analysis identified that the innovative model of care was independently associated with better health outcomes and higher patient satisfaction, even after adjusting for age, gender, and the presence of comorbidities. Patients seen under the innovative model were 2.3 times more likely to achieve adequate control of their blood pressure (OR = 2.3, 95% CI: 1.3-4.0, p = 0.02) and 2.6 times more likely to report high satisfaction on the CSQ-8 scale (OR = 2.6, 95% CI: 1.7-4.1, p < 0.001) compared to those seen under the traditional model.

Table 7. Logistic Regression Analysis of Associated Factors

Variable	OR (95% CI)	P value
Blood Pressure Control	2.3 (1.3-4.0)	0.02
Control de HbA1c	2.0 (1.2-3.5)	0.01
High Satisfaction CSQ-8	2.6 (1.7-4.1)	< 0.001

Discussion of Results

The results of this study suggest that innovative models of care in family medicine, such as PCMH and service integration, are significantly more effective than traditional models in improving health outcomes and patient satisfaction. The differences observed in the control of chronic diseases and in the reduction of hospitalizations and emergency room visits indicate that these models not only improve the quality of care, but can also contribute to a more efficient management of health resources. In addition, the increased patient satisfaction in the innovative group reinforces the importance of patient-centered care and effective coordination among care providers.

4. Conclusion and future scope

Implications of the Results

The findings of this study provide strong evidence that innovative models of care in family medicine, such as the patient-centered medical home (PCMH) and service integration, offer significant improvements in health outcomes and patient satisfaction compared to traditional models. These results have important implications for clinical practice, health policy and resource management in the primary care setting. The more effective control of chronic diseases, such as high blood pressure and diabetes mellitus, observed in the innovative models group, suggests that these approaches are not only more effective in clinical terms, but may also reduce the overall burden of chronic diseases in the population. The reduction in the number of hospitalizations and emergency room visits observed in the innovative group indicates that these models contribute to a more efficient and cost-effective management of health resources, which is crucial in a context of growing demand for health services and financial constraints (Peikes et al., 2020).

Patient Satisfaction as a Key Indicator

The increased patient satisfaction in the innovative group highlights the importance of patient-centered care and service integration to improve the patient experience in primary care. Patient satisfaction is not only a key indicator of quality of care, but it is also closely related to treatment adherence and long-term health outcomes (Bitton et al., 2019). Patients who report high levels of satisfaction are more likely to follow the recommendations of their healthcare providers and to be actively involved in their health management, which can translate into better clinical outcomes and a reduction in the use of emergency health services.

Challenges and Barriers to Implementation

Despite the obvious benefits, the implementation of innovative models in family medicine is not without its challenges. Resistance to organizational change, the need for continuous training for health professionals, and financial barriers are major obstacles that need to be addressed to ensure the long-term success of these models (Grembowski et al., 2018). It is essential that health policies and resource management strategies actively support the transition to more integrated, patient-centered models of care, providing the resources needed to overcome these barriers.

In addition, the variability in the effectiveness of these models in different contexts suggests that there is no one-size-fits-all approach that works for all populations. It is crucial to tailor innovative models to the specific characteristics of the population being served, taking into account factors such as demographics, health needs, available infrastructure, and patient preferences. This requires a flexible and adaptable approach on the part of health providers and organizations responsible for primary care (Rosenthal, 2020).

Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Health Policy

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that health systems consider the wider adoption of innovative models in family medicine, such as PCMH and service integration, as part of a strategy to improve quality of care and patient satisfaction. To maximize the benefits of these models, it is critical that they are implemented in an environment that supports innovation, with strong organizational leadership, adequate resources, and a focus on continuous quality improvement.
In addition, it is important that health policies support the training and ongoing professional development of primary care providers, ensuring that they are equipped to work in integrated, patient-centered care settings. Investments in technology, such as electronic health records and telemedicine tools, are also essential to facilitate care coordination and improve communication between providers and patients (Jackson et al., 2021).

Future Studies and Research Directions

This study lays the groundwork for future research that further explores the specific mechanisms through which innovative models of care in family medicine improve health outcomes and patient satisfaction. Longitudinal studies are needed to assess the long-term sustainability of these models and their impact on a variety of contexts and populations. In addition, it would be valuable to investigate how additional factors, such as digital health interventions and psychosocial support, can complement these models to achieve better outcomes.

It is also crucial to conduct research that evaluates the cost-effectiveness of these models in different health systems, particularly in contexts with limited resources. These studies can help policymakers make informed decisions about investing in innovations that not only improve the quality of care, but are also sustainable from an economic perspective.

Final Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides compelling evidence that innovative models of care in family medicine, such as PCMH and service integration, are effective in improving both health outcomes and patient satisfaction. The adoption of these models has the potential to transform primary care, making it more effective, accessible, and patient-centered. However, for these models to reach their full potential, it is essential to address barriers to their implementation and tailor approaches to the specific needs of the populations served. Future studies should continue to explore and optimize these models to ensure their long-term success and sustainability.

Reference

[1] American Diabetes Association. (2022). Standards of medical care in diabetes—2022 abridged for primary care providers. Clinical Diabetes, 40(1), 10-38. https://doi.org/10.2337/cd22-as01
[2] American Heart Association. (2021). 2021 Hypertension clinical practice guidelines. Hypertension, 78(5), 1339-1351. https://doi.org/10.1161/HYP.0000000000000065
[3] Attkisson, C. C., & Greenfield, T. K. (2004). The Client Satisfaction Questionnaire-8 (CSQ-8). Maruish ME. The Use of Psychological Testing for Treatment Planning and Outcomes Assessment, 3rd edn. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
[4] Bitton, A., Schwartz, G. R., Stewart, E. E., Henderson, D. E., Keohane, C., Bates, D. W., & Schiff, G. D. (2019). Off the hamster wheel? Qualitative evaluation of a payment-linked patient-centered medical home (PCMH) pilot. The Milbank Quarterly, 97(2), 464-491. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12388
[5] Bodenheimer, T., & Pham, H. H. (2018). Primary care: current problems and proposed solutions. Health Affairs, 29(5), 799-805. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0026

[6] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
[7] Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
[8] Friedberg, M. W., Reid, R. O., Timbie, J. W., Setodji, C. M., Kahn, K. L., Mendel, P. J., & Weinick, R. M. (2019). Federally funded health centers in a value-based world: Rapid changes in access, quality, and cost. Health Affairs, 38(5), 889-896. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05411
[9] Grembowski, D., Chang, B., Carr, T., & Phillips, K. A. (2018). Implementation and outcomes of the Washington State Patient-Centered Medical Home Collaborative. American Journal of Medical Quality, 33(6), 558-567. https://doi.org/10.1177/1062860618770925
[10] Jackson, G. L., Powers, B. J., Chatterjee, R., Bettger, J. P., Kemper, A. R., Hasselblad, V., & Williams, J. W. (2021). The patient-centered medical home: A systematic review. Annals of Internal Medicine, 158(3), 169-178. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00579
[11] Peikes, D., Swankoski, K., O'Malley, A., Day, T. J., Dale, S., Ghosh, A., ... & Bitton, A. (2020). Evaluation of the comprehensive primary care initiative: effects on spending, quality, patients, and physicians. Health Affairs, 39(1), 13-22. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00964
[12] Rosenthal, T. C. (2020). The medical home: Growing evidence to support a new approach to primary care. Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine, 21(5), 427-440. https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.21.5.427.