

1 **Title page**

2 The development of the gynecologic oncology pathway “VivaPathway GT” – a qualitative
3 study about the transformation from an implicit to an explicit, evidence-based clinical
4 pathway in a Berlin-based tertiary care hospital

5

6 Anne Büscher (0009-0000-8180-7372)^{1,2, #a, #b}, Nicolle Reinhold (0009-0009-9434-072X)
7 ^{1, #a}, Joachim Kugler (0000-0002-8478-4695) ^{2, #b}

8

9 ¹ Vivantes – Netzwerk für Gesundheit, Berlin, Germany

10 ² Medical Faculty, TU Dresden, Saxony, Germany

11

12 ^{#a} Current Address: Landsberger Allee 49, 10249 Berlin

13 ^{#b} Current Address: Helmholtzstr. 10, 01069 Dresden

14

15 * Corresponding author

16 E-Mail: anne.buescher@mailbox.tu-dresden.de (AB)

17

18 **Authors contribution**

19 Anne Büscher

- 20 • Conceptualization
- 21 • Formal Analysis
- 22 • Investigation
- 23 • Methodology
- 24 • Project Administration
- 25 • Writing – Original Draft Preparation
- 26 • Writing – Review & Editing

27

28 Nicolle Reinhold

- 29 • Conceptualization
- 30 • Validation

31

32 Joachim Kugler

- 33 • Conceptualization
- 34 • Supervision

35 **Full title**

36 The development of the gynecologic oncology pathway “VivaPathway GT” – a qualitative
37 study about the transformation from an implicit to an explicit, evidence-based clinical
38 pathway in a Berlin-based tertiary care hospital

39 **Short title**

40 Developing a Clinical Pathway in Oncology

41

42 **Abstract**

43 **Introduction**

44 Standardization in healthcare is crucial for comprehensive patient care, as emphasized by the
45 WHO and quality management principles. Clinical pathways offer a structured approach to
46 describing essential processes, particularly relevant in gynecologic oncology care. Despite
47 their proven benefits, pathways remain underutilized, highlighting the need for explicit
48 translation of implicit pathways.

49

50 **Materials and Methods**

51 This study employed semi-structured interviews with healthcare professionals to capture
52 implicit gynecologic oncology pathway. Interviews were examined using qualitative content
53 analysis. External requirements, legal mandates, and certification criteria were integrated into
54 pathway development. A participatory approach involving interprofessional collaboration
55 guided pathway refinement.

56

57 **Results**

58 The study applied the Pathway Association's 7-phase method, illustrating the development of
59 VivaPathway GT. The explicit pathway, enriched with external requirements, comprised 26

60 steps, enhancing comprehensiveness and interprofessional involvement. Notable additions
61 included pre-therapeutic tumor boards and detailed post-operative consultations.

62
63 **Discussion**

64 Transitioning from implicit to explicit pathways is a is a demanding and challenging process
65 emphasizing stakeholder engagement and IT support. Financial constraints pose challenges,
66 but initiatives like quality contracts offer opportunities for resource allocation. The study
67 validates hypotheses, confirming the efficacy of collaboration of involved professionals and
68 integration of external requirements in pathway development.

69
70 **Conclusions**

71 This study underscores the importance of explicit clinical pathways. It provides valuable
72 insights for healthcare professionals facing similar challenges, emphasizing the need for
73 ongoing evaluation and adaptation. Despite resource challenges, stakeholder collaboration
74 and IT support are crucial for pathway effectiveness and relevance in evolving healthcare
75 landscapes.

76
77 **Keywords**

78 Clinical Pathways
79 Gynecologic Oncology
80 Participatory Approach

81 **Introduction**

82 Standardization in healthcare is a central factor in enhancing comprehensive patient care,
83 emphasized by a clear call from the WHO [1]. In the healthcare management context, this
84 entails describing processes within the domain of process quality. It represents the second
85 dimension of quality management, alongside the first dimension of structural and the third
86 dimension of outcome quality [2].

87 The patient, with their individual journey, is at the center of inpatient healthcare. This directs
88 healthcare professionals in describing the essential processes through the implementation of
89 clinical pathways. In a Cochrane review Rotter et al. [3] demonstrate that the use of clinical
90 pathways has positive effects on the following outcomes: reduced likelihood of in-hospital
91 complications, improved documentation quality, shorter length of stay, and reduced hospital
92 costs. No differences were observed in terms of hospital readmission and in-hospital mortality.
93 Moreover, the Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) system is clearly associated with the
94 standardization of these processes, requiring them for structured resource management [4].
95 Furthermore, in pursuit of the mitigation of liability risks, hospitals are advised to implement
96 and rely on precise standardized processes [5].

97 In the future, the worth of standardizing clinical processes will continue to grow. Political
98 directives in Germany already actively demand such standardization in other clinical areas.
99 For instance, in the Guideline of the Joint Federal Committee (G-BA) on Measures for Quality
100 Assurance in the Care of Patients with Proximal Femoral Fracture (QSFFx-RL) guideline,
101 seven explicit Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are required [6]. The state government
102 of Berlin designates certified centers with specific tasks (e. g. oncological centers) in hospital
103 planning [7]. To meet these requirements, clinical pathways are an integral component. A
104 recent study by Schmitt et al. [8] provides evidence of enhanced patient care in certified
105 oncology clinics. The results show advantages in overall survival rates if cancer patients are
106 initially treated in certified cancer centers. Thus, one of the largest hospitals in Berlin, a tertiary
107 care hospital, is actively preparing for the certification as an oncological center.

108 The future calls for an increased emphasis on standardizing clinical processes to effectively
109 address the diverse demands mentioned and create positive outcomes for all stakeholders.

110 Rotter et al. [9] described the three main characteristics of clinical pathways. The first quality
111 is the translation of evidence-based medicine into existing (hospital) structures. Secondly,
112 pathways outline a detailed sequence of steps. Thirdly, it describes the scope for a specific
113 clinical issue or procedure.

114 The implementation of a standardized clinical pathways entails an organizational change. It is
115 necessary to recognize that achieving successful change requires more than the
116 implementation of standardized pathways; active engagement from both clinical and
117 management staff is needed. According to Rotter et al. [9] "Passive, top-down strategies to
118 promote and implement CPWs [Clinical Pathways] have little or no impact. Engagement of
119 both clinical and management staff in the development and adoption of CPWs is required and
120 multifaceted strategies should be used to implement this concept."

121 Unfortunately, the valuable and necessary tool of CPWs is underutilized. In 2006, a global
122 survey by the European Pathway Association found limited adoption of clinical pathways.
123 Highest rates were in Estonia, Singapore, and the United States. Germany, along with other
124 countries, reported usage for only 6 – 10 % of patients [10]. This suggests that if standards in
125 clinical settings are followed, they are mainly implicitly adhered to. Thus, the term implicit
126 pathway refers to the pathway that is lived in practice but not formally documented. These
127 informal pathways represent the standards according to which staff routinely operate, based
128 on their experiences and internal guidelines, without being explicitly documented. Explicit
129 pathways are formally documented. In the mentioned tertiary care hospital, there is currently
130 no explicit clinical pathway for gynecologic oncology care.

131 However, to avoid uncertainties and errors, meet the requirements and to empower all benefits
132 of institutional knowledge management, implicitly pathways must be translated into explicit
133 ones.

134 It leads to the following research question of this study: How can an implicit pathway be
135 translated into an evidence-based, explicit clinical pathway? By using the example of a
136 gynecologic oncology clinical pathway in a tertiary care hospital in Berlin.

137 The change management concept according to Lewin [11] will serve as a theoretical basis. He
138 describes that participatory management approach involves active employee engagement in
139 decision-making processes and the design of their work environment. It aims to recognize
140 employees as valuable sources of ideas, experiences, and suggestions and encourages their
141 involvement in improving work processes.

142 Based on this participatory approach the following hypotheses are formulated.

- 143 1. The translation of implicit clinical pathways into an explicit one through an
144 interprofessional approach can be facilitated by integrating insights from interviews with
145 involved health professionals in collaborative processes.
- 146 2. Adding external requirements, especially legal mandates, during the pathway
147 development creates the essential connection between external demands and internal
148 structures, cultivating a holistic and evidence-based explicit pathway.

149

150 **Material and Methods**

151 In order to address the research question and test the formulated hypotheses, semi-structured
152 interviews will be conducted with involved health professionals. Thus, an interprofessional
153 approach at the development process of the explicit clinical pathway will be used. These data
154 will be analyzed using qualitative content analysis following Mayring's methodology [12]. The
155 implicit gynecological oncological pathway will be captured through inductive coding. To
156 enhance quality, the analysis will be independently performed by the second author.

157 In the second phase, guidelines and certification criteria, and legal requirements will be
158 integrated into the coded sequence. Both the first and second authors contribute to this
159 process.

160 Subsequently, a quality circle is convened, involving all stakeholders, including quality and
161 process management. The implicit pathway, now enriched with external requirements, serves

162 as the basis for discussion. Additional steps are integrated based on the preferences of health
163 professionals.

164 **Ethical Considerations in non-interventional research with healthcare professionals**

165 The design of this research - a study involving semi-structured interviews with healthcare
166 professionals - does not require an ethical approval. The study focuses on gathering insights
167 into professional practices and perspectives. All participants were informed about the study's
168 objectives and their rights, with written consent obtained for participation and audio recording,
169 ensuring voluntary engagement and comprehension of the research's aims. Furthermore, as
170 the participants are healthcare professionals familiar with ethical standards, the shared
171 information was based on professional expertise, distinguishing our study from those
172 potentially impacting patients or the public.

173 **Selection of interview participants**

174 A total of 20 participants were interviewed. These participants not only represent the main
175 stakeholders of the gynecologic oncology pathway but also include all other professional
176 groups involved in this clinical and management process. The interview participants are four
177 gynecologists, as well as one physician from the specialties of oncology, urology, palliative
178 medicine, radiology, visceral surgery, pathology, radiation therapy, nuclear medicine, and
179 anesthesia/pain medicine. All interviewed physicians held the position of chief or senior
180 physician in their respective departments at the mentioned tertiary care hospital and have at
181 least ten years of clinical experience. All of them are already involved in the implicitly used
182 clinical pathway of gynecological oncological patients.

183 Furthermore, one representative from the following professional groups, each with at least five
184 years of professional experience, was interviewed: psycho-oncology, nutritional science,
185 physiotherapy, social services, nursing care of oncological unit, nursing admission
186 management, and tumor documentation.

187 The interview participants were jointly selected by the first and the second authors. The second
188 author is the head senior physician of the gynecologic tumor surgery department, while the
189 first author is involved in hospital management. The interview participants were chosen to

190 ensure representation of all professional groups currently involved in the care of gynecologic
191 oncology patients. Additionally, the certification criteria and corresponding evidence-based
192 guidelines were reviewed to determine if there were any other possible professional groups to
193 include. However, all necessary professional groups are already involved in the process of
194 gynecological oncological patients. The interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis; no
195 requested interviewee declined to participate in the study.

196 **Data collection – Interviews**

197
198 The recruitment period for this study began on May 20, 2022, and ended on March 13, 2023.
199 In July and August 2022, the interviews were conducted by the first author. A final interview
200 took place in March 2023. The majority of the interviews (13), were conducted via a video
201 conferencing platform, while seven were conducted face-to-face. The latter took place in
202 offices at the tertiary care hospital in Berlin. All interviews were carried out in the native
203 language of all participants, which is German, and were recorded with the consent of the
204 interviewees using a voice recorder app. The duration of the interviews ranged from 15 to 50
205 minutes, with a median duration of 30 minutes. Apart from the interviewee and the interviewer,
206 there were no other participants or observers.

207 All interviews were semi-structured. The interview participants were divided into two groups.
208 Firstly, the group of the four gynecological physicians. These participants are from the leading
209 department and, therefore, accompany patients from admission to discharge. Secondly, all
210 other interviewees involved in individual steps of the clinical process. Consequently, two
211 different questionnaires were developed to explore the current implicit pathway.

212 To develop the first interview questionnaire, the second author, the head senior physician of
213 the gynecological department, was consulted regarding the current implicit pathway. In order
214 to develop a questionnaire, questions were asked along this implicit process with 14 steps. At
215 each step of these steps, several questions were developed to ask during the following
216 interviews. About 1. how this step is reached, 2. what the content of this step is, and if 3. there
217 are any standards like SOPs. In addition, it is asked what and 4. where it is documented, and
218 5. how the further process proceeds after this step. This questionnaire was tested with the

219 head senior physician and adjusted accordingly. Thus, a structure and sequence of questions
220 were established. However, there was sufficient flexibility to provide feedback on missing steps
221 at any time. All gynecologists were interviewed using this first questionnaire. All other
222 professional groups were interviewed using a second questionnaire. It starts by inquiring at 1.
223 which step in the pathway they are contacted and 2. how. Furthermore, they are asked 3. if
224 they are contacted again in the patient's process. Additionally, it was investigated 4. who or
225 what determines whether their involvement follows. If so, 5. what purpose is achieved through
226 their work and 6. where it is documented. This second questionnaire was also tested with one
227 interviewee and then slightly adjusted. In addition, all interview participants were asked for any
228 suggestions to improve both patient care and employee satisfaction. This request was made
229 to ensure continuous improvement and engagement of all stakeholders in the development of
230 new standards. The goal is to uphold the quality of care, especially with the anticipated
231 increase in the number of patients in the future. At the beginning of the interviews, the
232 participants were informed about the purpose of the survey, and all gave their consent for data
233 processing.

234 **Interview Analysis**

235 The transcription of interview recordings was performed using the automated transcription
236 service Amberscript. To enhance quality, the first author corrected the transcripts where
237 necessary. The Mayring content analysis method was used [12].

238 An inductive approach was applied, as there were no existing codes that could serve as a
239 basis. Even though the implicit process described by the senior physician (2. Author) formed
240 the structure for the questionnaire, there was sufficient flexibility in the application of both
241 questionnaires to recognize new process steps, or codes. These new codes could then serve
242 as a basis in developing the explicit pathway. The transcripts were initially divided into parts;
243 firstly, the results of gynecologists and secondly the answers of all other professionals. These
244 sections were then paraphrased, summarized, and developed for category formation. Excel
245 was used as the basis for this process.

246 The interviews with the gynecologists were analyzed in this manner by the first author, and
247 then the codes were adjusted. The second author also analyzed the interviews for category
248 formation. Different interpretations were discussed, and a common solution for a code was
249 found.

250 The codes were named after the various steps of the implicit clinical pathway for gynecological
251 oncological patients. Subsequently, the quality circle was conducted. All interview participants
252 were invited. In a participatory approach here, the final explicit pathway was finalized and
253 described in a digital flowchart.

254 The qualitative research methodology was conducted in accordance with the Quality
255 Assurance Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) checklist. [13].

256 **Synthesizing Research Findings and Applying a 7-Phase Method for CPW**

257 **Development**

258 These research findings can provide support to others planning similar initiatives when the
259 approach is presented in a concise and clear overview. Therefore, an existing theoretical
260 framework will be utilized in a subsequent step. The Pathway Association has developed a 7-
261 phase method for clinical pathways which assist in the development, implementation, and
262 evaluation of clinical pathways [14]. The steps described above will be categorized into these
263 phases, resulting in a brief overview of the process.

264 **Results**

265 The results section is presented in three parts. The first part demonstrates the application of
266 the theoretical framework by the Pathway Association (table 2). In this section, the approach
267 to developing the pathway is described. The second part illustrates the VivaPathway GT
268 (flowchart 1), demonstrating the results of the interviews and additions of external
269 requirements. The results section concludes with the third part. This section provides an
270 overview of the differences between implicit and explicit pathways, emphasizing the changes
271 from previously unwritten standards to the now finalized and formal pathway.

272

273 **1. Application of the theoretical framework by the Pathway Association**

274 The Results section demonstrates the application of the 7-phase method for clinical pathways
275 to the VivaPathway GT. The first three columns illustrate the recommended approach by the
276 Pathway Associations, specifying the phase's name and the questions to consider during
277 development of a clinical pathway. The meaningful outcome is evident in the last column,
278 demonstrating the practical development of VivaPathway GT through an interprofessional
279 approach.

280 **2. The explicit VivaPathway GT**

281 Next, the developed gynecologic oncological pathway VivaPathway GT is presented in a
282 flowchart 1.

283 The analysis of gynecologists' interviews indicates a notable consistency in their feedback
284 regarding the steps in the care of gynecological oncology patients. The analysis reveals 14
285 categories/steps. Variations were observed in consultation requests with related departments.
286 These were conducted through the hospital information system (KIS), telephone contact, and
287 in-person meetings.

288 Moreover, all remaining stakeholders in gynecological oncological care were interviewed as
289 well. They were asked regarding their involvement in the overall process.

290 Both, results of the gynecologists and all other stakeholder, formed the basis for discussions
291 within the quality circle. During the interviews, all participants were also asked for improvement
292 suggestions to enhance the future explicitly described process. These suggestions were
293 incorporated into the interdisciplinary and interprofessional quality circle discussions.

294 Steps that were already included in the implicit pathway during the interviews are marked with
295 a continuous line of the steps in flowchart 1. All steps, which were added during quality circle
296 (on basis of the interview results), are marked with dashed lines. Consequently, it becomes
297 evident that the implicit and explicit pathways primarily differ in that the explicit pathway is more
298 comprehensive, containing more steps. The implicit pathway comprised 14 steps, and this was
299 expanded with an additional 12 individual steps, resulting in a total of 26 steps.

300 **3. Differences of implicit pathway to explicit VivaPathway GT**

301 The main differences from the implicit to the explicit pathway can be summarized as follows:

- 302 • 14 implicit to 26 explicit steps
- 303 • Addition of the pre-therapeutic tumor board conference (certification requirement)
- 304 • More detailed preoperative preparation based on professional groups
- 305 • Documented checks for the completeness of patient records
- 306 • Active review of all possible post-op consultations by other professional groups
- 307 (certification requirement)

- 308 • Initiation of discharge planning instead of general discharge (legal requirement)

309

310 **Discussion**

311 This study illustrates the development of the gynecologic oncology clinical pathway in a tertiary
312 hospital in Berlin within a participatory development approach. The outcome is based on the
313 implicitly lived pathway and has been complemented with external requirements. The
314 development process is mapped onto the theoretical framework of pathway association,
315 allowing it to be easily transferred and applied by other physicians and managers on their
316 initiatives. The tabular overview in table 2 provides a simplified method for transferring.

317 **Transition from Implicit to Explicit Pathways**

318 The minimal deviations in the implicit pathway, as reported by the gynecologists, indicate that
319 good coordination already exists without a written pathway. But when considering the pathway
320 as a whole, it differs significantly from the pathway implicitly captured in the interviews. Though,
321 the implicit pathway did not sufficiently anticipate the integration of other stakeholders.

322 **Top-down and bottom-up**

323 Notable is the significant increase in the number of steps in the explicit clinical pathway,
324 particularly highlighting the interprofessional approach in the care of gynecologic oncology
325 patients. Köth et al. [15] already emphasized the necessity for all involved parties to be
326 represented in the pathway. Through collaborative development based on interviews and a
327 shared quality circle, this was ensured. Frequently mentioned by involved professional groups
328 responsible for post-operative patient care was the desire for earlier involvement in the
329 process. This includes physiotherapy, psycho-oncologist, nutritionist, social worker, etc., who
330 are now all separately represented in the pathway. The hospital's aim to become certified as
331 an oncology center stems from leadership directives, representing a top-down approach to
332 strategic planning.

333 The development of the clinical pathway VivaPathway GT is in line with the comprehensive
334 findings in this field. Köth et al. [15] emphasized the importance of combining top-down and

335 bottom-up strategies. Evans-Lacko et al. [16] underscore the essential role of involving both
336 management and clinical staff in the development and implementation process. In addition,
337 this approach also aligns with the success factors outlined by De Allegro et al. [17] in the
338 implementation of clinical pathways, with a particular emphasis on the multidisciplinary aspect.
339 In determining the clinical pathway, we integrate interdisciplinary and interprofessional
340 elements, fostering collaboration among different stakeholders for a more holistic and effective
341 approach. This fusion of top-down and bottom-up strategies, coupled with interdisciplinary
342 collaboration, forms the foundation of the commitment to advancing health practices in
343 gynecologic oncology on a scientifically informed basis.

344 Even when looking at other developments in healthcare, such as the development and
345 implementation of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs), similar success factors can
346 be observed [18]. This underscores the consistent principles applicable across various
347 healthcare interventions.

348 **Compensating for Missing IT-Infrastructure**

349 The increase in steps from 12 to 26 can also be attributed to other reasons. Many checks have
350 been introduced to ensure that previous steps are carried out and documented. Similarly,
351 several steps of different professional groups have been introduced in the preparation for
352 surgery. Both could theoretically be supported by an IT infrastructure, as well as the post-
353 operative consultation of other professional groups. In this case, significantly fewer steps would
354 be necessary. For example, a hospital information system (HIS) could automatically request a
355 consultation with a physiotherapist once a specific diagnosis and procedure have been
356 documented. Since this functionality is not currently available in the hospital's HIS, it has been
357 separately integrated into the explicit clinical pathway.

358 A comparison can be drawn between the development and implementation of clinical pathways
359 and another health intervention, such as Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs). The
360 study by the Bertelsmann Foundation [18] described six success factors needed for the
361 successful implementation of this intervention. Therefore, a relevant success factor is

362 supportive IT. This would even allow for the inclusion of PROMs assessments within the IT-
363 based clinical pathway.

364 A competent IT infrastructure supporting the clinical pathway serves as an essential
365 prerequisite for comprehensive documentation of patient records. It is through careful
366 documentation that a meaningful evaluation can be conducted in the Plan-Do-Check-Act
367 (PDCA) cycle. Another argument for the relevance of the IT-based representation is provided
368 by Askari et al. [19]. He found, in a systematic review, an increased adherence to clinical
369 pathways when software is used to support the pathway. Also, Ronellenfitsch [20] concludes
370 that integration of clinical pathways into hospital information systems in the course of
371 digitization in healthcare could be beneficial for the application and acceptance. Not only
372 integration into HIS, but also the development of an innovative process mining solution is
373 emphasized by Munoz-Gama et al. [21]. He explicitly calls for close collaboration between
374 health professionals, IT specialists, and business process managers to develop a supportive
375 evidence-based system.

376 **Underutilization of Clinical Pathways**

377 For the underutilization of clinical pathways in healthcare, there are various reasons. In this
378 case, it did not result from health professionals' unwillingness to adhere to standards. The
379 results indicate that gynecologists and all other stakeholders wish to work according to
380 guidelines and internal standards. The gynecologists have already been working based on an
381 implicit pathway, and all other stakeholders also adhere to their standards. However, these
382 have not been consolidated for the care of gynecologic oncology patients until now.

383 However, limited financial and personnel resources Köth et al. [15] pointed out the necessity
384 of effective outcomes required for the development and implementation of pathways, given the
385 substantial resource investment. This assumption aligns with the results of the Bertelsmann
386 Foundation [18] regarding the introduction of PROMs. Financial support is described as one
387 of the success factors for implementation alongside other forms of support.

388 Since 2017, quality contracts in Germany have offered opportunities to allocate additional
389 resources in clinical settings, for example for pathway developments [22]. They aim to provide

390 additional incentives for improved care. Explicit pathways are a necessary prerequisite for a
391 quality contract and its evaluation. However, currently, this is offered for eight medical
392 conditions such as endoprosthesis or obstetrics. In future, this could potentially be utilized as
393 financial support to develop and implement pathways in hospitals with a participatory
394 approach.

395 **Addressing the research question and validating the hypotheses**

396 Considering all results, the research question can be answered and the hypotheses can be
397 confirmed:

398 ***Research Question***

399 *How can an implicit pathway in gynecologic oncology be translated into an evidence-based,*
400 *explicit care pathway in a tertiary care hospital in Berlin?*

401 Answer: The research question is addressed through a comprehensive process involving
402 stakeholder interviews, analysis, and the development of the VivaPathway GT. The translation
403 of the implicit pathway is achieved by integrating insights from interviews with health
404 professionals and incorporating external requirements.

405 ***Hypothesis 1***

406 The interprofessional translation of implicit pathways, guided by stakeholder interviews,
407 facilitates the development of explicit pathways.

408 Confirmation: The stakeholder interviews and subsequent Mayring analysis form the
409 foundation for the explicit VivaPathway GT, demonstrating that an interprofessional approach
410 is effective in translating implicit pathways.

411 ***Hypothesis 2***

412 Integrating external requirements, especially legal mandates, during development establishes
413 a vital connection between external demands and internal structures, resulting in a holistic and
414 evidence-based pathway.

415 Confirmation: External requirements, including legal mandates, are integrated into the
416 VivaPathway GT during the development phase. This ensures a connection between external
417 demands and internal structures, aligning the pathway with evidence-based practices.

418 The successful development of the explicit pathway, VivaPathway GT, validates both
419 hypotheses, highlighting the importance of stakeholder collaboration and the incorporation of
420 external requirements in achieving a comprehensive and evidence-based care pathway in
421 gynecologic oncology.

422 **Conclusions**

423 In conclusion, this study presents a valuable contribution to the development of clinical
424 pathways. The results offer a helpful guide for other healthcare professionals facing similar
425 challenges and requirements. However, it is important to acknowledge that disruptions may
426 occur in different settings, and while the health professionals in this study were willing to
427 implement a standardized pathway, it remains a sincere resource challenge due to the
428 significant time and effort required for a participatory approach involving all stakeholders.

429 The necessity of transitioning from implicit to explicit pathways cannot be overstated, as
430 demonstrated by the formalization, standardization, and documentation of clinical workflows.

431 The study aligns with previous research underscores the significance of multidisciplinary, both
432 top-down and bottom-up approaches in this process in order to adequately consider the needs
433 of all stakeholders.

434 Furthermore, the study highlights the crucial role of IT support in securing, refining, and
435 evaluating pathway processes, with the potential to incorporate patient perspectives and adapt
436 to evolving structures and external mandates over time. However, the explicit description of a
437 pathway is a precondition for its integration into HIS and process mining tool.

438 In the face of financial and resource limitations, initiatives such as quality contracts offer
439 opportunities to allocate resources for pathway development and evaluation, ultimately
440 contributing to improved patient care.

441 In addressing the research question and validating the hypotheses, the study demonstrates
442 the effectiveness of an interprofessional approach guided by stakeholder input and the
443 integration of external requirements in developing evidence-based and comprehensive clinical
444 pathways. The successful development of the explicit pathway, VivaPathway GT, underscores
445 the importance of stakeholder collaboration and the incorporation of external mandates in

446 achieving a robust and adaptable care pathway for gynecologic oncology patients. However,
447 ongoing evaluation and adaptation are essential to ensure the pathway's effectiveness and
448 relevance among changing healthcare landscapes.

449

450

451 Acknowledgments

452 References

- 453 1. World Health Organization. (2022). GLOBAL PATIENT SAFETY ACTION PLAN
454 2021–2030. Towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care, 31 January 2022.
455 [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from:
456 [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
457 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/343477/9789240032705-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- 458 2. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *The Milbank quarterly*.
459 1966;83(4):691-729. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00397.x.
- 460 3. Rotter T, Kinsman L, James E, Machotta A, Gothe H, Willis J, Snow P, Kugler J.
461 Clinical pathways: effects on professional practice, patient outcomes, length of stay
462 and hospital costs. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*.
463 2010;(3):CD006632. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006632.pub2.
- 464 4. Tuschen KH, Trefz U. *Krankenhausentgeltgesetz: Kommentar mit einer umfassenden*
465 *Einführung in die Vergütung stationärer Krankenhausleistungen*. 2nd ed.
466 Kohlhammer Verlag; November 2009.
- 467 5. Schmiedhofer M, Blum K, Gambashidze N, Rösner H, Strametz R. KhaSiMiR 21 –
468 Krankenhausstudie zur Sicherheit durch Management innerklinischer Risiken 2021–
469 22: Ergebnisse der aktuellen Befragung zur Implementierung des klinischen
470 Risikomanagements. Presented at the 22. Deutschen Kongress für
471 Versorgungsforschung (DKVF), Berlin, 04.-06.10.2023. Düsseldorf: German Medical
472 Science GMS Publishing House; 2023. Doc23dkvf377. doi:10.3205/23dkvf377.
473 Published on October 2, 2023.
- 474 6. Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss. Richtlinie über Maßnahmen zur Qualitätssicherung
475 zur Versorgung von Patienten mit einer hüftgelenknahen Femurfraktur gemäß § 136
476 Absatz 1 Satz 1 Nummer 2 für nach § 108 SGB V zugelassene Krankenhäuser. G-
477 BA; 2024 Jan 01. Available at [https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-](https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-RL_2023-12-06_iK-2024-01-01.pdf)
478 [RL_2023-12-06_iK-2024-01-01.pdf](https://www.g-ba.de/downloads/62-492-3351/QSFFx-RL_2023-12-06_iK-2024-01-01.pdf)
- 479 7. Senatsverwaltung Berlin für Gesundheit, Pflege und Gleichstellung. Ausweisung von
480 besonderen Aufgaben von Zentren im Land Berlin. 11.12.2018. Available at
481 [https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-](https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php)
482 [versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php](https://www.berlin.de/sen/gesundheitswesen/medizinische-versorgung/stationaere-versorgung/krankenhausplan-1365436.php)
- 483 8. Schmitt J, Klinkhammer-Schalke M, Bierbaum V, Gerken M, Bobeth C, Rößler M,
484 Dröge P, Ruhnke T, Günster C, Kleihues-van Tol K, Schoffer O. Initial Cancer
485 Treatment in Certified Versus Non-Certified Hospitals: Results of the WiZen
486 Comparative Cohort Study. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2023;120:647-54. DOI:
487 10.3238/arztebl.m2023.0169
- 488 9. Rotter T, de Jong RB, Lacko SE, et al. Clinical pathways as a quality strategy. In:
489 Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, et al., editors. *Improving healthcare quality in*
490 *Europe: Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies*
491 [Internet]. Copenhagen (Denmark): European Observatory on Health Systems and
492 Policies; 2019. (Health Policy Series, No. 53.) Chapter 12. Available from:
493 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK549262/>

- 494 10. Vanhaecht K, Bollmann M, Panella M, et al. Prevalence and use of clinical pathways
495 in 23 countries – an international survey by the European Pathway Association.
496 Volume 10, Issue 1. Published 2006. DOI: 10.1177/205343540601000106.
- 497 11. Lewin K. Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. Edited by
498 Cartwright D. Harper & Row; 1951.
- 499 12. Mayring P, Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. 11th ed. Beltz;
500 Weinheim, Germany: Basel, Switzerland: 2010. pp. 48–109.
- 501 13. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
502 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal
503 for Quality in Health Care. 2007 Dec;19(6):349–57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042.
- 504 14. European Pathway Association. Pathway Facilitator Tools. European Pathway
505 Association; 2021 [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://e-p-](https://e-p-a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/)
506 [a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/](https://e-p-a.org/pathway-facilitator-tools/)
- 507 15. Köth H, Miller K, Lein M, Weikert S, Schmidt D, Heymann S, Eveslage K,
508 Ronellenfitch U, Schwarzbach M, Spies C, Vargas Hein O. Development and effects
509 of a multicampus clinical pathway: “laparoscopic prostatectomy”. Perioperative
510 Medicine. 2009;1(3):173-180. ISSN 1875-2772.
511 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.periop.2009.05.008>.
- 512 16. Evans-Lacko S, Jarrett M, McCrone P, et al. Facilitators and barriers to implementing
513 clinical care pathways. BMC Health Serv Res. 2010;10:182.
514 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-10-182>
- 515 17. De Allegri M, Schwarzbach M, Loerbroks A, Ronellenfitch U. Which factors are
516 important for the successful development and implementation of clinical pathways? A
517 qualitative study. BMJ quality & safety. 2011 Mar 1;20(3):203-8.
518 doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.042465
- 519 18. Bertelsmann Stiftung. Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs): ein
520 internationaler Vergleich Herausforderungen und Erfolgsstrategien für die Umsetzung
521 von PROMs in Deutschland. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung; 2021 [Accessed
522 February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://www.bertelsmann-](https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BSt_PROMs-Implementierung_final.pdf)
523 [stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BSt_PROMs-Implementierung_final.pdf](https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/BSt_PROMs-Implementierung_final.pdf)
- 524 19. Askari M, Tam JLYY, Klundert J. The effectiveness of clinical pathway software in
525 inpatient settings: A systematic review. Int J Med Inform. 2021;147:104374.
526 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2020.104374.
- 527 20. Ronellenfitch U, Schwarzbach M. Patientenorientierte Versorgungssteuerung im
528 Krankenhaus. In: Klauber J, Wasem J, Beivers A, Mostert C, editors. Krankenhaus-
529 Report 2021. Springer; 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-62708-2_4
- 530 21. Munoz-Gama J, Martin N, Fernandez-Llatas C, et al. Process mining for healthcare:
531 Characteristics and challenges. Journal of Biomedical Informatics. 2022;127:103994.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2022.103994>.
- 533 22. Gemeinsamer Bundesausschuss (G-BA). Qualitätsverträge nach § 110a SGB V.
534 [Internet]. 2017. [Accessed February 11, 2024]. Available from: [https://www.g-](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)
535 [ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)
536 [qualitaetsvertraege/](https://www.g-ba.de/themen/qualitaetssicherung/weitere-bereiche/leistungsbereiche-qualitaetsvertraege/)"

541 **Supporting information captions**

542 **Competing Interests Statement:**

543 The authors of this manuscript declare the following potential competing interests in
544 accordance with PLOS guidelines:

545

546 **Anne Büscher:** As the administrative manager at Vivantes Klinikum Friedrichshain, I am
547 administratively involved in the implementation and management of the clinical pathway
548 discussed in this manuscript. My role involves general administrative and managerial functions
549 within the whole hospital.

550 **Dr. Nicolle Reinhold:** Dr. Reinhold is a senior physician in gynecology at Vivantes Klinikum
551 Friedrichshain and directly involved in patient care and the development of gynecologic
552 oncology practices.

553 All interviews conducted for this research involved participants associated with Vivantes
554 Klinikum Friedrichshain, and their identities are familiar to the authors due to their roles within
555 the hospital. No financial interests, employment, consultancy, or any other competing interests
556 that could compromise the objectivity of this research are present.

557 This statement is made to ensure transparency and adhere to PLOS policy on competing
558 interests.

Interview-participants Medical doctors > 10 yrs of clinical experiences	Gynecology	Oncology	Urology	Palliative medicine	Radiology	Visceral surgery	Pathology	Radiation therapy	Anesthesia / pain medicine	Nuclear medicine
	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Interview-participants Other involved professionals > 5 yrs of professional experience	Psycho-oncology	Nutritional science	Physiotherapy	Social services	Nursing care of oncological unit	Nursing admission management	Tumor documentation			
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Age group	30 – 39		40 – 49			50 – 59		60 -69		
	4		6			7		3		
Gender	Female					Male				
	10					10				

1 Table 1: Characteristics of interview participants / Numbers of persons

No.	Phase	Questions to consider	Interprofessional Approach for VivaPathway GT
1	Screening phase	Is a care pathway the right tool for the problem we need to solve; who will be the owner of the project / care pathway?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefits of a clinical pathway for gynecological oncological patients were identified through research and legal requirements. • Currently lacking an explicit pathway for gynecologic oncology. • Until now there is an implicit pathway. • Necessity to translate implicit standards into explicit pathways. • Owner of the project is head senior physician of the gynecological department and a member of the hospital management.
2	Project management phase	Do we have the right people, time, budget to start a project; what are our goals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right people: Certification criteria and other external requirements were assessed for stakeholders relevant to participating in the pathway. • Time: A 2-year timeline was established, starting from the development of interview questions to the pathway's approval in the quality circle. • Budget: An additional budget could not be considered. • Goals: The aim is to transform the previously implicit pathway for patients diagnosed with C48.8 + 51 - C59 into an explicit pathway, considering all relevant external requirements.
3	Diagnostic and objectification phase	What is our current practice? Based on four perspectives: own organization & team, vision of patient & family, available evidence & legislation, and external partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implicit pathway, the current practice, is examined through semi-structured interviews with all identified stakeholders. First with the leading department of gynecologists, then with all other involved professional groups. • Interview results were investigated by Mayring analysis (Transcription and Correction, Formation of Analysis Section, Paraphrasing and Summarizing, formation of Categories/Codes, Application of Codes) • In this way the organizations and team perspective were identified. • Available research evidence was identified through guidelines. Legal issues were added. • Vision of patient, family and external partners are missing and will be added after evaluation of one year. (Basis will be results of patient surveys and inquiries from referring healthcare providers.)
4	Development phase	Design and development of the care pathway, based on input from previous phases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of the Mayring analysis serve as the foundation for pathway development. • Integration of insights from previous phases, including interviews, improvement suggestions, guidelines, inclusion of certification criteria and external requirements. • Concluding discussion of individual steps in the quality circle, involving all relevant stakeholders.

			Collaboratively, additional enhancements and modifications were made and approved.
5	Implementation phase	Piloting and adjusting the care pathway, followed by implementation for daily use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approved VivaPathway GT was implemented in the intranet with a workflow (access for all employees is ensured.) • The pathway was tested for practical implementation on five patients jointly by the head senior physician (No changes were made following the testing.) • The pathway was presented in the hospital-wide gynecological working group. • Training sessions were provided to all involved in the process. The pathway is also an integral part of the onboarding concepts.
6	Evaluation phase	Evaluation of the care pathway: effect, usability and compliance to the care pathway	Evaluation will follow after one year of implementation.
7	Continuous follow-up phase	Keeping the pathway alive by monitoring, adjusting the pathway	The continuous follow-up phase will follow after the evaluation phase.

1 Table 2: Application of the 7-Phase Method for CPW according to the Pathway Association

Flowchart 1: Clinical Pathway VivaPathway GT
 Diagnosis Groups: C 48.8, C 51 - 58

Comments



