



<b>Title</b>	<b>Therapeutic Conversation: the Effectiveness of Intensified Physician–Patient Communication</b>
<b>Agency</b>	LBI of HTA, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute of Health Technology Assessment Garnisonsgasse 7/20, AT-1090 Vienna, Austria; Tel: +43 1 236 81 19 0, Fax: +43 1 236 8119 99; office@hta.lbg.ac.at, http://hta.lbg.ac.at
<b>Reference</b>	HTA project report no 1. ISSN 1992-0488, 1992-0496 (online)

## Aim

To systematically review the effects of a therapeutic conversation.

## Conclusions and results

Results of large patient surveys in different countries suggest that patients expect to receive good counseling, to be extensively informed, and to be given sufficient time and opportunity to communicate their concerns when visiting a physician. In some countries, this has resulted in reimbursing an item called the "therapeutic conversation", which goes beyond the usual consideration of the patient's medical history.

Several outcome parameters were investigated to answer the following question: Does the therapeutic conversation result in improvement of the quality of care offered in physicians' practices? The outcome parameters analyzed were; attainment of therapeutic goals, patients' compliance, participation, self-management, satisfaction, and a reduction in additional healthcare costs.

The report also covers reimbursement regulations in selected countries. Some options for maintaining or extending the coverage are discussed, taking into account the existing study results and the problems of transferring these results to the real care situation in Austria. In Austria, the therapeutic conversation is reimbursed up to a specified limit.

Reasonable evidence was found for the effectiveness of the therapeutic conversation on patients' self-management and satisfaction. For specific diseases/disorders, a reduction in additional healthcare costs was reported. For the remaining outcome parameters, evidence was less convincing.

## Methods

Databases used in the systematic review were MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Central, CINAHL, Pascal Biomed, and the databases of the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, York. The review included primarily high-quality studies (RCTs and systematic reviews

of RCTs). Additionally, cohort studies, observational studies, and several qualitative studies were identified. Overall, 49 publications were considered for the assessment.