Screening and prevention in Swiss primary care: a systematic review

Background and objectives: Prevention is a challenging area of primary care. In Switzerland, little is known about attitudes to and performance of screening and prevention services in general practice. To implement prevention services in primary care it is important to know about not only potential facilitators but also barriers. Primary care encompasses the activities of general practitioners, including those with particular interest and/or specializations (e.g., pediatrics, gynecology). The aim of this study was to review all studies with a focus on prevention services which have been conducted in Switzerland and to reveal barriers and facilitators for physicians to participate in any preventive measures.

Methods: The Cochrane Library, PubMed, EMBASE and BIOSIS were searched from January 1990 through December 2010. Studies focussing on preventive activities in primary care settings were selected and reviewed. The methodological quality of the identified studies was classified according to the guidelines in the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement.

Results: We identified 49 studies including 45 descriptive studies and four randomised controlled trials (RCTs). Twelve studies addressed the prevention of epidemics, eleven out of them vaccinations. Further studies focussed on lifestyle changes, physical activity counselling, smoking cessation, cardiovascular prevention and cancer screening. Perceived lack of knowledge/training and lack of time were the most commonly stated barriers. Motivation, feasibility and efficiency were the most frequently reported supporting factors for preventive activities. The methodological quality was weak, only one out of four RCTs met the applied quality criteria.

Conclusion: Most studies focussing on screening and prevention activities in primary care addressed vaccination, lifestyle modification or cardiovascular disease prevention. Identified barriers and facilitators indicate a need for primary-care-adapted education and training which are easy to handle, time-saving and reflect the specific needs of general practitioners. If new prevention programs are to be implemented in general practices, RCTs of high methodological quality are needed to assess their impact.
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Background
The WHO as well as most national health care authorities strongly recommend preventive services since there is a clear and overwhelming evidence of their effectiveness in many areas, especially in primary prevention. Primary prevention has shown to be four times as cost-effective as secondary prevention. Counselling and vaccinations are the most important preventive services, but there is also clear evidence for some
screening procedures. Despite the fact that these services can easily be provided, especially in a primary care setting, the delivery of preventive services remains low.3

In Switzerland, prevention is a central public health objective and should therefore play a major role in general practitioners’ (GPs) daily work. In consequence, over the years, several preventive programs as for example the recent “gesundheitscoaching-project” (“health coaching project”) from the Swiss college of primary care physicians (KHM) have been launched.4 If new prevention programs in primary care are to be introduced successfully, it is important to know about not only potential facilitators but also barriers to implementation. So far, little is known about GPs’ attitudes towards and performance of screening and prevention services in Switzerland. Several studies from the US have determined some barriers and facilitators to the performance of preventive services,5–9 namely and most importantly lack of time, along with provider forgetfulness, inconvenience and logistical difficulties, lack of expertise, lack of positive feedback, disagreement with recommendations, patient discomfort or refusal, high cost, and lack of third-party reimbursement. It remains unclear if these findings can be transferred to Switzerland. The Swiss health care system differs in many aspects, especially with regard to insurance schemes. In contrast to countries such as the US, in Switzerland all residents are insured and these insurances cover a large variety of preventive services. Therefore, the aim of this study was to review all studies with a focus on prevention services which have been conducted so far in Switzerland and to reveal the reported barriers and facilitators in Switzerland’s primary care setting.

Methods

Search strategy

The databases PubMed, BIOSIS, EMBASE and the Cochrane Library were searched systematically from January 1990 through December 2010 using medical subject headings and title key words related to “prevention”, “screening” and “primary care”. In addition, a manual search was done for four Swiss journals (“Schweizerische Ärztezeitung”, “Primary Care”, “Ars Medici” and “Managed Care”) which focus on primary care. The search was limited to studies performed in Switzerland and included articles in German, English and French.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were considered relevant if they addressed screening and prevention activities (including primary, secondary and tertiary prevention) in Swiss primary care. In addition, we included studies which were conducted in settings in which a primary care provider played a key role (eg, as an author or as a study participant). Review articles, study descriptions and studies about epidemiological prevalence were excluded. The methodological quality of all included studies was assessed using the guidelines in the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement.10

Data extraction and validity assessment

Data extraction was performed by one of the authors (DE) and checked independently by a second (MZ). Final extraction was decided by consensus of both. Included studies have been systematically analyzed for study motivation, topics, methods, age and gender of participants, results, conclusions, barriers and supporting factors for preventive measures and the specific role of the GP.

Results

Description of studies

The search of the databases yielded 1918 references, of which 49 met our inclusion criteria for detailed data abstraction (Figure 1). All studies were conducted in Switzerland and were published in German, English or French between 1990 and 2010. The main characteristics and the results are summarized and presented in Table 1. Most of the included studies were cross-sectional surveys and descriptive studies, with four randomized controlled trials (RCTs). The preventive interventions provided in the studies varied widely according to the addressed preventive subject. Twelve studies addressed the prevention of infectious diseases, especially influenza by providing vaccinations11–20 or by performing a specific diagnostic test.21 For clinical topics, most prevention activities addressed cardiovascular disease prevention,21–30 cancer screening,31–34 HIV,35–37 prevention of osteoporosis,38,39 addiction prevention,40,41 and others42–44 (Table 2). The most common observed intervention was counseling on lifestyle changes with twelve studies.30,48–59 Among them, six addressed counselling about physical activity and two dealt with smoking cessation. Most of the studies addressed specific age groups or patient characteristics, such as influenza vaccination in people older than 65 years, or enhancing physical activity in patients younger than 65 years.

Methodological quality

Our review revealed a remarkable number of studies performed in Swiss primary care with a focus on preventive services. Most of these studies did not define a clear intervention and did not define clear clinical outcomes or process parameters. Only six studies were two-armed studies with a defined control and intervention group. Of these six only four studies reported a randomized process. In consequence, only four
studies fulfilled the criteria for a randomized controlled trial (RCT). 41,48,51,53 Detailed information is displayed in Table 1.

In order to assess the methodological quality of the included RCTs, we used the guidelines in the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) statement.10 Overall, the methodological quality was weak. None of the RCTs fulfilled all of the CONSORT criteria. The best study fulfilled 30 out of 37 checklist items.53 Two of the remaining three RCTs met more than half and one of the RCTs met less than half of the criteria.

Barriers
Table 3 displays the most frequently mentioned barriers in screening and prevention services from a GP’s as well as from a patient’s perspective.

Barriers from GP’s perspective
Thirty nine studies reported any barriers which precluded GPs from performing screening and prevention services.12,13,15–17,19–22,24–27,29–33,35,36,39–53,55,57–59 The most frequently cited barriers were “lack of knowledge/skills” (20 out of 39), 16,24,25,30–33,35,40–44,46,47,49,51,52,58,59 “lack of time/high workload” (11 out of 39)12,29,30,32,33,43,48,51,53,55,59 and “own disbeliefs” (9 out of 39).17,19,25,30,39–41,50,57

Lack of knowledge/skills
Lack of knowledge or skills was the most common reported barrier and mentioned in studies with completely different clinical targets, eg, in studies addressing cardiovascular risk factors, 24,25,30 cancer prevention, 31,33 addiction prevention 40,41 or in different prevention interventions for infectious diseases.16,35 The main barrier reported was the lack of specific communication skills for counselling in lifestyle changes 43,49 and insufficient routine in specific counselling.51,58,59 Insufficient sources of information were mentioned, eg, in the field of advice-giving for travelling.52 Five further studies on different areas of prevention also reported a lack of knowledge and skills as a barrier.42–44,46,47

Lack of time/high workload
Time constraints were found in several studies, independent of the prevention focus.29,30,52 Five studies focusing
Table 1 Key features of studies included in the systematic review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No of providers</td>
<td>No of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allenspach et al48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical activity counselling depending on the current level of physical activity</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bally et al10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retrospective analysis of adherence to plasma cholesterol management guidelines</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchmeier et al11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vaccination counselling by a healthcare professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovier et al12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questionnaire about attitudes and use of recommended vaccinations</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovier et al13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mail survey about missed opportunities for vaccination in adults, regarding patients' perceptions and GPs' recommendations</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovier et al49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review of medical files regarding adherence to diabetes care guidelines</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner-La Rocca/Marti23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Patients' questionnaire about after care following myocardial infarction</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucher et al42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Determination of the effect of study results reporting using either the relative or the absolute risk reduction</td>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerletti-Knusel et al44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessment of knowledge in terms of endocarditis prophylaxis</td>
<td>285 (164 dentists, 121 PCP)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornuz et al43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Determination of the relative importance of certain barriers to preventive interventions and exploration of the association between physicians' characteristics and their attitudes towards prevention</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckert/Junker45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Investigation about smoking cessation management by GPs</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workload, time constraints, disturbance, of daily routine, too complex project organisation, doubts about the own counselling abilities

Relevant comorbidity, priority of other disease, belief that risk doesn’t require screening (acceptance and knowledge of guidelines), forgetting to follow guidelines, lack of time

Medical contraindication, need for an additional person

No time to verify vaccination status and convince patient to be immunized and other logistic issues related to physician’s practice, patients expressing a categorical no to vaccinations, allergy to a vaccine, lack of material and/or personnel

Lack of clear national objectives and guidelines regarding the prevention of vaccine-preventable diseases, area of residence

Documentation of family and personal history and of lipid profile, specific communication and counselling skills

Misinterpretation of different variables expressing the same result, lack of training

Knowledge

Lack of time, lack of patient interest, lack of training, consumption of more than three alcoholic drinks per day, sedentary lifestyle, lack of national certification and lack of awareness of their own blood pressure

Weak belief in the efficacy of short counselling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients</th>
<th>Supporting factors</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Methodological quality of RCTs: fulfilled CONSORT criteria*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time, interest</td>
<td>Personal contacts of the project team's colleagues, manageable workload, agreement with the project's idea and practical implementation, own physical activity</td>
<td>Patients' interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal to take drugs</td>
<td>Positive predictors for overall guideline adherence were cardiovascular event in family and elevated triglycerides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical contraindication, need for an additional person</td>
<td>Medical contraindication, patient's own choice put into question</td>
<td>Professional's aid, advice, reminder letter, organizational and administrative strategies, feasibility and effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own positive attitudes towards vaccination, regular use of the different sources of information, readiness to take responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician's recommendation, perceived usefulness, opinion, lack of physician's encouragement, lack of efficacy of the influenza vaccination</td>
<td>French-speaking region, promotion campaigns</td>
<td>Patient’s perceived usefulness of vaccination and opinion, age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to focus on the patient's individual needs</td>
<td>Risk of relapse (smoking), fear</td>
<td>RCT 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 4b, 5, 6a, 8b, 11a, 11b, 12a, 12b, 13a, 15, 16, 17a, 17b, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, techniques to tailor information in a differentiated way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge, guidelines</td>
<td>Education and instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of the responsibility for prevention, high motivation to implement prevention in the daily practice, consciousness of patients' expectations regarding prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing advice from the physician, missing wish to stop</td>
<td>Patients' expectation of being asked about smoking, guidelines, short counselling with good effects</td>
<td>Physician’s advice, poor health status, heavy smoking, intention to stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichler et al</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation of barriers impeding the application of cardiovascular prediction rules in primary prevention</td>
<td>356 questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escher/Sappino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment of physicians’ knowledge, attitude, and perception of their role towards testing for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etter et al</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Testing of the acceptability and effectiveness of mailing “Smoker” stickers to private practitioners (and its influence on smoking cessation counselling)</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaspoz et al</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Analysis of the impact of a public campaign on chest pain on physicians involved in the prehospital care (physician delay, rates of immediate hospitalization, transportation by ambulance)</td>
<td>749 before, 866 after the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasser et al</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Validation of a case finding strategy for postmenopausal women who would benefit most from subsequent DXA measurement</td>
<td>90 / 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauthey et al</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of flu vaccination coverage of the geriatric population living in the community</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotschi et al</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experiences with a program for patients with coronary artery disease: patient identification, measuring of performance, recruitment and motivation of patients for a CAD-training</td>
<td>Practice A: 66; practice B: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugelmann et al</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of hepatitis B vaccination attitudes referred to existing guidelines</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller et al</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brief intervention using a motivational interviewing style and a guide known as the 5A’s. Training sessions with actors</td>
<td>7 / 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Patients | Supporting factors | Study design | Methodological quality of RCTs: fulfilled CONSORT criteria*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers (GPs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions: workshops, journal articles, more simple prediction rules, lectures. The effect is questionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable opinion of genetic testing, feeling of responsibility, suggested: targeted educational programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of the responsibility for prevention, high motivation to implement prevention in the daily practice, consciousness of patients’ expectations regarding prevention</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>RCT 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 4b, 5, 7a, 7b, 8a, 13a, 15, 16, 17a, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalangeal measurement site easily accessible, widespread access to conventional x-ray devices</td>
<td>Better diagnosis, cost-efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely affected by flu, “good health”, no recommendation, fear of vaccination side effects, doubts about the effectiveness, information, little knowledge</td>
<td>Physician’s advice and information, information in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently absolved rehabilitation program, feeling to be too old to participate</td>
<td>Useful tool in chronic disease management, network synergies, additional personnel</td>
<td>Satisfaction with the program, felt to be helpful, gratefulness for the time given to discuss personal matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older children or adolescents, combined vaccines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being flexible in time schedule, good feasibility and usefulness, benefit from training</td>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No of providers</td>
<td>No of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasse et al&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of anti-infectious strategies after splenectomy, assessment of adherence to vaccination guidelines, the use of antibiotics and the awareness of the infectious risks</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatz et al&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Survey about knowledge, sources of information and the needs of physicians regarding travel advice</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausser/Jeangros&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evaluation of preventive activities in ambulatory care among self-employed physicians</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>7482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayoz et al&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigation of the Ankle/Brachial Pressure Index (ABI) for its suitability in daily practice to identify patients at atherothrombotic risk</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>25,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenin et al&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment of the knowledge, attitudes and practices of women in respect to breast cancer and its prevention. The present study focuses on access by women to medical preventive measures</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy/Martin&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Investigation of physical activity based on the transtheoretical model (TM) of behaviour change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krause et al&lt;sup&gt;54&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment of the awareness of the risk of rabies for travelers, and of the relevant preventive measures</td>
<td>150 Swiss, 150 German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malinverni et al&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Questionnaire about current practice, attitudes and knowledge on care, prevention and treatment of HIV infection and HIV-related problems</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marki et al&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt; (a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Systematic counselling by general practitioners for promoting physical activity in elderly patients</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marki et al&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt; (b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development and testing of a counselling program based on the Transtheoretical Model of behavioral change</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Methodological quality of RCTs: fulfilled CONSORT criteria*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge and education</td>
<td>Knowledge, being informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Interest in the provision of information and awareness of the need for improved information; vaccination schedules; requested: checklist, information leaflets on malaria and medical journals Own motivation</td>
<td>Compliance, leaflets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms of pain (rheumatism, back pain), lack of time, lack of interest</td>
<td>Feasibility of the system, physicians’ commitment</td>
<td>Good and useful perception of the project, being given an incentive to get moving (brief feedback)</td>
<td>RCT 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 4b, 5, 6a, 8a, 8b, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b, 14a, 14b, 15, 16, 17a, 17b, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician’s awareness</td>
<td>Published recommendations on travel advice</td>
<td>Physician’s awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor motivation, already high level of physical activity</td>
<td>Handling of the counselling protocol was considered easy</td>
<td>Tailored information materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems (already high level of physical activity)</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Good acceptance of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matter et al17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of the impact of the Swiss MMR vaccination campaign (started in 1987) on disease frequency</td>
<td>150–200; &gt;200</td>
<td>Mumps vaccine quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter et al18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monitoring clinical pertussis over time</td>
<td>150–200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moiradat Rytz et al19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questionnaire about the use of vaccination against influenza in the hospital milieu and by family physicians in Fribourg in 1997: facts and opinions</td>
<td>104 GPs, 19 clinicians</td>
<td>Oblivion of vaccination, patient refusal, disagreement with official guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntwyler et al28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>National survey on prescription of cardiovascular drugs among outpatients with coronary artery disease in Switzerland</td>
<td>650; 565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page et al17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Study about the quality of generalist versus specialty care for people with HIV on antiretroviral treatment</td>
<td>10 GPs, 6 clinicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelet et al22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evaluation of governmental policies of easier and increased access to MMT in Vaud</td>
<td>236; 1782</td>
<td>Difficult management, comorbidity, lack of knowledge about adequate methadone dosage; ambivalence about methadone, treating unstable patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltenburg et al45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Survey about preserving vision in the elderly: quality development program in general practice</td>
<td>107; 4918</td>
<td>Implementation and awareness of ophthalmological concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdrix et al16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Detection of alcoholism in general practice: Applicability of the CAGE test by the general practitioner</td>
<td>12; 416</td>
<td>Negative perception of the test (partly as useless, eg, If clinical evaluation was clear enough), delicate topic for the first consultation and relationship to patients, own attitude, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pichert et al23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Questionnaires about Swiss primary care physicians’ knowledge, attitudes and perception towards genetic testing for hereditary breast cancer</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge, time, high workload, limitations of providing genetic services at the primary care level, understanding of risks and benefits is still very insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praz et al44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Questionnaires about screening of the prostate cancer</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramseier46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Survey on the observance of the international guidelines for relapse in acute and long-term treatment of depression and schizophrenia</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients</td>
<td>Supporting factors</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Methodological quality of RCTs: fulfilled CONSORT criteria*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower vaccination coverage in the Romandie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of banalization</td>
<td>Conviction of responsibility in HIV prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of side effects, disbelief in necessity</td>
<td>Overall high opinion of the vaccine efficacy and tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad health status, bad health-related quality of life, health care model</td>
<td>High motivation, specialized knowledge, communication skills, cooperation with specialists; Treatment program; Cooperation with ophthalmologists, special skills</td>
<td>Choice of an individual health care model</td>
<td>RCT 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 4a, 4b, 5, 7a, 12a, 13a, 16, 17a, 20, 21, 22, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easy access, low-threshold management; high level of integration in the social framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and awareness of complexity, favorable attitudes and readiness to play a central role in every part of the genetic counseling and testing process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>Own initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard et al&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation of the performance of sentinel and mandatory-based surveillance systems for measles in Switzerland (comparison of both systems in terms of their aptitude to promote measles elimination)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Reporting system, reporting compliance, unclear diagnosis criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmid et al&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation of two procedures to tackle physical inactivity: counselling and mailing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Little routine, time pressure, personal obstacles of the physician, physical activity promotion alone perceived as too specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebo et al&lt;sup&gt;57&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cross-sectional assessment of diabetes care in order to identify diabetic patients’ characteristics and medical care factors associated with recommended glycemic control (HbA1c ≈ 7%)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Quality of care, motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steurer-Stey et al&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investigation of physicians’ knowledge of the principles and implementation of self-management in asthma care</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Inadequate financial compensation, lack of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoll et al&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-reflection about the implementation of guidelines in osteoporosis management</td>
<td>13 (1996), 14 (1997)</td>
<td>No regular follow-ups, no clear indication for therapy, skepticism against guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaudaux/Steinemann&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of Swiss physicians’ knowledge on hepatitis B, their perception of parental information concerning this infection, their attitude towards planned universal vaccination, and their agreement with different universal immunization scenarios</td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>Logistic problems arising from the administration of three doses within two subsequent school years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunderli et al&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assessment of the use of a ‘near patient’ test for rapid antigen detection to obtain the more timely acquisition of data for the surveillance of influenza epidemics</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Lower sensitivity of the rapid test, results not always accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on preventive lifestyle changes reported a lack of time as a major barrier in counselling regarding physical activity,<sup>48,53,55</sup> cannabis use, smoking cessation or alcohol reduction.<sup>43,51,59</sup>

A study addressing the prevention of hepatitis B by providing vaccination stated a lack of time to verify vaccination status and to convince patients to be immunised.<sup>12</sup>

**Own disbeliefs**

Own disbeliefs were a barrier found in many studies. This includes reluctance to use tests, eg, a detection-test of alcoholism;<sup>41</sup> ambivalence about the use of methadone in patients with drug use disorders;<sup>40</sup> disbeliefs in the quality of interventions;<sup>17</sup> or in their necessity;<sup>25,30</sup> or skepticism about current guidelines.<sup>19,39</sup>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Methodological quality of RCTs: fulfilled CONSORT criteria*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers (GPs)</td>
<td>Patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation, compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of patient’s interest</td>
<td>Face-to-face contact, regarding a patient’s individual situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal of the patient, psychiatric and physical comorbidity, formal contra-indication, compliance problems, language problems</td>
<td>Stronger conviction of the physician to implement guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster yield of results, no laboratory needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Abbreviations: RCT, Randomised Control Trial; INTS, Intervention Study; NR, Not Reported; PCP, Primary Care Physician; GP, General Practitioner; SD, Standard Deviation; DXA, Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (bone densitometry); CAD, Coronary Artery Disease; ABI, Ankle Brachial Index; CAGE, clinical test for the assessment of alcohol-related problems (Cut down, Annoyed, Guilty, Eye-opener).

Barriers from patient’s perspective

We identified 24 studies which reported barriers precluding patients from using screening and prevention services.11,13,14,16,17,19,23,24,29,30,32,36,37,39,43,48,50–56,59 The most frequently cited barriers were “the lack of GP’s engagement” (5 out of 24),13,14,32,56,54 “the lack of interest or time” (8 out of 24),23,43,48,51,53,59 and “own disbeliefs” (3 out of 24).13,14,19

Lack of GP’s engagement

In the patient’s view a lack of GP engagement was a common barrier. This referred to the lack of encouragement from
Facilitators from GP’s perspective
Independent of the prevention subject, 43 studies reported any factor which supports GPs to perform preventive activities.11–13,15–19,31–33,37–39,48–50–59 Most frequently cited facilitators were “counselling” (15 out of 43),12,19,20,31,33,36,37,39,41,44,47,48,51–53 “conviction/motivation” (10 out of 43),24,26,33,35,37,41,42,45,49,50,58 and “feasibility/usefulness” (7 out of 43),13,21,22,27,29,48,50,53,55,58

Motivation/attitude
Physicians’ acknowledgement of responsibility for prevention and high motivation to implement prevention were the main facilitators in several studies, independent of the main prevention focus (lifestyle changes,48,51–53 infectious diseases,12,19,20,36,37 cancer screening,31,33 and further aspects of prevention41,43,44,47).

Education/knowledge
Several studies showed that a specific awareness13 and knowledge about a disease, as well as an existing guideline (eg, guidelines on endocarditis prevention24) or a specific training or educational programmes can increase the probability that the GP will provide prevention services.26,35,37,41,42 Also the role of special skills was highlighted in an ophthalmological study in elderly patients in routine ophthalmologic controls to preserve vision as factor that increases specific prevention.45

Feasibility/usefulness
Counselling of inactive patients,48,53,55 smokers,50 and patients using cannabis58 was considered as feasible in daily practice. This was considered as a facilitator in using these preventive interventions. Useful tools in chronic disease management (patient education, reminder)29 and for identification of patients at atherothrombotic risk (ankle/brachial pressure index)27 were also found to be facilitators in performing preventive services.

Facilitators from patient’s perspective
We identified 23 studies describing factors which support patients to use preventive activities.11,13,14,16,18,24,28,32,34,37,38,40,43,48,50–58 The most frequently cited facilitators were “education/knowledge” (8 out of 23),11,14,16,22,24,32,50,54,55 “conviction/motivation/information” (5 out of 23)28,34,43,48,50,51 and “feasibility/usefulness” (4 out of 23).11,13,38,53

Counselling
Information and GP’s advice to use screening and preventive services are supporting factors.11,14,16,22,24,32,55 Receiving information and advice from a physician was not only an

### Table 2 Subjects of prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of prevention</th>
<th>Number of studies (n = 49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of infectious diseases and epidemics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle changes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular prevention</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer screening</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporosis prevention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

Facilitators from GP’s perspective
Independent of the prevention subject, 43 studies reported any factor which supports GPs to perform preventive activities.11–13,15–19,31–33,37–39,48–50–59 Most frequently cited facilitators were “counselling” (15 out of 43),12,19,20,31,33,36,37,39,41,44,47,48,51–53 “conviction/motivation” (10 out of 43),24,26,33,35,37,41,42,45,49,50,58 and “feasibility/usefulness” (7 out of 43),13,21,22,27,29,48,50,53,55,58

Motivation/attitude
Physicians’ acknowledgement of responsibility for prevention and high motivation to implement prevention were the main facilitators in several studies, independent of the main prevention focus (lifestyle changes,48,51–53 infectious diseases,12,19,20,36,37 cancer screening,31,33 and further aspects of prevention41,43,44,47).

Education/knowledge
Several studies showed that a specific awareness13 and knowledge about a disease, as well as an existing guideline (eg, guidelines on endocarditis prevention24) or a specific training or educational programmes can increase the probability that the GP will provide prevention services.26,35,37,41,42 Also the role of special skills was highlighted in an ophthalmological study in elderly patients in routine ophthalmologic controls to preserve vision as factor that increases specific prevention.45

Feasibility/usefulness
Counselling of inactive patients,48,53,55 smokers,50 and patients using cannabis58 was considered as feasible in daily practice. This was considered as a facilitator in using these preventive interventions. Useful tools in chronic disease management (patient education, reminder)29 and for identification of patients at atherothrombotic risk (ankle/brachial pressure index)27 were also found to be facilitators in performing preventive services.

Facilitators from patient’s perspective
We identified 23 studies describing factors which support patients to use preventive activities.11,13,14,16,18,24,28,32,34,37,38,40,43,48,50–58 The most frequently cited facilitators were “education/knowledge” (8 out of 23),11,14,16,22,24,32,50,54,55 “conviction/motivation/information” (5 out of 23)28,34,43,48,50,51 and “feasibility/usefulness” (4 out of 23).11,13,38,53

Counselling
Information and GP’s advice to use screening and preventive services are supporting factors.11,14,16,22,24,32,55 Receiving information and advice from a physician was not only an
important determinant in the decision to receive influenza vaccination\textsuperscript{11,14} but also regarding smoking cessation, or preventive arrangements in the context of travel medicine.\textsuperscript{30,34}

Conviction/motivation

The patient’s interest or own initiative (eg, in smoking cessation\textsuperscript{30,34,48}) was found to be an important factor in different studies\textsuperscript{28,34,48} Another study showed that the patient’s perceived usefulness of tetanus, influenza and pneumococcal vaccination were associated with vaccination status.\textsuperscript{13}

Feasibility/usefulness

A personal proposal suggesting a hepatitis B vaccination by a health care professional was considered as an effective measure to achieve high vaccination coverage.\textsuperscript{11}

By a specific intervention (feedback, counselling) one study observed that patients’ physical activity could be improved effectively.\textsuperscript{53}
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Discussion

The study was performed to review all studies with a focus on prevention services in Swiss primary care settings, and to identify barriers and facilitators which influenced physicians in performing and patients in using preventive services.

We could include numerous studies which were conducted in Switzerland during the last twenty years. Taking into account the small number of all studies performed in primary care in Switzerland, the proportion of studies focusing on preventive services is remarkably high. This fact may demonstrate the importance of prevention in primary care, not only in acute or infectious, but also in chronic illnesses. Many studies have shown that preventive activities are an effective way to reduce the burden of chronic illnesses.\textsuperscript{2,60–62}

A major finding of our review was that the methodological quality of the available studies is very low. Our results strongly emphasize that future projects should have clearly defined populations, interventions, and outcomes to be able to create valid data about the efficacy but also efficiency of preventive services in primary care.

We identified 49 studies which addressed the prevention of epidemics, lifestyle changes, physical activity counseling, smoking cessation, cardiovascular disease prevention and cancer screening. Included studies revealed several barriers and facilitators in performing screening and prevention activities from GP’s as well as from patients’ perspective.
Perceived lack of knowledge/skills, lack of time/high workload and own disbeliefs were the most commonly stated barriers to performing screening and prevention services from the GP’s perspective. The lack of GP engagement, lack of interest and time as well as own disbeliefs were the most frequently reported barriers in using preventive activities from the patients’ perspective. Two reviews on cancer screening, one specifically on colorectal cancer screening and one screening for both colorectal and breast cancer have found very similar barriers, including the GP’s disbelief in the usefulness of testing on the physician’s side and the lack of recommendation to screen as a barrier from the patient’s perspective. A British study on intervention against excessive alcohol consumption showed that GPs report too little training to deal with the problem in everyday practice. An American study based on a questionnaire about cholesterol treatment revealed an insufficient knowledge and awareness about the treatment goal of non-HDL-Cholesterol.

Both reviews on cancer prevention also revealed the lack of financial coverage by insurance as a major barrier. This problem did not arise in our study since in Switzerland everyone is obliged to have health insurance that also covers many of the mentioned preventive interventions. The following supporting factors in performing preventive services were mentioned by GPs: motivation/attitude, education/knowledge, feasibility/usefulness. From a patient’s perspective, counselling, conviction/motivation and feasibility/usefulness were the most frequently reported supporting factors for using preventive activities. Similar facilitators such as extent of knowledge or attitude of both the GP and the patient were found in cancer screening. In the US an electronic medical record reminder was found to augment the influenza and pneumococcal vaccination rate.

**Sponsorship**

Half of the disclosed sponsorships relate to the pharmaceutical industry and the other half originates in foundations and official authorities. This latter finding suggests that some political efforts are made to support prevention in primary care.

**Strengths and limitations**

Our review included a broad variety of studies addressing prevention in primary care over a time period of two decades, but has several limitations. The main limitation is that the methodological quality of the studies is very low. Due to this, conclusions about effective preventive services are not possible. Furthermore, the focus on the country rather than on a single disease or a disease class precludes clear findings regarding barriers and facilitators.

**Conclusion**

Most reviews focussing on screening and prevention activities in primary care addressed vaccination, lifestyle modification and cardiovascular disease prevention. Identified barriers and facilitators indicate a need for primary-care-adapted education and training in prevention which are easy to handle, time saving, and reflect the specific needs of general practitioners. If new prevention programs are to be implemented in general practices, RCTs of high methodological quality are needed to assess their impact.
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