

# Advance Care Planning in Primary Care. A Retrospective Medical Record Study Among Patients With Different Illness Trajectories.

**Yvonne A.C. Bekker**

Radboud University Medical Center, Institute for Primary Care

**A. Suntjens**

Radboud University Medical Center, Institute for Primary Care

**Y. Engels**

Radboud University Medical Center, Scientific Center for Quality of Healthcare

**H. Schers**

Radboud University Medical Center, Institute for Primary Care

**Gert P. Westert**

Radboud University Medical Center, Scientific Center for Quality of Healthcare

**A. Stef Groenewoud** (✉ [stef.groenewoud@radboudumc.nl](mailto:stef.groenewoud@radboudumc.nl))

Radboud University Medical Center, Scientific Center for Quality of Healthcare

---

## Research Article

**Keywords:** Advance Care Planning, Primary Care, General Practice, General Practitioner, Medical records, End of Life Care

**Posted Date:** June 9th, 2021

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-600560/v1>

**License:**  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published at BMC Palliative Care on February 14th, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-022-00907-6>.

# Abstract

## *Background*

Advance Care Planning (ACP) enables physicians to align healthcare with patients wishes, reduces burdensome life-prolonging medical interventions, and potentially improves the quality of life of patients in the last phase of life. However, little objective information is available about the extent to which structured ACP conversations are held in general practice.

Our aim was to examine the documentation of ACP for patients with cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity in medical records (as a proxy for ACP application) in Dutch general practice.

## *Methods*

We chose a retrospective medical record study design in seven primary care facilities. Medical records of 119 patients who died non-suddenly (55 cancer, 28 organ failure and 36 multimorbidity) were analysed. Other variables were: general characteristics, data on ACP documentation, correspondence between medical specialist and GP, and healthcare utilization in the last two years of life.

## *Results*

In 65% of the records, one or more ACP items was registered. Most often documented were aspects regarding euthanasia (35%), the preferred place of care and death (29%) and concerns and hopes towards the future (29%). Median timing of the first ACP conversation was 126 days before death. ACP was more often documented in patients with cancer (84%) than in those with organ failure (57%) or multimorbidity (42%) ( $p = 0,000$ ). Patients with cancer had the most frequent (median 3 times, inter-quartile range (IQR) 2-5), and extensive (median 5 items, IQR 2-7) ACP consultations.

## *Conclusion*

Documentation of ACP items in medical records by GPs is present, but incomplete, especially in patients with multimorbidity or organ failure. We recommend more attention for, and documentation of ACP in daily practice in order to start anticipatory conversations in time, and to address the needs of all people living with advanced conditions in primary care.

# Introduction

Advance Care Planning (ACP) is the ongoing process of communication among patients, their healthcare providers, family and loved ones regarding health related problems, needs and preferences for future care. (1, 2) Timely conversations about these topics enable healthcare providers to align healthcare with the wishes of the patient (3), thereby extending patient autonomy and patient centred care, even when a patient would become unable to participate in decision making due to, for example, cognitive impairment or a crisis situation. (4) ACP is a crucial element of palliative care, which is often indicated when patients

suffer from chronic, progressive and life-limiting illnesses. (5) ACP includes items like resuscitation policy, treatment limitations, preferred place of care and death, and conversations about future scenarios. (1, 2) Positive outcomes of ACP have been reported: ACP is found to improve the quality of end of life (EoL) care, to facilitate access to palliative care and hospice care, while to reduce life-sustaining treatments and preventing hospitalization in the last months of life. (3, 8-10) Moreover, it decreases the physical and mental burden of relatives and informal caregivers (9), and it may lower healthcare costs. (11)

In many Western countries *general practitioners* (GPs) play an important role in providing and coordinating palliative care for cancer as well as for non-cancer patients. (12) Also, the long-term relationship between a patient and GP provides a good basis for initiating timely ACP conversations. (13) Therefore, the GP is well positioned to encourage and engage in timely ACP.

However, little is known about the actual application and documentation of ACP in medical records in general practice. Previous studies are mainly based on self-report by GPs (14, 16-18), and documentation has only been studied in a specific GP population of patients with lung and colorectal cancer. (15) Also, patients' personal wishes, concerns, values and beliefs are often left out, though according to recent definitions and recommendations, they are just as much part of ACP as, for example, specific treatment limitations. (1)

Our study's first *objective* is to provide better insight into the practice and (as a proxy for that) the documentation of ACP in medical records of GPs in the Netherlands. Second, we sought to analyse and contrast if the ACP practice differs for several illness trajectories. We hypothesize that in disease categories with a less predictable trajectory (organ failure, multimorbidity) the prevalence, timing and extensiveness of ACP in general practice will be lower. Finally, we also wanted to see how healthcare utilization at the EoL differed in accordance with differences in the ACP practice.

## Methods

### *Study design, setting and data source*

For this retrospective medical record study, we retrieved data from FaMe-net, a primary care registration network in Nijmegen, the Netherlands. This network routinely collects patient data from the electronic GP information system (GPIS) of its seven associated general practices. From the FaMe-net database, medical records of 1234 patients who died between 2003 and 2016 were included. These patient records consisted of: personal characteristics (gender, age at death), reports from the GP, diagnostic ICPC-codes (International Classification of Primary Care), medication prescriptions, correspondence from and to other healthcare providers (of secondary care, out-of-hours primary care and paramedic services) and measured (lab) values, all provided with accompanying dates.

### *Study population*

First, children (under the age of 18 years) and patients diagnosed with dementia (ICPC-1 P70) were excluded. Patients with dementia form a specific group in the field of ACP. Conversations should be initiated as early as possible after diagnosis, when cognitive decline is still mild. Besides, many patients move to a nursing home in the advanced stage of their disease, where not the GP but the elderly care physician is responsible. (26) After these records had been excluded the 1234 records that had been retrieved from the FaMe-Net database, a random sample of 150 patient records was taken, with an equal distribution among the seven general practices to reduce the risk of bias, maintain maximum variation in cases and documentation and thereby enhance representativity. To compare the application and documentation of ACP in patients with a different trajectory of illness, four groups were created, based on literature: i) patients dying from incurable cancer, whose decline is generally progressive and reasonably predictable, usually with a clear terminal phase. (24, 25). ii) Patients with organ failure (like respiratory and heart failure), whose decline might be punctuated by episodes of acute deterioration and some recovery, with more sudden, seemingly unexpected death. iii) Elderly with multiple chronic diseases (i.e. multimorbidity) whose decline is often prolonged and gradual. (24, 25). iv) Patients who died suddenly. We used the following inclusion hierarchy: cancer [1], organ failure [2], multimorbidity [3] and sudden death [4], (meaning that patients who could be classified in more than one category were classified in the first 'fitting' category). Allocation was based on medical history and diagnosis was checked and corrected for registration errors. The 'cancer' group was defined as patients that had a diagnosed active malignancy at the moment of death (concerning mostly patients with metastasized disease). The 'organ failure' group included patients with end-stage heart failure (NYHA 3-4), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (Gold classification 3-4), renal failure (GFR < 15 ml/min) and symptomatic liver failure. The 'multimorbidity' group was defined as patients aged  $\geq 65$  years with multimorbidity, meaning  $\geq 2$  chronic diseases other than cancer or end-stage organ failure. The 'sudden death' group included the remaining patients, who died unexpectedly without a history of cancer, organ failure or multimorbidity (e.g. suicide or an acute cardiovascular event). Subsequently, the 'sudden death' category was excluded, because ACP is less applicable for such patients. Also, files with too limited data for proper group assignment and/or analysis were excluded.

### *Data collection*

We used patient record information of the last *two* years before death for data extraction. Our rationale was that we expected to find most ACP-related information in the last year(s) of life and that it is recommended to regularly re-discuss ACP themes, especially near the end of life. (1) Also, the widely used surprise question uses a 1-year timeline (33), which we decided to double because we wanted to minimize the risk of missing essential information. We designed a data extraction form to collect quantitative data on patient characteristics and ACP-items (Appendix 1). In total, 17 ACP-items were defined, based on the recent international consensus on the definition of and recommendations for ACP, supported by the European Association for Palliative Care. (1) A panel discussion with senior investigators (ASG and YE) led to optimization of the form. Then, two researchers (AS and YB) independently collected data from the first nine patient records (three from each group), using the data extraction form. These findings were discussed, which led to final adjustments of the form. No relevant

differences between the researchers were found. In this way, inter-observer reliability was considered to be guaranteed, and further in-depth data collection was performed by one researcher (YB).

### *Variables*

The final data extraction form contained different sections with the following elements (for variables marked with an \*, dates (dd/mm/yyyy) were registered):

1. *General characteristics*: patient ID, practice ID, disease category, gender, date of death, age at time of death, place of death, presence of a written euthanasia request and received EoL treatment (palliative sedation, euthanasia, assisted suicide)
2. *Healthcare utilization in the last two years of life*: number of hospitalizations\*, number of emergency department visits\* and number of contacts with an after-hours primary care center (telephone contacts, consults at the out-of-hours primary care center and home visits)\*
3. *ACP items*: documented treatment preferences for future care (regarding resuscitation, mechanical ventilation, intensive care (IC) admission, emergency department referral and hospitalization, antibiotics, artificial feeding and liquid administration and 'other treatment preferences'), preferred place of care and/or death, registration of advance directives (allocation of a legal representative and a declaration of will) and conversations regarding palliative sedation, euthanasia, prognosis/life expectancy, disease specific future scenarios, personal wishes and goals, concerns and hopes towards the future and the 'end-of-life' or death
4. *ACP characteristics*: ACP presence ( $\geq 1$  item documented), timing of first ACP conversation (documentation; in days until death) and number of ACP conversations (different dates on which ACP items were reported)\*

'First ACP conversation' and 'number of ACP conversations' concerned discussions of one or more ACP item(s) between a patient (and his/her family or loved ones) and their GP. ACP items were scored if they consisted of proactive, anticipating discussions, registrations or actions (concerning future treatments or situations). We additionally scored ACP-related information that was found in the correspondence from secondary care medical specialists, out-of-hours GPs and paramedics. 'Other treatment preferences', 'preferences for place of care/death', 'personal wishes and goals' and 'concerns and hopes towards future' were extracted as free text for further analysis.

### *Data analysis*

Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 22. We used descriptive statistics for all outcome measures. The extensiveness of ACP was further categorized in 'no ACP', '1 or 2 items documented', '3-5 items documented' and '6 or more items documented'. Differences between groups were assessed using Pearson's chi-square test or Fischer's exact test (in case  $>20\%$  of the cells had an expected count less than 5) for categorical variables. For continuous variables, we used the ANOVA in case the distribution was normal and the Kruskal Wallis test in case the distribution was skewed. A P

value of  $<0.05$  was considered significant. In case of significance, we performed post hoc analysis, comparing groups mutually (pairwise) using independent t-tests (or Mann-Whitney U) and Pearson's chi-square tests (or Fischer's exact?). A Bonferroni correction was applied, adjusting the level of significance to correct for multiple comparisons. (39) This led to a significance level of  $p < 0.0167$  ( $0.05/3$ ).

## Results

### *Study sample*

After a random selection of 150 records, and after applying the exclusion criteria, medical records of 119 patients who died non-suddenly were identified for the in-depth file research, of whom 55 patients with cancer, 28 with organ failure and 36 with multimorbidity (see flowchart in figure 1).

#### *Patient characteristics and general information about the last two years of life*

Mean age of the patients at time of death was 79 years (range: 27-103; see table 1). Patients with cancer were younger than patients with organ failure and multimorbidity (both  $p = 0.000$ ). The male:female ratio was approximately 1:1 for all groups. Most patients died at home (63%). Other places of death were hospital (29%), hospice (5%), and long-term care facility (4%). All patients who died in a hospice were patients with cancer. Most patients who died in a hospital had multimorbidity (44%) or cancer (34%). Prevalence of (intermittent or continuous) palliative sedation was highest in the cancer group (40%), followed by the multimorbidity (22%) and the organ failure group (7%). Ten patients (8%) had a documented written euthanasia directive. Euthanasia was actually performed in 50% of those patients, who all had cancer. More than two thirds of the patients visited the emergency department (70%) and were hospitalized (72%) at least once in the last two years of life. The median numbers of hospitalizations, emergency department visits, and out-of-hours primary care contacts are shown in table 1.

#### *Application of ACP*

Prevalence of ACP ( $\geq 1$  item documented) by the GP in the last two years of life was 65%. In 40% of the medical records, three or more items were registered, and in 18% of all the cases six or more items. The prevalence differed significantly between the three groups, with respectively 84%, 57% and 42% in patients with cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity ( $p = 0.000$ ) (see table 2). Post hoc analyses showed that ACP was applied more often in the cancer group than in the organ failure and multimorbidity group ( $p = 0.015$  and  $p = 0.000$  respectively). There was no statistically significant difference between the organ failure and multimorbidity group ( $p = 0.314$ ). The prevalence of ACP also differed between practices ( $p = 0.030$ ), as some of the practices had a higher prevalence than others (range 42-83%).

If at least one ACP item was documented, the median number of conversations was three, with a median of four different items that were documented. The extent (number of ACP items documented) and frequency (number of conversations) of ACP differed significantly between the groups ( $p = 0,047$  and  $p =$

0,012, respectively). Post hoc analyses (table 3) showed that the number of consultations in which ACP was documented was higher in patients with cancer than in patients with multimorbidity ( $p = 0,010$ ). All other post hoc analyses did not show a statistically significant difference. The median time period from the first ACP documentation until death was 126 days (interquartile range (IQR) 30-316), with no significant difference between patient groups. IQRs showed a large variation in timing in all three disease groups.

The prevalence of ACP for all patients and for the different disease categories is visualized in figure 2. The colours in the bars represent the number of ACP items discussed.

### *Content of ACP*

If aspects of ACP were documented by a GP, this most often regarded: euthanasia (35%), preferred place of care and death (29%), concerns and hopes towards the future (29%), prognosis (24%) and palliative sedation (23%) (see table 4). Most often documented treatment preferences were resuscitation policy (21%) and policy for referral and hospitalization (19%). The registration of a declaration of will was present in 8% of the cases. The appointment of a legal representative was never documented. Preferred place of care/death consisted of 'home' in 57% of the cases and 'hospice' in 26% of the cases. Some patients did not specify their preference, but only discussed which options they did not prefer. If GPs documented the patient's preferred place of death, more patients died in a hospice ( $p = 0.010$ ). When the GP and patient had at least one conversation about palliative sedation, more patients were supported by palliative sedation in the last days of life ( $p = 0.000$ ). Documentation of a policy for referral and hospitalization did not influence the number of Emergency Room (ER) visits ( $p = 0,838$ ) and hospitalizations ( $p = 0,793$ ).

'Other treatment preferences' consisted mostly of disease specific treatment choices for future care, such as chemotherapy, follow-up diagnostics, surgical procedures and medication choices or limitations (other than antibiotics). The items 'personal wishes and goals' and 'hopes and concerns towards the future' mainly concerned themes related to the different domains of palliative care, i.e. psychological, social and spiritual issues. Examples of personal wishes and goals were: attending specific future events (like the graduation of a grandson or a holiday with family); spending more time outside in the last months of life; regaining enough energy to receive visitors; being able to carry out personal hobbies (like gardening or etching) and the wish for conversations with a chaplain or pastor. Regarding hopes and concerns towards the future, patients mainly expressed their fears, such as cognitive impairment, being a burden to others, being left alone or death itself. Patients hoped, for example, for passing away naturally in the short term.

In 19% of the cases, it was documented that the GP and patient had had a conversation about the 'end-of-life', without further documenting an outcome or specific preferences. When going through the patient records, we noticed that GPs often used loose terms when documenting about ACP, for example: 'conversation about death', 'best supportive care', 'palliative policy' or 'prefers quality instead of quantity'.

GPs also received ACP-related information from other healthcare providers (see table 5). In 50% of the medical records, at least one ACP item was found in the correspondence between other healthcare providers and GPs. This concerned mainly resuscitation (28%) and Intensive Care Unit (ICU) admission (17%) policies and discussion of prognosis/life expectancy (21%). All other items had a lower prevalence (0-11%). In 24% of the patients, no ACP items were found in both the GPs file and the correspondence of other healthcare providers.

## Discussion

We found a prevalence of documented ACP activities during the last two years of life in GPs' medical records of patients with cancer, organ failure or multimorbidity of 65%. However, the extensiveness of documented ACP was limited. Of all cases that contained at least one aspect of ACP, in 71% five or less ACP items were covered, and in 38% only one or two (out of 17), meaning that in the majority of patients (60%) ACP is not or only minimally (1-2 items) documented. Items such as resuscitation, disease specific future scenario's, hospital referral were documented irregularly (<20%). For most patients who received ACP, the first ACP conversation took place during the last months of life (4.2) and the median number of ACP conversations was three. Documented ACP mainly focused on euthanasia, concerns and hopes towards the future and the preferred place of care and death. In half of the patients, GPs also received ACP information through the correspondence from other healthcare providers. In such cases ACP aspects were: resuscitation policy (28%), prognosis (21%) and ICU admission (17%). Other treatment decisions that take place in the context of a hospital (such as (dis)continuation of chemotherapy) are scarcely found in the GPs medical record. In 24% of the patients, no ACP items were found in both the GPs file and the correspondence of other healthcare providers. Application and documentation of ACP differed between the disease categories. The prevalence of ACP was higher in patients with cancer (84%) than in those with organ failure (57%) or multimorbidity (42%). We also found statistically significant differences between the disease categories regarding the number of ACP-items and of consultations in which ACP was discussed, with cancer rating highest on both aspects.

### *Strengths and limitations*

To the best of our knowledge this was one of the first studies (besides a study by Tapsfield et al. (29)) that sought to explore actual ACP documentation in the population of non-sudden deaths in general practice, while discerning between different illness (and EoL) trajectories. We picked up on the recent shift in extending ACP also to non-physical issues, as physical changes are usually accompanied by psychological, social and existential fluctuations in the well-being of patients and their families, seen in both cancer as well as non-cancer patients. (27) We were able to define 17 ACP items, covering the physical, psychosocial and spiritual dimension, based on the consensus definition and recommendations for ACP supported by the European Association for Palliative Care and expert opinion. By taking a stratified sample that equally represents seven different practices, we enhanced the representativity of our results and minimized the influence of between-practice differences on the found group differences. FaMe-net also aims to be representative of the national population by age, gender and cause of death.

Last, our study protocol comprises several check-points to enhance inter-observer reliability (reproducibility).

Also, some *limitations* must be acknowledged. First, scanned documents, attached to the medical record, were missing from the database, which might explain the low percentage of advance directives and the absence of information on the appointment of legal representatives. Second, data were collected in general practices from a practice-based research network, which are known to have a better registration routine than average. This may have resulted in an overestimation of ACP documentation. On the other hand; participating practices were not specialized in palliative care, and no specific codes for ACP registration are used in the network. Third, there is a risk of missing ACP related information, as ACP discussions might have taken place without documentation. However, registration of ACP content is essential to facilitate future decision-making that is based on a patient's preferences and is, therefore, a condition to successful ACP, especially since in most health care settings multiple caregivers are involved. Fourth, we may have also missed information by only looking at the last two years of life. In our opinion, though, information dating from longer than this period is less relevant as patients' preferences and wishes possibly change along with changes in their medical condition. (28) This is why ACP should be frequently re discussed. (1)

### *Interpretation*

Our finding that 35% of the deceased patients seemed *not* to have received any form of ACP consultation by their GP, is in line with existing literature about the uptake of ACP in general practice, and may be explained by some barriers for ACP that have been reported before (see textbox 1 for these barriers). Recently, patient records in the general practice were examined in Scotland, showing that 60% of all patients who died in 2014 had an anticipatory care plan; 75% of the patients with cancer and 41% with organ failure. (29) Though this was a study in a different country, these percentages are quite comparable with our findings. Ermers et al found that, in the Netherlands, in 74% of the records of patients with colorectal and lung cancer, at least one ACP item was documented, compared to 84% in our group of patients with an active malignancy at the moment of death. (15)

### *Textbox 1: Barriers for the uptake of ACP, as reported in the literature*

Despite the fact that there is increasing attention for ACP and a growing body of evidence of its positive effects, research shows that the application of ACP conversations remains still low, and the organization and delivery of healthcare is still predominantly reactive. (13-16, 14-18)

Several barriers have been reported that may prevent optimal implementation in clinical practice. First, on the patient-side, participation is at risk in case patients are not ready to talk about themes related to deterioration in their condition or the nearing death. (19) Second, for GPs, insufficient time is among the most important barriers. Third, GPs find it difficult to engage in end-of-life conversations, which is sometimes caused by lack of skills or experience, and that they have a hard time finding the appropriate moment to initiate ACP, especially in case of uncertainty of prognosis. (20-23) Fourth, illness trajectories

differs a lot from patient (group) to patient (group). Especially in uncertain trajectories (especially at the EoL), there are less clear-cut 'triggers' that may help GPs starting ACP conversations, moreover: a great diversity of factors have to be taken into account. (22) In patients with incurable cancer, the decline is generally progressive and reasonably predictable, usually with a clear terminal phase. (24, 25) Patients dying from a non-malignant cause, however, frequently experience a more gradual decline. In those with organ failure (like respiratory and heart failure), the decline might be punctuated by episodes of acute deterioration and some recovery, with more sudden, seemingly unexpected death. In the elderly with multiple chronic diseases (i.e. multimorbidity) the decline is often prolonged and gradual. (24, 25)

Second, our finding that ACP is more prevalent among cancer patients, is in line with the results of other studies. (7, 14, 16, 17, 29) Although these studies are based on questionnaires and interviews, whereas our study has the design of a medical record study, existing literature strengthens our conclusion that patients with organ failure and multimorbidity receive less ACP. This might be due to prognostic uncertainty; the relative unpredictability of non-cancer patients' decline possibly impedes physicians to anticipate palliative care needs and initiate end-of-life conversations timely. (23) As there are less direct causes to start the conversations, GPs might prevaricate or postpone when considering end-of-life issues, also described in literature as prognostic paralysis. (30) Also, the need for ACP is often less clear when there is no strict demarcation between the curative and the palliative phase. (31) Patients suffering from cancer are more aware of the life-threatening consequences of their disease and engage in ACP more proactively (40), while patients still being treated in the hospital, are less open to ACP discussions, as was reported by GPs in earlier research. (22) Nonetheless, ACP is also appropriate alongside optimal chronic disease management and has been widely recommended for non-cancer patients. (1, 17, 32, 33) GPs, however, appear to find this difficult to implement (20, 22, 23, 31-34), resulting in non-cancer patients being relatively underserved with regard to comprehensive and timely ACP.

Third, our results support earlier findings that ACP is initiated late in the disease process; other studies found a timing of ACP that ranged from 33 days until 18 weeks before death, compared to 126 days before death in our study. (15, 29, 31, 35)

### *Implications and recommendations*

Though ACP receives more and more attention, widespread implementation in clinical practice stays behind. A higher prevalence of ACP, broader discussion of ACP-related themes and timely initiation could benefit the quality of end-of-life care. It appears desirable to close the gap between patients with and without cancer and offer ACP to all patient groups, especially when considering the growing number of old people suffering and dying from serious chronic diseases. (36) Extending an anticipatory care approach to all people with advanced chronic conditions is a challenge and multiple barriers (see textbox 1) need to be overcome. Professionals caring for people with life-limiting conditions need core generic skills to enable them to assess supportive care needs and judge the readiness of individual patients and families to participate in discussions about the future. However, many physicians feel poorly prepared to conduct end-of-life conversations. (37) Recently, in the Netherlands, ACP training programs have been

developed, such as the course 'Timely end of life conversations' by the Dutch GP Association and the RADPAC training. (34) These trainings might serve as useful aids to educate physicians and to help them deal with feelings of uncertainty, though they are not widely implemented yet. Another starting point for improvement is the structure of documentation. Our study shows that there is no uniform structure in registering ACP information in the Netherlands, and we found that both GPs and medical specialists used heterogenous and aspecific terminology, which makes it hard to retrieve, transfer and update information. This could be improved by using predictable, homogeneous and exchangeable formats to document ACP, which has been shown to be successful in other countries. (29, 38) Lastly, timely recognition of patients that could benefit from ACP is essential, but appears to be difficult. In the group of organ failure, hospital admissions and exacerbations might serve as a helpful starting points for discussion about wishes and needs. (22, 27) We recommend that future research contributes to the identification of patients that may benefit from ACP, as well as the appropriate timing to initiate ACP conversations.

## Conclusion

This study shows that at least one ACP-item is documented in the medical record in a majority of deceased patients in the Dutch general practice. However, there is considerable potential for improvement in the documentation (and practice) of ACP, concerning the amount of topics covered, disease specific future scenario's and treatment preferences, timely initiation, and the documentation structure and multidisciplinary information exchange. Also, attention is needed for the current gap between patients with cancer and patients with other chronic diseases, addressing the needs of all people living with advanced conditions in primary care.

## Abbreviations

ACP	-	Advance Care Planning
EoL	-	End of Life
ER	-	Emergency Room
GP	-	General Practitioner
GPIS	-	General Practitioner's Information System
ICU	-	Intensive Care Unit
RADPAC		Radboud indicators for PAlliative Care

## Declarations

*Ethics approval and consent to participate*

The research ethics committee of the Radboud University Medical Center (Radboudumc) Nijmegen declared that this study does not fall within the remit of the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (file number 2018-4271, July 2018). Besides, they approved utilization of the FaMe-Net database for this purpose (file number 2020-6871).

In the participating practices of the FaMe-Net database, all medical ethical and privacy requirements in relation to scientific studies are met. Informed consent was signed by all cooperating general practices and consent of patients was obtained through an opt-out arrangement, to make the data available for quality improvement and research purposes. Patient records were received pseudonymized, whilst the key to the personal data was inaccessible for the researchers.

### *Consent for publication*

This manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form

### *Availability of data and materials*

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

### *Funding*

This study was funded by the Dutch institute for Health Care Research and Sciences (ZonMw), grant number: 844001510.

### *Authors' contributions*

YAB performed data extraction, data analyses, wrote a preliminary version of the manuscript, and was involved in later editorial rounds. AS helped designing the study, the data extraction form and helped YAB in performing analyses as well as with writing the first draft of the paper. She was also involved in later editorial activities. YE was one of the supervisors, who also helped developing the data extraction form; she was also involved in writing the article. HS gathered and delivered the FameNet health record data, that formed the basis for this study. He was also involved in writing the article. GW supervised the study and was actively involved in writing all version of the manuscript. ASG designed the study, acquired the grant, performed daily supervision of YAB and AS, took the initiative in writing the first and later versions of the current article.

## **References**

1. Rietjens JAC, Sudore RL, Connolly M, van Delden JJ, Drickamer MA, Droger M, et al. Definition and recommendations for advance care planning: an international consensus supported by the European Association for Palliative Care. *Lancet Oncol.* 2017;18(9):e543-e51.

2. UpToDate. Advance care planning and advance directives 2018 [Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/advance-care-planning-and-advance-directives>].
3. Houben CHM, Spruit MA, Groenen MTJ, Wouters EFM, Janssen DJA. Efficacy of advance care planning: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2014;15(7):477–89.
4. Silveira MJ, Kim SY, Langa KM. Advance directives and outcomes of surrogate decision making before death. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(13):1211–8.
5. World Health Organization. Definition of palliative care 2002 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/cancer/palliative/definition/en/>].
6. Johnson S, Butow P, Kerridge I, Tattersall M. Advance care planning for cancer patients: a systematic review of perceptions and experiences of patients, families, and healthcare providers. *Psychooncology*. 2016;25(4):362–86.
7. Evans N, Costantini M, Pasman HR, Van den Block L, Donker GA, Miccinesi G, et al. End-of-life communication: a retrospective survey of representative general practitioner networks in four countries. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2014;47(3):604 – 19.e3.
8. Brinkman-Stoppelenburg A, Rietjens JA, van der Heide A. The effects of advance care planning on end-of-life care: a systematic review. *Palliat Med*. 2014;28(8):1000–25.
9. Detering KM, Hancock AD, Reade MC, Silvester W. The impact of advance care planning on end of life care in elderly patients: randomised controlled trial. *Bmj*. 2010;340:c1345.
10. Baker A, Leak P, Ritchie LD, Lee AJ, Fielding S. Anticipatory care planning and integration: a primary care pilot study aimed at reducing unplanned hospitalisation. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2012;62(595):e113-20.
11. Klingler C, in der Schmitzen J, Marckmann G. Does facilitated Advance Care Planning reduce the costs of care near the end of life? Systematic review and ethical considerations. *Palliat Med*. 2016;30(5):423 – 33.
12. Groot MM, Vernooij-Dassen MJ, Crul BJ, Grol RP. General practitioners (GPs) and palliative care: perceived tasks and barriers in daily practice. *Palliat Med*. 2005;19(2):111–8.
13. Michiels E, Deschepper R, Van Der Kelen G, Bernheim JL, Mortier F, Vander Stichele R, et al. The role of general practitioners in continuity of care at the end of life: a qualitative study of terminally ill patients and their next of kin. *Palliat Med*. 2007;21(5):409–15.
14. Evans N, Pasman HR, Donker GA, Deliëns L, Van den Block L, Onwuteaka-Philipsen B. End-of-life care in general practice: A cross-sectional, retrospective survey of 'cancer', 'organ failure' and 'old-age/dementia' patients. *Palliat Med*. 2014;28(7):965–75.
15. Ermers DJM, van Bussel KJH, Perry M, Engels Y, Schers HJ. Advance care planning for patients with cancer in the palliative phase in Dutch general practices. *Fam Pract*. 2019;36(5):587–93.
16. Meeussen K, Van den Block L, Echteld M, Bossuyt N, Bilsen J, Van Casteren V, et al. Advance care planning in Belgium and The Netherlands: a nationwide retrospective study via sentinel networks of general practitioners. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2011;42(4):565–77.

17. Abarshi E, Echteld M, Donker G, Van den Block L, Onwuteaka-Philipsen B, Deliens L. Discussing end-of-life issues in the last months of life: a nationwide study among general practitioners. *J Palliat Med.* 2011;14(3):323–30.
18. Meeussen K, Van den Block L, Bossuyt N, Bilsen J, Echteld M, Van Casteren V, et al. GPs' awareness of patients' preference for place of death. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2009;59(566):665–70.
19. Piers RD, van Eeoud IJ, Van Camp S, Grypdonck M, Deveugele M, Verbeke NC, et al. Advance Care Planning in terminally ill and frail older persons. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2013;90(3):323–9.
20. De Vleminck A, Houttekier D, Pardon K, Deschepper R, Van Audenhove C, Vander Stichele R, et al. Barriers and facilitators for general practitioners to engage in advance care planning: a systematic review. *Scand J Prim Health Care.* 2013;31(4):215–26.
21. Howard M, Bernard C, Klein D, Elston D, Tan A, Slaven M, et al. Barriers to and enablers of advance care planning with patients in primary care: Survey of health care providers. *Can Fam Physician.* 2018;64(4):e190-e8.
22. Wichmann AB, van Dam H, Thoonsen B, Boer TA, Engels Y, Groenewoud AS. Advance care planning conversations with palliative patients: looking through the GP's eyes. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2018;19(1):184.
23. De Vleminck A, Pardon K, Beernaert K, Deschepper R, Houttekier D, Van Audenhove C, et al. Barriers to advance care planning in cancer, heart failure and dementia patients: a focus group study on general practitioners' views and experiences. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(1):e84905.
24. Murray SA, Kendall M, Boyd K, Sheikh A. Illness trajectories and palliative care. *Bmj.* 2005;330(7498):1007–11.
25. Lunney JR, Lynn J, Foley DJ, Lipson S, Guralnik JM. Patterns of functional decline at the end of life. *Jama.* 2003;289(18):2387–92.
26. Tilburgs B, Vernooij-Dassen M, Koopmans R, van Gennip H, Engels Y, Perry M. Barriers and facilitators for GPs in dementia advance care planning: A systematic integrative review. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(6):e0198535.
27. Murray SA, Kendall M, Grant E, Boyd K, Barclay S, Sheikh A. Patterns of social, psychological, and spiritual decline toward the end of life in lung cancer and heart failure. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2007;34(4):393–402.
28. Auriemma CL, Nguyen CA, Bronheim R, Kent S, Nadiger S, Pardo D, et al. Stability of end-of-life preferences: a systematic review of the evidence. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2014;174(7):1085–92.
29. Tapsfield J, Hall C, Lunan C, McCutcheon H, McLoughlin P, Rhee J, et al. Many people in Scotland now benefit from anticipatory care before they die: an after death analysis and interviews with general practitioners. *BMJ Support Palliat Care.* 2019;9(4):e28.
30. Murray SA, Boyd K, Sheikh A. Palliative care in chronic illness. *Bmj.* 2005;330(7492):611–2.
31. Claessen SJ, Francke AL, Engels Y, Deliens L. How do GPs identify a need for palliative care in their patients? An interview study. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2013;14:42.

32. Janssen DJA, Spruit MA, Schols J, Wouters EFM. A call for high-quality advance care planning in outpatients with severe COPD or chronic heart failure. *Chest*. 2011;139(5):1081–8.
33. Gott M, Gardiner C, Small N, Payne S, Seamark D, Barnes S, et al. Barriers to advance care planning in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Palliat Med*. 2009;23(7):642–8.
34. Thoonsen B, Groot M, Verhagen S, van Weel C, Vissers K, Engels Y. Timely identification of palliative patients and anticipatory care planning by GPs: practical application of tools and a training programme. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2016;15:39.
35. Mack JW, Cronin A, Keating NL, Taback N, Huskamp HA, Malin JL, et al. Associations between end-of-life discussion characteristics and care received near death: a prospective cohort study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30(35):4387–95.
36. Barnett K, Mercer SW, Norbury M, Watt G, Wyke S, Guthrie B. Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9836):37–43.
37. Block SD. Medical education in end-of-life care: the status of reform. *J Palliat Med*. 2002;5(2):243–8.
38. Ali AA, Adam R, Taylor D, Murchie P. Use of a structured palliative care summary in patients with established cancer is associated with reduced hospital admissions by out-of-hours general practitioners in Grampian. *BMJ Support Palliat Care*. 2013;3(4):452–5.
39. Midway, S., M. Robertson, S. Flinn and M. Kaller, 2020. Comparing multiple comparisons: practical guidance for choosing the best multiple comparisons test. *Bioinformatics and Genomics*. December 4, 2020 <https://peerj.com/articles/10387/>
40. Parker, S.M., J.M. Clayton, K. Hancock, S. Walder, P.N. Butow, S. Carrick, et al. A Systematic Review of Prognostic/End-of-Life Communication with Adults in the Advanced Stages of a Life-Limiting Illness: Patient/Caregiver Preferences for the Content, Style, and Timing of Information. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2007, 34(1):81–93

## Tables

Table 1

Patient characteristics and healthcare use in the last two years of life (subgroup analyses for cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity patients)

General characteristics	Total (n = 119)	Cancer (n = 55)	Organ failure (n = 28)	Multimorbidity (n = 36)	P value
Gender female, n (%)	61 (51)	29 (53)	14 (50)	18 (50)	0,957*
Age at time of death, mean (SD)	79 (14)	70 (14)	84 (8)	88 (7)	0,000**
Place of death, n (%)*	70 (63)	35 (66)	16 (67)	19 (54)	0,088***
- Home	32 (29)	11 (21)	7 (29)	14 (40)	
- Hospital	6 (5)	6 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	
- Hospice	4 (4)	1 (2)	1 (4)	2 (6)	
- Long-term care facility					
EoL support, n (%)	32 (27)	22 (40)	2 (7)	8 (22)	0.005*
- Palliative sedation	5 (4)	5 (9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0,085***
- Euthanasia/assisted suicide					
Healthcare use, median (25th -75th percentile, range)	1 (0-3, 0-15)	2 (1-3, 0-11)	2 (1-4, 0-15)	0,5 (0-1, 0-4)	0,000**
- Number of hospitalizations	1 (0-2, 0-9)	1 (0-3, 0-6)	2 (1-3, 0-9)	1 (0-1, 0-6)	0,006**
- Number of ER visits	1 (0-2, 0-9)	1 (0-3, 0-6)	2 (1-3, 0-9)	1 (0-2, 0-8)	0,316**
- Number of GP out of office hours contacts	1 (0-4, 0-22)	1 (0-4, 0-22)	2 (0-5, 0-6)		

\* Chi Square test

\*\* Kruskal Wallis test

\*\*\* Fisher's Exact test

Table 2

Prevalence and characteristics of Advance Care Planning by GP (subgroup analyses for cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity patients)

<b>Prevalence of ACP (documentation)</b>	<b>Total (n = 119)</b>	<b>Cancer (n = 55)</b>	<b>Organ failure (n = 28)</b>	<b>Multimorbidity (n = 36)</b>	<b>P value</b>
Prevalence (≥ 1 ACP item), n (%)	77 (65)	46 (84)	16 (57)	15 (42)	0,000*
<b>Characteristics of ACP</b>	<b>Total (n = 77)</b>	<b>Cancer (n = 46)</b>	<b>Organ failure (n = 16)</b>	<b>Multimorbidity (n = 15)</b>	<b>P value</b>
Extent Number of ACP items, median (25th -75th percentile, range)	4 (2-7, 1-11)	5 (2-7, 1-11)	3,5 (2- 6, 1-8)	2 (1-5, 1-7)	0,047** 0,222***
Subclassification: - Low (1 or 2 items)	29 (38)	15 (33)	6 (38)	6 (40)	
- Medium (3, 4 or 5 items)	26 (34)	14 (30)	6 (38)	1 (7)	
- High (≥ 6 ACP items)	22 (28)	17 (37)	4 (24)		
Frequency Number of ACP conversations, median (25th -75th percentile, range)	3 (1-4, 1-14)	3 (2-5, 1-14)	2 (1-3, 1-7)	2 (1-3, 1-4)	0,012**
Timing Time between first ACP conversation and death in days, median (25th -75th percentile, range)	126 (30- 316, 1- 714)	106 (22- 307, 3- 680)	227 (39- 395, 1- 714)	113 (52-320, 10-529)	0,417**

Table 3

Post-hoc tests on differences between groups of patients

<b>P values of post-hoc analyses</b>	<b>Cancer vs Organ failure</b>	<b>Cancer vs multimorbidity</b>	<b>Organ failure vs multimorbidity</b>
Prevalence (≥ 1 ACP item documented)	0,015*	0,000*	0,314*
Extent (number of ACP items)	0,417****	0,023****	0,175****
Frequency (number of ACP conversations)	0,043****	0,010****	0,520****

\* Chi Square test

\*\* Kruskal Wallis test

\*\*\* Fisher's Exact test

\*\*\* Mann Whitney U test

Table 4

ACP contents as documented by GPs (subgroup analyses for cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity patients)

Items of ACP	Total (n = 119)	Cancer (n = 58)	Organ failure (n = 28)	Multimorbidity (n = 36)	P value
Documented treatment preferences for future care, n (%)					
- Resuscitation	25 (21)	11 (20)	11 (39)	3 (8)	0,009
- Mechanical ventilation					
- Intensive Care Unit admission					
- Referral to ED and hospitalization	2 (2)	2 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0,499
- Antibiotics					
- Artificial feeding and liquid administration	4 (3)	2 (4)	2 (7)	0 (0)	0,266
- Other treatment preferences	22 (19)	8 (15)	8 (29)	6 (17)	0,286
	4 (3)	2 (4)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1,000
	1 (1)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1,000
	18 (15)	11 (20)	4 (14)	3 (8)	0,308
Documented EoL wishes, n (%)					
- Preferred place of care/death					
- Personal wishes/goals	35 (29)	20 (36)	7 (25)	8 (22)	0,327
	18 (15)	16 (29)	1 (4)	1 (3)	0,000
Discussed future scenarios, n (%)					
- Prognosis/life expectancy					
- Disease specific future scenarios	29 (24)	18 (33)	8 (29)	3 (8)	0,024
- Concerns and hopes towards future					
- Conversation about palliative sedation					
- Conversation about euthanasia	20 (17)	16 (29)	3 (11)	1 (3)	0,002
- Conversation 'end-of-life'					
	34 (29)	20 (36)	7 (25)	7 (19)	0,206
	27 (23)	22 (40)	4 (14)	1 (3)	0,000
	42 (35)	35 (64)	2 (7)	5 (14)	0,000
	22 (19)	14 (26)	5 (18)	3 (8)	0,136
Registered advance directives, n (%)					


- Declaration of will Items of ACP Appointment of legal representative	<b>Total</b> <b>(n =</b> <b>119)</b>	<b>Cancer</b> <b>(n =</b> <b>58)</b>	<b>Organ</b> <b>failure</b> <b>(n = 28)</b>	<b>Multimorbidity</b> <b>(n = 36)</b>	<b>P</b> <b>value</b>
	19 (16)	18 (33)	0 (0)	1 (3)	0,000
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-

Table 5

Content of ACP in correspondence of other healthcare provider (subgroup analyses for cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity patients)


Items of ACP	Total (n = 119)	Cancer (n = 58)	Organ failure (n = 28)	Multimorbidity (n = 36)	P value
Documented treatment preferences for future care, n (%)					
- Resuscitation	33 (28)	16 (29)	11 (39)	6 (17)	0,129
- Mechanical ventilation					
- Intensive Care Unit admission					
- Referral to ED and hospitalization	9 (8)	7 (13)	1 (4)	1 (3)	0,150
- Antibiotics					
- Artificial feeding and liquid administration	20 (17)	9 (16)	9 (32)	2 (6)	0,019
- Other treatment preferences					
	7 (6)	3 (6)	3 (11)	1 (3)	0,470
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
	1 (1)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1,000
	13 (11)	9 (16)	3 (11)	1 (3)	0,119
Documented EoL wishes, n (%)					
- Preferred place of care/death					
- Personal wishes/goals	11 (9)	8 (15)	1 (4)	2 (6)	0,272
	5 (4)	4 (7)	1 (4)	0 (0)	0,199
Discussed future scenarios, n (%)					
- Prognosis/life expectancy					
- Disease specific future scenarios	25 (21)	21 (38)	3 (11)	1 (3)	0,000
- Concerns and hopes towards future					
- Conversation about palliative sedation					
- Conversation about euthanasia	13 (11)	11 (20)	1 (4)	1 (3)	0,017
- Conversation 'end-of-life'					
	5 (4)	4 (7)	0 (0)	1 (3)	0,439
	4 (3)	3 (6)	1 (4)	0 (0)	0,358
	8 (7)	6 (11)	1 (4)	1 (3)	0,319
	2 (2)	2 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0,499

## Figures



**Figure 1**

Selection of patients who died non-suddenly of ‘cancer’, ‘organ failure’ or ‘multimorbidity’, and whose GP was their primary caregiver during the last two years of life



**Figure 2**

Patient characteristics and healthcare use in the last two years of life (subgroup analyses for cancer, organ failure and multimorbidity patients)

## Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Appendix1.docx](#)