



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2017

Choosing Wisely – An international and multimorbid perspective

Battegay, Edouard J; Cheetham, Marcus

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zefq.2017.10.010>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-142170>

Journal Article

Accepted Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Battegay, Edouard J; Cheetham, Marcus (2017). Choosing Wisely – An international and multimorbid perspective. *Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im Gesundheitswesen*, 129:27-30.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zefq.2017.10.010>

Choosing Wisely – An international and multimorbid perspective.

E.J. Battegay,^{1,2,3*} and M. Cheetham,^{1,2,3}

1. Department of Internal Medicine, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
2. Center of Competence Multimorbidity, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
3. University Research Priority Program “Dynamics of Healthy Aging”, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

edouard.battegay@usz.ch

marcus.cheetham@usz.ch

*Corresponding author: edouard.battegay@usz.ch

Keywords: Choosing Wisely, overuse, top five lists, multimorbidity.

Abstract

Some medical diagnostic and therapeutic interventions are non-beneficial or even harmful. The *Choosing Wisely* campaign has encouraged the generation of “top five” lists of unnecessary low-value services in different specialist areas. In the USA alone, where the campaign was launched, these lists include a total of 450 evidence-based recommendations. Professional associations in further countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, England, Switzerland and Germany have since initiated Choosing Wisely campaigns. Besides implementing top five lists, these aim to change attitudes, expectations and practices in the culture of medicine. The field of internal medicine has spearheaded change in Switzerland (Swiss Society of General Internal Medicine: Smarter Medicine) and Germany (German Society of Internal Medicine: Klug entscheiden). Formulating Choosing Wisely principles in managing complex patients with multiple concurrent acute or chronic diseases, i.e., *multimorbidity (MM)*, will present a particular challenge. Research is needed to determine the primary sources of overuse in specific combinations of diseases (i.e., MM clusters) and spearhead corresponding recommendations. National Choosing Wisely campaigns may serve as a forerunner to a more global initiative.

Zusammenfassung

Einige medizinische diagnostische und therapeutische Interventionen sind nicht vorteilhaft oder sogar schädlich. Choosing Wisely Kampagnen haben die Erstellung von "Top-5"-Listen unnötiger oder minderwertiger Interventionen (Low-Value-Services) in verschiedenen Fachgebieten gefördert. Allein in den USA, wo die Kampagne gestartet wurde, enthalten diese Listen insgesamt 450 evidenzbasierte Empfehlungen. Berufsverbände in weiteren Ländern wie Kanada, Australien, Neu Seeland, England, der Schweiz und Deutschland haben seitdem Choosing Wisely Kampagnen initiiert. Neben der Implementierung von Top-5-Listen sollen diese Einstellungen, Erwartungen und Praktiken

in der Kultur der Medizin verändern. Wissenschaftliche Fachverbände der Inneren Medizin haben in der Schweiz (Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Allgemeine Innere Medizin: Smarter Medicine) und in Deutschland (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Innere Medizin: Klug entscheiden) Choosing Wisely Kampagnen vorangetrieben. Das Formulieren von Choosing Wisely Kampagnen bei der Betreuung komplexer Patienten mit mehreren gleichzeitigen akuten oder chronischen Krankheiten, d.h. Multimorbidität (MM), wird eine besondere Herausforderung darstellen. Forschung ist erforderlich, um die primären Quellen der Überbeanspruchung in bestimmten Kombinationen von Krankheiten (d.h. MM-Cluster) und entsprechende Empfehlungen zu entwickeln. Nationale Choosing Wisely Kampagnen sollen als Vorläufer einer globalen Initiative dienen.

The beginnings of Choosing Wisely

Modern medicine has produced an impressive range of diagnostic and therapeutic interventions.^{1,2} Careful evaluation of their effectiveness suggests that some of these interventions have no recognizable benefit and can even be detrimental to the patient.^{3,4,5} While acting in good faith, clinicians and their institutions may be unwittingly promoting overuse of health care resources, without adding value of care for patients, by delivering ineffective, harmful wasteful or unnecessary interventions.^{6,7} This problem is estimated to account for as much as 30% of all medical expenditure in the USA.^{8,9}

Information to discourage the use of non-beneficial or harmful interventions may be collected from a wide variety of sources. However, high-quality knowledge in medical databases can be difficult to access and knit together for specific cases. Also, medical books are limited to generic principles and can soon become outdated. Online databases of medical research are growing so quickly that the sheer quantity of information can hinder the capacity of individuals to retrieve, process and use new knowledge to guide treatment decisions.^{10,11} Systematic literature reviews often focus on favorable findings of effectiveness with little mention of safety and tolerability,^{12,13} and the all too literal application of clinical guidelines may be wrong or even hazardous for the individual patient.¹⁴

The over- and underuse of medical resources has long been the subject of debate in expert committees, specialist associations, professional and non-specialist media, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and the general public.^{15,16} But this debate has been hard to initiate, to maintain and to apply. This is in part because research has focused more on underuse of health care. Furthermore, development of measures of overuse has met with various research, cultural, and political challenges,¹⁷ and because efforts to bring the various stakeholders together has been slow.¹⁸ Therefore, the *American Board of Internal Medicine (ABIM) Foundation* started Choosing Wisely in 2012 to encourage physicians and patients in the USA to enter into dialogue about overuse of unnecessary tests, treatments and procedures.^{19,20,21,22}

Global development

Choosing Wisely invited a diverse array of specialist societies to determine in their own field of expertise a “top five” list of particularly prevalent low-value services. These lists have the character of recommendations based on evidence of inappropriate and potential harm. This medical campaign has been a great success. To date, over 60 medical societies in the USA have created a total of 450 recommendations through lists of five common tests, treatments or procedures for which there is strong scientific evidence that they do not benefit patients or may even cause harm.^{12,13} *Wisely Canada* followed USA in 2014, with 21 societies, and supporting patient organizations, generating top five recommendations within two years^{23,24,25} and a total of 264 recommendations.²⁶ *Choosing Wisely Australia*²⁷ began in 2015, with 21 societies generating by the end of 2016 a total of 123 recommendations.

Professional associations in further countries, including New Zealand, England, Wales, Japan, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland and Germany have since launched Choosing Wisely campaigns to reach and influence the professional field.²⁸ Choosing Wisely in the UK can build on the work of the *National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)* that has identified around 800 potentially unnecessary interventions.²⁹ Besides the top five lists, the key elements of the Choosing Wisely campaigns relate to changing physician attitudes to practice, patient engagement and acceptance, key clinical practices (e.g., shared decision making), and better alignment with the healthcare system (e.g., with the payment system).^{30,31,32,33} Generally, these campaigns differ in stage of implementation,³⁴ sponsorship, structure, methods, organization, financing, and content. For example, the German initiative (Klug Entscheiden) considers both overuse and as well as underuse of beneficial procedures, having now generated 115 recommendations through 12 specialist societies and actively disseminated these in specialist literature.³⁵

Smarter Medicine

The campaign in Switzerland, referred to as Smarter Medicine, has been spearheaded by experts and chief physicians in the field of internal medicine by the Swiss Society of General Internal Medicine (Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Allgemeine Innere Medizin), focussing on low-value and especially prevalent interventions for outpatients in 2014 and for inpatients in 2016.^{36,37}

These recommendations could be taken as a general example of the style of recommendations of societies in Choosing Wisely campaigns. Thus, the Swiss campaign outlined five procedures to be avoided for outpatients:

1. Obtaining imaging studies during the first six weeks in patients with non-specific low back pain.
2. Performing the Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA) test to screen for prostate cancer without a discussion of the risks and benefits.
3. Prescribing antibiotics for uncomplicated upper respiratory tract infections.
4. Obtaining preoperative chest radiography in the absence of a clinical suspicion for intra-thoracic pathology.
5. Continuing long-term treatment of gastro-intestinal symptoms with proton pump inhibitors without titrating to the lowest effective dose needed.

For inpatients, procedures to be avoided include:

1. Ordering blood tests at regular intervals or routine extensive lab panels including X-rays without specific clinical questions.
2. Placing or leaving in place urinary catheters for incontinence or monitoring of output for non-critically ill patients.
3. Transfusing more than the minimum number of red blood (RBC) units necessary to relieve symptoms of anemia or to return a patient to a safe hemoglobin range.
4. Letting older adults lie in bed during their hospital stay. In addition, individual therapeutic goals should be established considering the patients' values and preferences.
5. Using benzodiazepines or other sedative-hypnotics in older adults as first choice for insomnia, agitation or delirium and avoid prescription at discharge.

Choosing Wisely and multimorbidity

When recommendations from top-five lists are not relevant for a specific case, Choosing Wisely encourages prudent judgement as to what the clinician and patient should or should not do in order to counter overuse. For example, avoiding imaging studies in patients with "non-specific low back pain" (the first Swiss recommendation for outpatients) asks for very careful clinical evaluation to identify "specific low back-pain" and the identification of "red flags", i.e., symptoms or signs, that would support immediate use of imaging studies.³⁸ Such red flags in back pain also include morbidities such

as immunosuppression, cancer and tumors and inflammatory diseases which may suggest a more severe, complicated or dangerous disease constellation. For example, a patient with kidney transplantation and therefore immunosuppression may develop back pain due to spondylodiscitis, i.e., he may have two or more concurring disease conditions. Judgements are therefore inherently tied to the particulars of the unique patient, especially when handling multiple concurrent acute or chronic diseases, that is, *multimorbidity (MM)*.^{39,40} In MM, the clinician is often faced with complex trade-offs between benefits and risks of different treatment strategies in order to manage potentially adverse *disease-disease, drug-disease and drug-drug interactions (DDIs)*.⁴¹ Instead of there being a “right” treatment, the clinician prioritizes and reconciles these DDIs with the most suitable therapeutic strategy for the patient’s specific pattern of diseases, goals and preferences.⁴² Recommendations from clinical practice guidelines and the top-five lists could enhance uncertainties,⁴³ as these typically relate to the treatment of single diseases (with exceptions, e.g.,^{44,45,46}). The handling of multiple uncertainties can in itself lead to overuse, for example, by over-precautionary use of tests and treatments in order to diminish potential risks to patients and enhance subjective confidence in the selected course of treatment.^{47,48,49}

The intricacies of DDIs and risk management in MM thus present a particular challenge to Choosing Wisely and guidelines in general.^{50,51} Research into MM-specific opportunities for Choosing Wisely is needed to determine which tests and treatments are unnecessary.⁵² Given the huge number and heterogeneity of MM clusters and DDIs,^{53,54,55} overuse research to develop five Choosing Wisely measures in MM could begin by prioritizing specific MM clusters (e.g., a top-five list of MM clusters). The aims would be to determine the scale and primary sources of overuse (e.g., over-precaution in risk management), understand moderating factors (e.g., differences in expertise and risk perception, stress, cognitive overload, patient anxiety and demands, attitudes toward different types of intervention),^{56,57,58,59,60} and develop and integrate recommendations into the management of these clusters. The potential impact on care value could be large, considering the high prevalence of MM.^{61,62,63}

Future developments and challenges

Change in health policies and practices and public knowledge and expectations should be evidence-based.⁶⁴ The successes of Choosing Wisely in different countries may give impetus to a more coordinated global initiative and effort. Thus, a number of factors might help to overcome engrained practices and to sustain acceptance and adoption of Choosing Wisely: A synthesis of the existing top five lists across participating countries and specialist fields may further promote good practice such that these are internationally accepted and adopted norms (i.e., quality goals to aim for), despite considerable heterogeneity of health care provision and policy across different countries. Multinational top five lists may serve to better patient outcomes and to reduce waste in a global effort. This may strengthen research on overuse.⁶⁵ The scope of this research should be broadened to generate Choosing Wisely recommendations that align well with the everyday context of the diverse challenges encountered by physicians, patients and relatives in dealing with the intricacies of managing MM and polypharmacy. Prioritizing a top-five list of prevalent MM clusters might facilitate the observability of progress in and benefits of Choosing Wisely in MM.

References

¹ Weatherall D, Greenwood B, Chee HL, et al. (2006). Science and Technology for Disease Control: Past, Present, and Future. In: Jamison DT, Breman JG, Measham AR, et al., editors. Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries. 2nd edition. Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank; Chapter 5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11740/> Co-published by Oxford University Press, New York.

- ² Institute of Medicine (US) and National Academy of Engineering (US) Roundtable on Value & Science-Driven Health Care. Engineering a Learning Healthcare System: A Look at the Future: Workshop Summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2011. 3, Healthcare System Complexities, Impediments, and Failures. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK61963/>
- ³ Wennberg JE. (2004). Practice variations and health care reform: connecting the dots. *Health Aff (Millwood) Suppl Variation*:VAR140–4.
- ⁴ Academy of Royal Medical Colleges. Protecting resources, promoting value: a doctor's guide to cutting waste in clinical care. Secondary Academy of Royal Medical Colleges. Protecting resources, promoting value: a doctor's guide to cutting waste in clinical care, 2014. http://www.aomrc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Protecting_Resources_Promoting_Value_1114.pdf (accessed 19 June 2017).
- ⁵ Chou R. (2015). Cardiac screening with electrocardiography, stress echocardiography, or myocardial perfusion imaging: advice for high-value care from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*,162:438–47.
- ⁶ Emanuel EJ, & Fuchs VR. The perfect storm of overutilization. *JAMA* 2008;299:2789–91
- ⁷ Institute of Medicine. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington DC: National Academy Press, 2001.
- ⁸ Wennberg JE, Fisher ES, & Skinner JS.(2002). Geography and the debate over Medicare reform. *Health Aff (Millwood)*;Suppl Web Exclusives:W96–114.
- ⁹ Institute of Medicine (US) Roundtable on Evidence-Based Medicine. In: Yong PL, Saunders RS, Olsen LA, eds. The Healthcare Imperative: Lowering Costs and Improving Outcomes: Workshop Series Summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2010. The National Academies.
- ¹⁰ Larsen, P. O., & von Ins, M. (2010). The rate of growth in scientific publication and the decline in coverage provided by Science Citation Index. *Scientometrics*, 84(3), 575–603.
- ¹¹ Druss, B. G., & Marcus, S. C. (2005). Growth and decentralization of the medical literature: implications for evidence-based medicine. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 93(4), 499–501.
- ¹² Loke, Y. K., Price, D., Herxheimer, A., & the Cochrane Adverse Effects Methods Group. (2007). Systematic reviews of adverse effects: framework for a structured approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 7, 32.
- ¹³ Golder, S., Loke, Y., & McIntosh, H. M. (2006). Room for improvement? A survey of the methods used in systematic reviews of adverse effects. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 6, 3.
- ¹⁴ Woolf, S. H., Grol, R., Hutchinson, A., Eccles, M., & Grimshaw, J. (1999). Potential benefits, limitations, and harms of clinical guidelines. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*, 318(7182), 527–530.
- ¹⁵ World Health Organization. (2000). Appropriateness in Health Care Services, Report on a WHO Workshop. Copenhagen, WHO.
- ¹⁶ Combes J.R. & Arespachoga E. (2013). Appropriate Use of Medical Resources. *American Hospital Association's Physician Leadership Forum*, Chicago, IL.
- ¹⁷ Keyhani, S., & Siu, A. L. (2008). The Underuse of Overuse Research. *Health Services Research*, 43(6), 1923–1930.
- ¹⁸ Gaspoz, J. (2015). Smarter medicine: do physicians need political pressure to eliminate useless interventions? *Swiss Med Wkly.*, 145:w14125
- ¹⁹ Cassel CK, & Guest JA. (2012). Choosing wisely: helping physicians and patients make smart decisions about their care. *JAMA*, 307:1801–2.
- ²⁰ Wolfson D, Santa J, & Slass L. (2014). Engaging physicians and consumers in conversations about treatment overuse and waste: a short history of the choosing wisely campaign. *Acad Med.*, 89: 990–5.
- ²¹ Brody H. (2014). Talking with patients about cost containment. *J Gen Intern Med*,29: 5–6.
- ²² Fine B, & Dhanoa D. (2014). Imaging appropriateness criteria: why Canadian family physicians should care. *Can Fam Physician*, 60:217–18.
- ²³ Levinson W, & Huynh T. (2014). Engaging physicians and patients in conversations about unnecessary tests and procedures: choosing Wisely Canada. *CMAJ*, 186, 325–6.
- ²⁴ Grady D, Redberg RF, & Mallon WK. (2014). How should top-five lists be developed?: what is the next step? *JAMA Intern Med.*, 174,498–9.
- ²⁵ Gliwa C, & Pearson SD. (2012). Evidentiary rationales for the Choosing Wisely Top 5 lists. *JAMA*,311:1443–4.
- ²⁶ <https://choosingwiselycanada.org/recommendations/>
- ²⁷ Choosing Wisely in Australia. 2016 Report. http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/choosingwiselyaustralia/media/Media/PDF/Resources/NPS0139_CWA-2016-Report_FINAL.pdf. (accessed 19 June 2017).

- ²⁸ Levinson W, Kallewaard M, & Bhatia RS. (2015). On behalf of the Choosing Wisely International Working Group, et al 'Choosing Wisely': a growing international campaign. *BMJ Qual Saf.*,24: 167-174.
- ²⁹ Garner, S., and Littlejohn, P. (2011). Disinvestment from low-value clinical investments: NICEly done? *BMJ*, 343, d4519.
- ³⁰ Korenstein D, Falk R, Howell EA, et al. (2012). Overuse of health care services in the United States: an understudied problem. *Arch Intern Med.*,172: 171–8.
- ³¹ Berwick DM, Hackbarth AD. Eliminating waste in US health care. *JAMA* 2012;307:1513–16.
- ³² Keyhani S, Falk R, Howell EA, et al. (2013). Overuse and systems of care: a systematic review. *Med Care*, 51: 503–8.
- ³³ Levinson W, & Huynh T. (2014). Engaging physicians and patients in conversations about unnecessary tests and procedures: choosing Wisely Canada. *CMAJ*, 186, 325–6
- ³⁴ Levinson W, & Huynh T. (2014). Engaging physicians and patients in conversations about unnecessary tests and procedures: choosing Wisely Canada. *CMAJ*, 186, 325–6
- ³⁵ Fölsch, U. R. Hallek, M. Raupach, T. Hasenfuß G. (2017). Resonanz und Weiterentwicklung der Initiative Klug entscheiden. *Der Internist*, 58, 527-531
- ³⁶ Gaspoz, J. (2017). Der Trend: Smarter Medicine. *Therapeutische Umschau* (2017), 74, pp. 786-790
- ³⁷ Information for physicians "Top Five List for « Choosing Wisely". Available from <http://www.smartermedicine.ch/de/top-5-listen>. (accessed 19 June 2017).
- ³⁸ Locher, H.-A., Böhni, U.W., von Heymann, W. (2017). Rücken-/Kreuzschmerz. Pages 1178ff. *Differenzialdiagnose Innerer Krankheiten* (Battegay, E., ed) Thieme Verlag Stuttgart New York 21st edition
- ³⁹ van den Akker M, Buntinx, F, & Knottnerus, J. (1996). Comorbidity or multimorbidity: what's in a name. A review of literature. *Eur. J. Gen. Pract.* 2; 65e70.
- ⁴⁰ Bayliss EA, Edwards AE, Steiner JF, & Main DS. (2008). Processes of care desired by elderly patients with multimorbidities. *Fam Pract.* 25(4); 287-293.
- ⁴¹ Battegay, E., Cheetham, M., Holzer, B M., Nowak, A., Schmidt, D., Rampini, S. (2017). Multimorbiditätsmanagement im Alltagsdilemma, *Der Internist*, 344 – 353.
- ⁴² Markun S, Holzer BM, Rodak R, et al. (2014). Therapeutic conflicts in emergency department patients with multimorbidity: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*;9:e110309.
- ⁴³ Boyd CM, Darer J, Boulton C, Fried LP, Boulton L, et al. (2005) Clinical Practice Guidelines and Quality of Care for Older Patients with Multiple Comorbid Diseases. *JAMA* 294: 716–724.
- ⁴⁴ Gutermann IK, Niggemeier V, Zimmerli LU, et al. (2015). Gastrointestinal bleeding and anticoagulant or antiplatelet drugs: systematic search for clinical practice guidelines. *Medicine*, 94:e377.
- ⁴⁵ Guthrie B, Payne K, Alderson P, et al. Adapting clinical guidelines to take account of multimorbidity. *BMJ* 2012;345:e6341.
- ⁴⁶ Blozik E, van den Busche H, Gurtner F, et al. (2013). Epidemiological strategies for adapting clinical practice guidelines to the needs of multimorbid patients. *BMC Health Serv Res.*,13:352.
- ⁴⁷ Tannert, C., Elvers, H.-D., & Jandrig, B. (2007). The ethics of uncertainty. In the light of possible dangers, research becomes a moral duty. *EMBO Reports*, 8(10), 892–896.
- ⁴⁸ Stirling A. (2007). Risk, precaution and science: towards a more constructive policy debate. *EMBO Rep* 8: 309–315.
- ⁴⁹ Miyakis, S., Karamanof, G., Liontos, M., & Mountokalakis, T. D. (2006). Factors contributing to inappropriate ordering of tests in an academic medical department and the effect of an educational feedback strategy. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 82(974), 823–829.
- ⁵⁰ Bally, K., Martina, B., Halter, U., Isler, R., Tschudi, P., (2010). Barriers to Swiss guideline-recommended cholesterol management in general practice. *Swiss Med Wkly.*,140:280-5.
- ⁵¹ Dumbreck, S., Flynn, A., Nairn, M., Wilson, M., Treweek, S., Mercer, S.W., Alderson, P., Thompson, A., Payne, K., Guthrie, B. (2015). Drug-disease and drug-drug interactions: systematic examination of recommendations in 12 UK national clinical guidelines *BMJ*, 2015;350:h949 doi:10.1136/bmj.h949
- ⁵² Søndergaard, E., Willadsen, T. G., Guassora, A. D., Vestergaard, M., Tomasdottir, M. O., Borgquist, L., & Reventlow, S. (2015). Problems and challenges in relation to the treatment of patients with multimorbidity: General practitioners' views and attitudes. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care*, 33(2), 121–126.
- ⁵³ Marengoni A, Angleman S, Melis R, et al. (2011). Aging with multimorbidity: a systematic review of the literature. *Ageing Res Rev.*,10:430–9.

- ⁵⁴ Vogeli C, Shields AE, Lee TA, et al. (2007). Multiple chronic conditions: prevalence, health consequences, and implications for quality, care management, and costs. *J Gen Intern Med*;22(suppl 3):391–5.
- ⁵⁵ WHO: The European health report 2009: health and health systems. Copenhagen: World Health Organisation; 2009.
- ⁵⁶ Riva, S., Monti, M., Iannello, P., & Antonietti, A. (2012). The Representation of Risk in Routine Medical Experience: What Actions for Contemporary Health Policy? *PLoS ONE*, 7(11), e48297.
- ⁵⁷ Chauvin B1, Hermand D, Mullet E. (2007). Risk perception and personality facets. *Risk Anal.* 27(1):171-85.
- ⁵⁸ Gray, G. & Ropeik, D., 2002. "Dealing with the Dangers of Fear: The Role of Risk Communication", *Health Affairs*, 21, no. 6 (2002), 106-116.
- ⁵⁹ Fenton JJ, Franks P, Feldman MD, Jerant A, Henry SG, Paterniti DA, et al. Impact of patient requests on provider-perceived visit difficulty in primary care. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2015;30(2):214–20.
- ⁶⁰ Schleifer D, Rothman DJ (2012) "The Ultimate Decision Is Yours": Exploring Patients' Attitudes about the Overuse of Medical Interventions. *PLOS ONE* 7(12): e52552.
- ⁶¹ Bundesamt für Statistik (2013). Todesursachenstatistik Sterblichkeit und deren Hauptursachen in der Schweiz. *BFS Aktuell*. Neuchâtel
- ⁶² Moreau-Gruet, F. (2013/4): Multimorbidität bei Personen ab 50 Jahren. Ergebnisse der Befragung SHARE (Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe). Bulletin des Schweizerischen Gesundheitsobservatorium 2013/4
- ⁶³ Schneider, F., Kaplan, V., et al. (2012). Prevalence of multimorbidity in medical inpatients. *Swiss Med Wkly*, 142, w13533
- ⁶⁴ Bhatia RS, Levinson W, Shortt S, et al. (2015). Measuring the effect of Choosing Wisely: an integrated framework to assess campaign impact on low-value care. *BMJ Qual Saf*,24: 523-531.
- ⁶⁵ Keyhani, S., & Siu, A. L. (2008). The Underuse of Overuse Research. *Health Services Research*, 43(6), 1923–1930.