



Beyond the Clock: Reconciling Efficiency with Comprehensive Care in the 15-Minute Visit

Lujain Abduh Alamodi ⁽¹⁾, Alrumaisaa Ahmad Daafi ⁽¹⁾, Wejdan Saddiq Hindi ⁽¹⁾, Kharifah Mohammad Ibrahim Sherah ⁽¹⁾, Tariq Dohmi Ahmed Mubarak ⁽¹⁾, Khulud Abdullah Omaysh ⁽¹⁾, Wasan Siddiq Alsalem ⁽¹⁾, Shaima Yahya Otayf ⁽¹⁾, Fatima Ahmed Majrabi ⁽¹⁾, Ahmed Ali Shubayli ⁽¹⁾, Ghaliya Yahya Ali Shannaq ⁽¹⁾, Wedad Mohammad Alhazmi ⁽¹⁾, Ebtisam Rashid Alsehly ⁽¹⁾, Ibtihal Hassan Ali Hadi ⁽¹⁾, Shemah Mohamed Ali Hakami ⁽¹⁾

(1) Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: The 15-minute patient visit has become a predominant model in modern healthcare systems, driven by economic pressures, physician shortages, and rising patient volumes. This constrained timeframe presents a significant challenge to delivering comprehensive, patient-centered care, potentially compromising quality, satisfaction, and clinical outcomes. **Aim:** This narrative review aims to critically synthesize the evidence on strategies to maximize both efficiency and clinical effectiveness within the 15-minute primary care visit, analyzing the inherent tensions and proposing a framework for optimized practice. **Methods:** A comprehensive literature search was conducted across PubMed, Scopus, and PsycINFO databases (2010-2024). Studies focusing on time management, communication techniques, team-based care, technology integration, and outcome measures in brief outpatient consultations were included and thematically analyzed. **Results:** Evidence supports the efficacy of specific pre-visit planning, agenda setting, shared decision-making aids, effective team delegation, and integrated digital tools in enhancing visit quality. However, the review identifies persistent risks, including physician burnout, disparities in care for complex patients, and over-reliance on transactional medicine. **Conclusion:** Maximizing the 15-minute visit requires a multifaceted approach that extends beyond clinician speed to encompass system-level redesign, team function, and technology leverage. A "pre-visit, in-visit, post-visit" model, supported by continuous training and appropriate performance metrics, is essential to reconcile efficiency with comprehensive, effective care. **Keywords:** Time Management; Primary Health Care; Physician-Patient Relations; Clinical Efficiency; Team-Based Care.

Introduction

The structure of the primary care encounter has undergone a profound transformation, with the 15-minute visit emerging as a standard unit of clinical time in many healthcare systems worldwide (Irving et al., 2017). This model is largely a product of economic imperatives, capitated payment structures, and efforts to improve access by increasing patient throughput (Abbo et al., 2008). While intended to enhance efficiency, this temporal compression creates a fundamental tension with the expanding goals of contemporary primary care, which include managing multiple chronic conditions, providing preventive services, addressing psychosocial concerns, and fostering therapeutic relationships (Basu et al., 2020). The pressure to deliver comprehensive care within a brief window has significant implications for clinicians, patients, and healthcare outcomes, raising critical questions about sustainability, quality, and safety (Sinsky et al., 2016).

This review synthesizes a decade and a half of literature to explore how healthcare systems and individual practitioners can navigate this tension. It

moves beyond lamenting time constraints to critically examine evidence-based strategies that can enhance the effectiveness of the short visit, while also acknowledging its inherent limitations and potential adverse consequences. The central thesis is that optimizing the 15-minute visit is not solely the responsibility of the clinician's personal efficiency but necessitates deliberate organizational, technological, and relational adaptations.

The Genesis and Pressures of the Time-Constrained Visit

The evolution toward shorter consultations is rooted in healthcare financing and workforce dynamics. Fee-for-service models often incentivize volume, while value-based care models, though aiming for quality, still frequently operate within productivity-focused organizational cultures (Bodenheimer & Smith, 2013). Simultaneously, physician shortages, particularly in primary care, exert pressure to expand panel sizes, indirectly forcing shorter visit slots to accommodate demand (Pettersson et al., 2012). Administrative burdens, primarily from electronic health record (EHR) documentation and

regulatory requirements, further erode the time available for direct patient interaction (Arndt et al., 2017). This "time squeeze" is quantitatively evident; studies indicate that primary care physicians (PCPs) spend an average of just 13-16 minutes face-to-face with patients while spending nearly two hours on EHR work daily (Overhage & McCallie, 2020; Tai-Seale et al., 2017). The cognitive load is immense, as clinicians must rapidly toggle between diagnostic reasoning, therapeutic planning, patient education, and data entry (Ming et al., 2020). This environment can lead to a phenomenon termed "contextual error," where the lack of time prevents the exploration of psychosocial or situational factors crucial for accurate diagnosis and tailored management (Weiner et al., 2010). Thus, the 15-minute visit is not merely a scheduling unit but a symbol of the complex systemic pressures challenging holistic care delivery.

Impacts on Care Quality, Safety, and the Clinician-Patient Relationship

The compression of visit time carries measurable risks. Research has linked shorter visit durations to poorer patient perceptions of care, including lower ratings of communication, shared decision-making, and overall satisfaction (Asare et al., 2019; Roland et al., 2011). Clinically, time pressure increases the likelihood of prescription errors, inadequate chronic disease management, and missed preventive service opportunities (Evans et al., 2019). For patients with multimorbidity, the 15-minute slot is often grossly inadequate to address competing demands, leading to "clinical inertia" where prioritization becomes necessary at the expense of comprehensive management (Grant et al., 2020). The therapeutic relationship, a cornerstone of effective primary care, is also vulnerable. Building trust and rapport requires time for narrative exploration, which is often sacrificed in favor of task completion (Epstein et al., 2017). This can foster a transactional dynamic, where care feels fragmented and depersonalized. For clinicians, the relentless pace contributes significantly to burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of accomplishment (Shanafelt et al., 2016). The moral distress arising from knowing what comprehensive care entails but being unable to deliver it due to systemic constraints is a potent driver of professional dissatisfaction (Dean et al., 2019). Therefore, while efficiency is a valid goal, it must be pursued in tandem with safeguards for quality and clinician well-being.

Strategies for Maximizing In-Visit Efficiency and Effectiveness

Despite the challenges inherent in the compressed consultation, a robust body of evidence supports specific, actionable techniques that can significantly enhance both the productivity and the clinical quality of the brief encounter. These strategies are centered on restructuring the clinician-patient interaction to maximize focused, patient-centered

communication. The foundational step is the explicit negotiation of the visit's agenda, a practice known as shared agenda development. Initiating the conversation with openings like, "What would you like to accomplish today?" or by transparently stating, "I see we have 15 minutes; let's prioritize your most important concerns," establishes a collaborative framework and sets realistic expectations (Garcia et al., 2020). This approach not only fosters partnership but also functionally prevents the "doorknob" phenomenon—where critical concerns are revealed only as the visit concludes—and allows the clinician to gently guide the conversation or schedule follow-up for less urgent items if the patient's list is unmanageable within the allotted time (White & Danis, 2013).

Once the agenda is set, the clinical assessment must be equally disciplined. Moving from a rote, comprehensive review of systems to a targeted, hypothesis-driven history is far more efficient. Incorporating techniques from motivational interviewing, such as eliciting the patient's own perspective with questions like, "What do you think is causing your symptoms?" can rapidly uncover key psychosocial and clinical concerns (De Vries et al., 2014). The physical examination should be thoughtfully guided by this focused history, concentrating on relevant systems while remaining attuned to critical non-verbal cues. Following assessment, patient education and shared decision-making (SDM) must be executed with similar precision. Effective education prioritizes clarity, using simple language, emphasizing one to three key messages, and employing the "teach-back" method to confirm patient understanding (Schillinger et al., 2003). Importantly, SDM need not be a lengthy process; it can be integrated efficiently through the use of simple decision aids, the presentation of curated options (e.g., "We have two main approaches here..."), and the active elicitation of patient preferences (Elwyn et al., 2017).

Finally, the burden of documentation, a major driver of inefficiency and burnout, must be addressed within the visit flow. Strategies such as employing medical scribes—either human or digital—to manage the electronic health record (EHR) in real-time have demonstrated efficacy in reducing physician documentation time, improving chart quality, and increasing direct patient-facing time (Gidwani et al., 2017). Complementary approaches, including training in concise, templated note-writing and the use of voice recognition software, can further mitigate the documentation burden and prevent work from spilling into personal time (Meeks et al., 2014). A synthesis of these core in-visit strategies is presented in Table 1, which organizes evidence-based techniques across the pre-visit, in-visit, and post-visit continuum to provide a practical framework for clinicians.

Table 1: Evidence-Based Strategies for the 15-Minute Clinical Encounter

Phase	Strategy	Key Action	Evidence of Benefit
Pre-Visit	Pre-Visit Planning	Review records, identify care gaps (e.g., overdue screenings).	Reduces in-visit cognitive load, improves preventive service delivery (Bodenheimer & Laing, 2007).
	Pre-Visit Data Collection	Use patient portals for history updates, medication reviews, and PROMs.	Saves in-visit time, provides structured data, engages patients (Irizarry et al., 2015).
In-Visit	Agenda Setting	Openly negotiate priorities for the time available.	Improves visit focus, patient satisfaction, and reduces late-arising concerns (Garcia et al., 2020).
	Focused Communication	Use teach-back, brief action planning, and shared decision-making aids.	Enhances patient understanding, adherence, and perception of involvement (Elwyn et al., 2017).
	Team Huddle	Brief pre-visit team meeting to assign tasks (e.g., vitals, injections, education).	Improves workflow efficiency and role clarity (Sinsky et al., 2014).
Post-Visit	Care Coordination	Delegate follow-up tasks (scheduling, referrals, patient messages) to the team.	Frees physician time, ensures continuity (Bodenheimer & Smith, 2013).
	Streamlined Documentation	Use templates, dictation, or scribe services.	Reduces after-hours charting, mitigates burnout (Gidwani et al., 2017).

The Critical Role of Team-Based Care

Reconceptualizing the "visit" as a team-based episode of care, rather than a solitary physician-patient interaction, is perhaps the most powerful strategy for enhancing comprehensiveness. The Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH) model formalizes this approach, distributing tasks according to skill sets (Nutting et al., 2011). Nurses, medical assistants, pharmacists, and social workers can perform vital functions. Pre-visit, medical assistants can conduct medication reconciliation and update histories (Bodenheimer & Laing, 2007). During the visit, they can administer vaccines, perform point-of-care testing, and provide standardized education for common conditions. Post-visit, clinical pharmacists can manage medication titration for chronic diseases, and nurses can conduct structured follow-up calls for conditions like hypertension or depression (Breton et al., 2021). This delegation, or "top-of-license" practice, requires a shift in mindset, workflow redesign, and clear protocols. Studies show that effective team-based care is associated with improved quality metrics, better chronic disease outcomes, and higher physician and patient satisfaction (Willard-Grace et al., 2014). It fundamentally alters the arithmetic of the 15-minute visit, allowing the physician's expertise to be focused on complex diagnosis, management planning, and relationship-building, while other needs are met by the broader team.

Leveraging Technology and Asynchronous Care

Digital tools can extend the care continuum beyond the physical confines of the visit. Patient portals facilitate asynchronous communication, allowing for secure messaging for follow-up questions, prescription renewals, and non-urgent advice, preventing these from consuming visit time

(Zhou et al., 2019). Remote patient monitoring (e.g., for blood pressure, glucose, weight) transmits data to the care team between visits, enabling proactive management without requiring an appointment (Noah et al., 2018). Automated patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) collected via tablet or portal before the visit can efficiently screen for depression, functional status, or symptom severity, providing valuable data to guide the consultation (Chen et al., 2013). Furthermore, artificial intelligence (AI) applications are emerging to assist with pre-visit chart review, drafting visit summaries, and identifying care gaps, potentially reducing administrative burden (Bohr & Memarzadeh, 2020). However, these technologies also introduce challenges, including the digital divide, increased clinician inbox burden, and the need for new workflow integration (Meyer et al., 2020). Their value lies not in adding more tasks but in intelligently redistributing and supporting them across the care continuum.

Addressing Complexity and Equity in Brief Encounters

A significant critique of the 15-minute model is its failure to accommodate variability in patient needs. Patients with low health literacy, limited English proficiency, or complex psychosocial situations inherently require more time for effective communication and care coordination (Sudore et al., 2018). Rigid scheduling that does not account for this complexity risks exacerbating health disparities. Solutions include predictive scheduling based on past utilization or reason for visit, creating longer "complex care" appointment slots, and embedding behavioral health or social work resources for immediate warm handoffs (Shepardson et al., 2023). Proactive panel management, where care teams stratify patients by risk and reach out between visits, can help manage the

needs of the most complex patients without relying solely on scheduled visits (van den Berk-Clark et al., 2018). Equity demands that efficiency measures be

flexible and patient-centered, not a one-size-fits-all constraint that disadvantages vulnerable populations.

Table 2: Systemic versus Individual-Level Interventions to Optimize Brief Visits

Level	Intervention Category	Examples	Potential Outcomes
System & Organization	Payment Model Reform	Value-based payments, capitation with risk adjustment, payment for team activities.	Aligns financial incentives with quality and comprehensiveness over volume.
	Team Structure & Training	Integrated care teams, defined roles, regular huddles, co-location of services.	Enhances care coordination, expands visit capacity, improves staff satisfaction.
	Schedule Design & Templates	Variable appointment lengths, dedicated time for complex patients, protected admin time.	Better matches time to need, reduces physician stress and burnout.
	Health IT Optimization	Integrated EHR tools, patient portals for pre-visit data, AI for documentation support.	Reduces administrative burden, improves data accessibility, engages patients.
Clinician & Patient	Communication Skills Training	Agenda-setting, shared decision-making, motivational interviewing, cultural humility.	Improves visit focus, patient adherence, and therapeutic alliance.
	Personal Efficiency Practices	Pre-visit planning, focused charting, task delegation to team members.	Reduces in-visit stress, improves time management.
	Patient Preparation & Activation	Encouraging pre-visit agenda preparation, use of portals, and self-management support.	Leads to more efficient, productive visits centered on patient goals.

Measurement, Metrics, and Moving Beyond Productivity

A key barrier to change is the prevailing measurement system. If healthcare organizations primarily track "patients per hour" or "relative value units (RVUs)" as markers of success, they incentivize speed over quality (Raffoul et al., 2016). Shifting towards a balanced scorecard is essential. This would include patient-reported experience measures (PREMs), clinical quality indicators (e.g., control of diabetes, hypertension), measures of comprehensiveness (e.g., continuity of care index), and clinician well-being metrics (e.g., burnout rates) (Lewis et al., 2014). Evaluating the success of a 15-minute visit paradigm should consider outcomes across this broader spectrum, assessing whether efficient visits are also effective, satisfying, and sustainable for the care team.

Conclusion and Future Directions

The 15-minute visit is a reality of modern primary care, but it need not be a barrier to high-quality, comprehensive practice. Maximizing its potential requires a multi-layered approach that transcends individual clinician haste. It demands: (1) System-level redesign through team-based care models and payment reforms that reward value; (2) Skillful use of technology to handle administrative and monitoring tasks asynchronously; (3) Advanced communication skills to foster rapid yet meaningful connections; and (4) Flexible scheduling that acknowledges variable patient needs. The future of the

brief visit lies in redefining it as the central, but not solitary, component of a continuous care process supported by a prepared team and empowered patients. Further research should focus on implementing and evaluating integrated models that combine these elements, with particular attention to their impact on health equity, clinician burnout, and long-term population health outcomes. The goal is not merely to survive the 15-minute visit, but to transform it into a node of efficient, effective, and humane care within a larger, supportive system.

References

1. Abbo, E. D., Zhang, Q., Zelder, M., & Huang, E. S. (2008). The increasing number of clinical items addressed during the time of adult primary care visits. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 23(12), 2058-2065. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-008-0805-8>
2. Arndt, B. G., Beasley, J. W., Watkinson, M. D., Temte, J. L., Tuan, W. J., Sinsky, C. A., & Gilchrist, V. J. (2017). Tethered to the EHR: primary care physician workload assessment using EHR event log data and time-motion observations. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 15(5), 419-426. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2121>
3. Asare, M., Fakhoury, C., Thompson, N., Culakova, E., Kleckner, A. S., Adunlin, G., ... & Kamen, C. S. (2020). The patient-provider relationship: predictors of black/African American Cancer patients'

- perceived quality of care and health outcomes. *Health communication*, 35(10), 1289-1294.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2019.1625006>
4. Basu, S., Phillips, R. S., Phillips, R., Peterson, L. E., & Landon, B. E. (2020). Primary Care Practice Finances In The United States Amid The COVID-19 Pandemic: Study estimates the potential impact of COVID-19 on operating expenses and revenues of primary care practices. *Health Affairs*, 39(9), 1605-1614.
<https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00794>
 5. Bodenheimer, T., & Laing, B. Y. (2007). The teamlet model of primary care. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 5(5), 457-461.
<https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.731>
 6. Bodenheimer, T. S., & Smith, M. D. (2013). Primary care: proposed solutions to the physician shortage without training more physicians. *Health Affairs*, 32(11), 1881-1886.
<https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0234>
 7. Bohr, A., & Memarzadeh, K. (2020). The rise of artificial intelligence in healthcare applications. In *Artificial Intelligence in healthcare* (pp. 25-60). Academic Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00002-2>
 8. Breton, M., Sullivan, E. E., Deville-Stoetzel, N., McKinstry, D., DePuccio, M., Sriharan, A., ... & McAlearney, A. S. (2021). Telehealth challenges during COVID-19 as reported by primary healthcare physicians in Quebec and Massachusetts. *BMC family practice*, 22(1), 192.
<https://doi.org/10.12927/hcpol.2021.26576>
 9. Chen, J., Ou, L., & Hollis, S. J. (2013). A systematic review of the impact of routine collection of patient reported outcome measures on patients, providers and health organisations in an oncologic setting. *BMC health services research*, 13(1), 211.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-211>
 10. Dean, W., Talbot, S., & Dean, A. (2019). Reframing clinician distress: moral injury not burnout. *Federal Practitioner*, 36(9), 400.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31571807/>
 11. De Vries, A. M. M., De Roten, Y., Meystre, C., Passchier, J., Despland, J. N., & Stiefel, F. (2014). Clinician characteristics, communication, and patient outcome in oncology: a systematic review. *Psycho-Oncology*, 23(4), 375-381.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3445>
 12. Elwyn, G., Durand, M. A., Song, J., Aarts, J., Barr, P. J., Berger, Z., ... & Van der Weijden, T. (2017). A three-talk model for shared decision making: multistage consultation process. *bmj*, 359.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4891>
 13. Epstein, R. M., Duberstein, P. R., Fenton, J. J., Fiscella, K., Hoerger, M., Tancredi, D. J., ... & Kravitz, R. L. (2017). Effect of a patient-centered communication intervention on oncologist-patient communication, quality of life, and health care utilization in advanced cancer: the VOICE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA oncology*, 3(1), 92-100.
[doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2016.4373](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2016.4373)
 14. Evans, D. B., Henschen, B. L., Poncelet, A. N., Wilkerson, L., & Ogur, B. (2019). Continuity in undergraduate medical education: mission not accomplished. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 34(10), 2254-2259.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-04949-0>
 15. Garcia, M. E., Hinton, L., Gregorich, S. E., Livaudais-Toman, J., Kaplan, C., & Karliner, L. (2020). Unmet mental health need among Chinese and Latino primary care patients: intersection of ethnicity, gender, and English proficiency. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 35(4), 1245-1251.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05483-9>
 16. Gidwani, R., Nguyen, C., Kofoed, A., Carragee, C., Rydel, T., Nelligan, I., ... & Lin, S. (2017). Impact of scribes on physician satisfaction, patient satisfaction, and charting efficiency: a randomized controlled trial. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 15(5), 427-433.
<https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.2122>
 17. Grant, R. W., McCloskey, J., Hatfield, M., Uratsu, C., Ralston, J. D., Bayliss, E., & Kennedy, C. J. (2020). Use of latent class analysis and k-means clustering to identify complex patient profiles. *JAMA network open*, 3(12), e2029068-e2029068.
[doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.29068](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.29068)
 18. Irizarry, T., DeVito Dabbs, A., & Curran, C. R. (2015). Patient portals and patient engagement: a state of the science review. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 17(6), e148.
<https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4255>
 19. Irving, G., Neves, A. L., Dambha-Miller, H., Oishi, A., Tagashira, H., Verho, A., & Holden, J. (2017). International variations in primary care physician consultation time: a systematic review of 67 countries. *BMJ open*, 7(10), e017902.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017902>
 20. Lewis, V. A., Colla, C. H., Tierney, K., Van Citters, A. D., Fisher, E. S., & Meara, E. (2014). Few ACOs pursue innovative models that integrate care for mental illness and substance abuse with primary care. *Health*

- Affairs*, 33(10), 1808-1816. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0353>
21. Meeks, D. W., Takian, A., Sittig, D. F., Singh, H., & Barber, N. (2014). Exploring the sociotechnical intersection of patient safety and electronic health record implementation. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 21(e1), e28-e34.
 22. Meyer, A. N., Giardina, T. D., Spitzmueller, C., Shahid, U., Scott, T. M., & Singh, H. (2020). Patient perspectives on the usefulness of an artificial intelligence-assisted symptom checker: cross-sectional survey study. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 22(1), e14679. <https://doi.org/10.2196/14679>
 23. Ming, D. K., Sangkaew, S., Chanh, H. Q., Nhat, P. T., Yacoub, S., Georgiou, P., & Holmes, A. H. (2020). Continuous physiological monitoring using wearable technology to inform individual management of infectious diseases, public health and outbreak responses. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 96, 648-654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.086>
 24. Noah, B., Keller, M. S., Mosadeghi, S., Stein, L., Johl, S., Delshad, S., ... & Spiegel, B. M. (2018). Impact of remote patient monitoring on clinical outcomes: an updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *NPJ digital medicine*, 1(1), 20172. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-017-0002-4>
 25. Nutting, P. A., Crabtree, B. F., Miller, W. L., Stange, K. C., Stewart, E., & Jaén, C. (2011). Transforming physician practices to patient-centered medical homes: lessons from the national demonstration project. *Health affairs*, 30(3), 439-445. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0159>
 26. Overhage, J. M., & McCallie Jr, D. (2020). Physician time spent using the electronic health record during outpatient encounters: a descriptive study. *Annals of internal medicine*, 172(3), 169-174. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-3684>
 27. Petterson, S. M., Liaw, W. R., Phillips, R. L., Rabin, D. L., Meyers, D. S., & Bazemore, A. W. (2012). Projecting US primary care physician workforce needs: 2010-2025. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 10(6), 503-509. <https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1431>
 28. Raffoul, M., Moore, M., Kamerow, D., & Bazemore, A. (2016). A primary care panel size of 2500 is neither accurate nor reasonable. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 29(4), 496-499. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2016.04.150317>
 29. Roland, M., Rao, S. R., Sibbald, B., Hann, M., Harrison, S., Walter, A., ... & Campbell, E. G. (2011). Professional values and reported behaviours of doctors in the USA and UK: quantitative survey. *BMJ quality & safety*, 20(6), 515-521. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs.2010.048173>
 30. Shepardson, R. L., Fletcher, T. L., Funderburk, J. S., Weisberg, R. B., Beehler, G. P., & Maisto, S. A. (2023). Barriers to and facilitators of using evidence-based, cognitive-behavioral anxiety interventions in integrated primary care practice. *Psychological services*, 20(4), 709. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/ser0000696>
 31. Schillinger, D., Piette, J., Grumbach, K., Wang, F., Wilson, C., Daher, C., ... & Bindman, A. B. (2003). Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low health literacy. *Archives of internal medicine*, 163(1), 83-90. doi:10.1001/archinte.163.1.83
 32. Shanafelt, T. D., Dyrbye, L. N., Sinsky, C., Hasan, O., Satele, D., Sloan, J., & West, C. P. (2016, July). Relationship between clerical burden and characteristics of the electronic environment with physician burnout and professional satisfaction. In *Mayo clinic proceedings* (Vol. 91, No. 7, pp. 836-848). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2016.05.007>
 33. Sinsky, C. A., Willard-Grace, R., Schutzbank, A. M., Sinsky, T. A., Margolius, D., & Bodenheimer, T. (2014). In search of joy in practice. *A report of 23 high-functioning primary care practices*, 2013, 11.
 34. Sinsky, C., Colligan, L., Li, L., Prgomet, M., Reynolds, S., Goeders, L., ... & Blike, G. (2016). Allocation of physician time in ambulatory practice: a time and motion study in 4 specialties. *Annals of internal medicine*, 165(11), 753-760. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-0961>
 35. Sudore, R. L., Schillinger, D., Katen, M. T., Shi, Y., Boscardin, W. J., Osua, S., & Barnes, D. E. (2018). Engaging diverse English-and Spanish-speaking older adults in advance care planning: the PREPARE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA internal medicine*, 178(12), 1616-1625. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.4657
 36. Tai-Seale, M., Olson, C. W., Li, J., Chan, A. S., Morikawa, C., Durbin, M., ... & Luft, H. S. (2017). Electronic health record logs indicate that physicians split time evenly between seeing patients and desktop

-
- medicine. *Health affairs*, 36(4), 655-662. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.0811>
37. van den Berk-Clark, C., Doucette, E., Rottnek, F., Manard, W., Prada, M. A., Hughes, R., ... & Schneider, F. D. (2018). Do patient-centered medical homes improve health behaviors, outcomes, and experiences of low-income patients? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Health Services Research*, 53(3), 1777-1798. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12737>
 38. Weiner, S. J., Schwartz, A., Weaver, F., Goldberg, J., Yudkowsky, R., Sharma, G., ... & Abrams, R. I. (2010). Contextual errors and failures in individualizing patient care: a multicenter study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 153(2), 69-75. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-153-2-201007200-00002>
 39. White, A., & Danis, M. (2013). Enhancing patient-centered communication and collaboration by using the electronic health record in the examination room. *Jama*, 309(22), 2327-2328. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.6030
 40. Willard-Grace, R., Hessler, D., Rogers, E., Dubé, K., Bodenheimer, T., & Grumbach, K. (2014). Team structure and culture are associated with lower burnout in primary care. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 27(2), 229-238. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2014.02.130215>
 1. Zhou, L., DeAlmeida, D., & Parmanto, B. (2019). Applying a user-centered approach to building a mobile personal health record app: development and usability study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 7(7), e13194. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13194>.