



**Key performance indicators for mental health and substance use disorders:
a literature review and discussion paper**

Journal:	<i>Mental Health and Substance Use</i>
Manuscript ID:	RMHS-2014-0001.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Keywords:	service, treatment outcome, comorbidity, service provision, dual diagnosis, substance use

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3 **Key performance indicators for mental health and substance use disorders:**
4
5 **a literature review and discussion paper**
6
7

8 **Abstract**
9

10 With increasing recognition of the importance of mental and substance use disorders
11 for population health and health systems and the potential value of systems-based
12 performance indicators in addressing this issue, we aimed to describe the development
13 and content of key performance indicators for mental and substance use disorders.
14 Publications were identified through official websites, Google searches and PubMed.
15 Following 'PRISMA' guidelines, twenty-five studies were kept for qualitative
16 synthesis and six for quantitative analysis. We describe their use in practice by
17 comparing their application across a range of public and mixed healthcare systems.
18 Currently, key performance indicator development for mental and substance use
19 disorders adopts several methodologies, including expert opinion, literature review,
20 stakeholder consultation and the structured consensus method. The rationales
21 provided for selection of particular key performance indicators vary greatly between
22 systems. Systems exhibit different levels of key performance indicator adaptability,
23 which is reflective of dynamic changes in evidence-based practices. We noted bias in
24 the level of key performance indicator assessment towards system/health plan
25 evaluation followed by programme/service evaluation. Similarly, there is a large
26 skew towards key performance indicators that reflect evaluation of processes.
27 Collection of data in all systems is nearly exclusively reliant on electronic
28 administrative/medical data. Experiences from these systems are synthesized into
29 methodological recommendations, and considerations for further research and clinical
30 practice are provided.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Key words:** Performance indicators, mental health, substance-related disorders
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 **Key performance indicators for mental health and substance use disorders:**
5
6 **a literature review and discussion paper**
7
8
9
10

11 **Introduction**
12

13
14
15 Over 450 million people are afflicted worldwide with neuropsychiatric conditions
16 (World Health Organisation, 2001). Five of the ten leading causes of death and
17 disability globally are attributable to mental and substance use disorders (MESUDS)
18 (World Health Organisation, 2002). Furthermore, the measureable social and
19 economic costs of MESUDS to the individual, society and economy are extensive at
20 approximately 3-4% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (International Labour
21 Organisation, 2000). Above and beyond the explicit health, social services and
22 reduced productivity costs are the implicit consequences, especially impact on
23 individuals, their families and society (World Health Organisation, 2001).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 There is established literature documenting the co-morbid nature of MESUDS
39 (Anderson & Baumberg, 2006; Grant et al., 2004; Jane-Llopis & Matytsina, 2006;
40 Merikangas et al., 1998; Rohde, Lewinsohn, & Seeley, 1991). This has implications
41 for diagnosis, treatment and continuity of care in that, individuals with depressed
42 mood states are more likely to smoke and drink, less likely to quit, and more likely to
43 relapse after cessation (Kenney et al., 2009). Negative health consequences as a result
44 of underestimating or not recognizing the co morbid nature of MESUDS has also
45 been described (Staiger, Richardson, Long, Carr, & Marlatt, 2013). Thus, it is
46 reasonable to consider optimised comprehensive health care for MESUDS a priority.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Reflecting this emerging need for optimization of health care for MESUDS are new
4
5 policy and implementation initiatives seen at multiple levels of healthcare. Actively
6
7 flexible policies and health care structures that enable accessible community-based
8
9 health care, which are delivered through evidence-based integrated multidisciplinary
10
11 approaches addressing the biological, psychological and social factors contributing to
12
13 MESUDS, are becoming more widely reported (Government of Ireland, 2006; Health
14
15 Canada, 2002; NHS Department of Health, 2012; Pawsey, Logan, & Castle, 2011;
16
17 Watkins & Pincus, 2011). Furthermore, in order to maximize limited resources and
18
19 address the gap between evidence-based best healthcare practices and the care that is
20
21 actually received, health systems need to address the underdevelopment of their
22
23 infrastructure, both at local and national levels, thus enabling measurement of system
24
25 performance (Hermann et al., 2002; Institute of Medicine, 2001) using measures
26
27 which are both valid and reliable (Hermann et al., 2000) . Such performance
28
29 measurement is likely to be integral to active evolution of a health system to meet the
30
31 needs of its users, may form the foundation for accountability and provision of good
32
33 quality care (Hermann et al., 2004; Pincus et al., 2007) and has contributed to the
34
35 development, content and application of key performance indicators (KPIs) for
36
37 MESUDS for several health systems internationally (Hermann et al., 2006; Watkins
38
39 & Pincus, 2011).

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 The development of KPIs for MESUDS firstly requires a performance management
48
49 system created for continuous quality improvement; therefore, the system must have
50
51 the means, capability and infrastructure to conduct performance reviews, which lead
52
53 to sequential recalibration of organizational goals and achievement strategies (i.e. be
54
55 sensitive, and reactive to achievement or failure to reach intended predetermined
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 goals). Ideally, the system should also be capable of determining if other parameters
4
5 are being influenced/factors are influencing the desired outcomes. Consequently, a
6
7 performance management system must have set strategic aims, goals and objectives
8
9 and corresponding implementation plans outlined to achieve those aims, goals and
10
11 objectives (McEwan & Goldner, 2001). These are necessary as KPIs are intended to
12
13 represent the progress towards specified objectives. The actual selection process of
14
15 indicators is highly system-dependent; the number of indicators must be sufficient to
16
17 address the objectives, yet not inundate the system such that it detracts from
18
19 meaningful interpretation (McEwan & Goldner, 2001). Likewise, target setting must
20
21 be appropriately based on past performance information, or comparable systems in
22
23 other jurisdictions (McEwan & Goldner, 2001).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Assessment of individual KPIs against specified criteria may assist in choosing an
31
32 appropriate set for a given system (McEwan & Goldner, 2001). Glover and Kamis-
33
34 Gould (Glover & Kamis-Gould, 1996) suggested nine criteria for good performance
35
36 indicators: “(1) Conceptual clarity, (2) Clear link to an organizational goal, (3)
37
38 Operationally defined, reliable and valid measures, (4) Measures derived wherever
39
40 possible from available management information systems, (5) Consisting of
41
42 proportion and ratios rather than raw numbers, (6) Desired direction for performance
43
44 is clear, (7) Indicators suitable for comparison (risk adjusted where necessary), (8)
45
46 Sufficiently universal for comparison with other services, and (9) Decision rules for
47
48 significant deviations from chance and for establishing high and low performance.”
49
50 These criteria were reflected by Hermann and Palmer (Hermann & Palmer, 2002) in
51
52 their developmental framework for quality measures specifically for MESUDS care.
53
54
55
56 Monitoring, compilation and reporting of performance parameters requires that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 information: be collected in a routine manner using devoted resources; be relevant and
4
5 appropriate to the systems' aims, goals and objectives; and be readily disseminated to
6
7 stakeholders (McEwan & Goldner, 2001). Making performance reports publicly
8
9 available can promote system accountability and may identify outlying practices, thus
10
11 allowing appropriate intervention (e.g., remediation or reward) (Canadian Institute of
12
13 Health Information, 2013; McEwan & Goldner, 2001). Finally, realigning the
14
15 performance framework to reflect changing aims and objectives, as well as to address
16
17 under or over performance, reflects the cyclical nature of a sound performance
18
19 system's use of KPIs (McEwan & Goldner, 2001).
20
21
22
23
24

25 The purpose of this paper is to describe the development and content of KPIs for
26
27 MESUDS and to describe their use in practice. For this purpose, their application
28
29 across exemplar public and mixed healthcare systems was examined.
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Methods**

36
37
38 An initial search identified systems that had reported extensively on performance
39
40 measures; from which four systems were selected that would represent a range of
41
42 funding and delivery arrangements for comparison purposes. Examples of mixed
43
44 (private delivery / publicly funded) systems included Ireland's Health Services
45
46 Executive (HSE) and Canada's 'Medicare', while examples of public systems
47
48 included United States Veterans Health Administration (VHA) and the UK National
49
50 Health Service (NHS). It should be noted that Canada's 'Medicare' is an example of a
51
52 health system that is administrated provincially; therefore, 'Canada' henceforth refers
53
54 to a synthesis of provincial level findings provided by Canadian publications but does
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not necessarily reflect national findings per se. Although we sought to include a
4 private health care system for inclusion in this comparison, we were unable to identify
5 such a system that had reported on the development and application of performance
6 measures for MESUDs in the public domain.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 Publications concerning development, content and application of KPIs for MESUDS
15 for public, private and mixed healthcare systems, written in the English language,
16 were identified through official websites, Google searches (June 29, 2012) and
17 PubMed (July 24, 2012) (see Table 1) with no limitation on date range of
18 publications. Following 'PRISMA' guidelines (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, &
19 Grp, 2010), 384 unique papers were identified through these sources using the terms,
20 including MeSH terms, outlined in Table 1, 108 papers were retained based on title
21 screening and 36 were retained after assessment of full-text abstracts screening.
22
23 Twenty-five studies were kept for qualitative synthesis and six for quantitative
24 analysis (Table 2). All articles were retained that did not meet any of the following
25 reasons for exclusion:
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

- 38 • Population did not have a DSM-IV axis 1 condition
 - 39 • Did not discuss either the development, content or application of KPIs
 - 40 • Did not represent one of the four jurisdictions (ie. Canada, NHS, HSE, VHA)
- 41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 <insert Table 1 here>

49 <insert Table 2 here>

50
51
52 Individual performance measures from the four representative health systems were
53 classified by the method outlined by Lauriks et al (Lauriks, Buster, de Wit, Arah, &
54 Klazinga, 2012). A total of six government publications outlined unique KPIs from
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the systems (Table 2). In the case where specific classifications for a given
4
5 characteristic were not reported in the publication, the author (CH) classified the KPIs
6
7 using both the definitions of characteristics provided (McEwan & Goldner, 2001)
8
9 (Table 3) and similarly stated KPIs from other publications in which classification
10
11 was provided.
12

13
14
15
16 <insert Table 3 here>
17
18
19

20
21 The six key government publications, which are used to illustrate KPIs for MESUDs
22
23 in this discussion paper, are outlined in Table 2. The rest of the publications included
24
25 in this discussion paper are used in the text to compare and describe the main features
26
27 of the four-exemplar systems.
28

29 30 31 **Results**

32 33 34 **Use in practice: comparing application across specific systems**

35
36 Canada, HSE, NHS and VHA all employ KPIs spanning various domains (refer to
37
38 Table 2). Canada's 'Medicare', which represents a synthesis of provincially based
39
40 systems, and VHA have used a mixed-methods approach to KPI development.
41
42 Specifically, for each KPI, a literature review followed by expert consultation for
43
44 Canada and a tri-step approach of literature review, stakeholder consultation and
45
46 structured consensus for the VHA. The HSE and NHS used a singular approach,
47
48 consisting of expert opinion and stakeholder consultation, respectively.
49
50

51
52
53
54
55 These systems have an inherent bias in the level of assessment that KPIs evaluate; the
56
57 bias is towards system/health plan evaluation followed by programme/service
58
59
60

1
2
3 evaluation (Table 2). Similarly, there is a large skew towards KPIs that reflect
4
5 process evaluation (i.e. key activities which relate to provision of care such as
6
7 implementation of best-practice care, and service contacts in terms of client
8
9 visits/admissions, etc.). Most systems employ a generalist approach to the diagnoses
10
11 that a given KPI for MESUDS encompasses. Collection of data in all systems is
12
13 nearly exclusively reliant on electronic based administrative/medical data; this is
14
15 particularly the case with the HSE whereby it only collects data on in-patients, as it is
16
17 the only electronic information gathering system currently in place. Canada is the
18
19 exception to this, as it accommodates a region's decision to either collect
20
21 administrative/medical data or to use surveys in either paper or electronic formats.
22
23 Also, the VHA does allow for some paper data collection through its External Peer
24
25 Review Program chart audit process.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 With respect to the parameters of performance that KPIs evaluate, Canada places
33
34 particular emphasis on competence, albeit the precise way in which to evaluate this is
35
36 still emerging (McEwan & Goldner, 2001). Other foci include appropriateness (ie.
37
38 evidence of best-practice core programs, treatment protocols for co-morbidity, etc.),
39
40 accessibility (ie. access to primary care, access to psychiatrists, etc.) and effectiveness
41
42 (ie. community tenure, potential years of life lost, etc.) (refer to Table 2). Similarly,
43
44 the other mixed health care example, the HSE, has accessibility and appropriateness
45
46 as their main focus areas for KPIs. The public health care examples of the NHS and
47
48 VHA differ in their main performance metrics in that for the NHS, efficiency and
49
50 accessibility are mainstays whereas the VHA is fairly balanced across all dimensions,
51
52 but is missing KPIs for efficiency (Table 1); though some of the KPIs used by VHA
53
54 may also infer efficiency (Watkins & Pincus, 2011). However, the provided
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 definitions of those KPIs do not meet this study's criteria for being a KPI, which
4
5 represents the efficiency domain as outlined in Table 3. Lastly, it is important to note
6
7 that although this study aimed to provide a private health care example for KPIs, there
8
9 was no publicly available information accessible on official websites to do so.
10

14 **Development and content of KPIs for MESUDS**

16 While developing KPIs based on expert opinion alone is suboptimal compared to
17
18 other development methods due to lack of evidence/justification and bias (Lauriks et
19
20 al., 2012), this approach requires the least resources and may be helpful as an initial
21
22 starting point in developing a set of KPIs. Alternatively, a system may choose to
23
24 adapt KPIs utilized in another system to their own needs; however, this can be fraught
25
26 with obstacles such as lack of sufficient fiscal, organisational, infrastructural and
27
28 personnel resources to appropriately collect KPIs and ensure dissemination of
29
30 findings (Garnick, Lee, Horgan, Acevedo, & Washington Circle Public, 2009). As
31
32 the System progresses, there are ample literature resources providing structure and
33
34 guidance for using more robust methods, which enhance KPI development through
35
36 collaboration, applying pre-existing instruments and consulting with key stakeholders
37
38 (Addington, Kyle, Desai, & Wang, 2010; Baars, Evers, Arntz, & van Merode, 2010;
39
40 Lauriks et al., 2012; Lin & Durbin, 2008; Rush, Martin, Corea, & Rotondi, 2012).
41
42 One such example of this is the Resident Assessment Instrument for Mental Health
43
44 (interRAI MH), which is an assessment system providing information on care
45
46 planning, case-mix and outcomes, that has been used to derive mental health quality
47
48 indicators (Perlman et al., 2013). Establishing a collaborative process is integral in
49
50 the development of KPIs as MESUD academics, clinicians, consumers and decision-
51
52 makers will differ in their opinion of what KPIs are of most importance (Waraich et
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 al., 2010). The structured consensus is ultimately the most rigorous development
4 method for KPIs; however, this, in itself, requires sufficient resources and
5 infrastructure to execute, such that it is the least used development method for
6
7
8
9
10 MESUD KPIs (Lauriks et al., 2012; Waraich et al., 2010; Watkins & Pincus, 2011).

11
12
13
14 Irrespective of the development method chosen, some systems provide comprehensive
15 rationale for selecting a particular KPI. For example, in many Canadian documents, a
16 succinct rationale statement followed by literature justification, where applicable, is
17 offered for each KPI (Alberta Health Services, 2010; McEwan & Goldner, 2001). The
18 VHA refers the reader to an entire chapter devoted to rationale (Watkins & Pincus,
19 2011). It is integral to KPI development that justification and well-defined criteria for
20 both indicator type and target population are provided; the lag in development of
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Furthermore, it impedes the ability of other parties to accurately assess KPIs and draw
conclusions across Systems as it makes classification (e.g., Table 1) open to
interpretation.

Having an appropriate representation of KPIs for the three care domains (i.e.
structure/input, process and outcome) helps to ensure a balanced perspective of a
system's performance as the rationale behind these three domains is that structure
influences resources and policies which, in turn, informs clinician care processes that
ultimately impact patient outcomes (Kilbourne et al., 2010). Indicators of each

1
2
3 domain have inherent strengths and limitations that must be effectively balanced
4
5 (Kilbourne et al., 2010):
6

- 7
8 • Indicators of structure, although the most straightforward to ascertain through
9 programme leader reports are, by their reporting nature, at risk of response
10 bias (Kilbourne et al., 2010). Furthermore, a structure indicator can only
11 reflect capacity for appropriate care and is not capable of determining if the
12 actual care takes place (Kilbourne et al., 2010).
13
14
- 15 • Process indicators, which are the most commonly used as they represent
16 aspects of care that systems have the most control over, can be overly
17 dependent on a patient's attendance at appointments as data sources do not
18 typically record the reason for missed appointments (Kilbourne et al., 2010).
19 For example, if the patient did not attend a follow-up appointment this can
20 reflect a process problem in that it was a failure of the visit to be scheduled by
21 the provider or, alternatively, the patient simply missing the appointment can
22 skew this indicator. Furthermore, differentiation of event-driven and panel-
23 driven process indicators is important in order to glean corresponding
24 information related to specific care events and management of a patient within
25 the system. Continuing research into improvements in risk adjustment for
26 process indicators, such as restraint use in mental health services, is adding to
27 their robustness as KPIs (Perlman et al., 2013).
28
29
- 30 • Outcome measures, which reflect change in patient status are also appealing to
31 Systems (Kilbourne et al., 2010). The main challenge encountered with
32 outcome measures is case-mix adjustment, which needs to be taken into
33 consideration to ensure that observed differences in outcomes are not due to
34 clinical difference in illness severity across patients (Kilbourne et al., 2010).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This effect is readily seen between a comparison of outcome measures from
4 systems that treat populations which are clinically recognized as being more
5 severely afflicted than Systems that treat less clinically severe populations
6 (Leslie & Rosenheck, 2000). Currently, the ability for risk adjustment is
7 limited and needs to be taken into consideration when analyzing outcome
8 indicators (Kilbourne et al., 2010).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Another premise emerging in KPIs development for MESUDS is the recognition by
19 many Systems, which jointly evaluate these co-morbid conditions, that there is a bias
20 towards KPIs for mental disorders, while KPIs for substance use disorders lag behind
21 (National Treatment Strategy Working Group, 2008). Canada and the VHA are
22 actively addressing this gap whilst providing a framework for other systems that
23 currently do not integrate the two classes of disorders for performance measurement
24 (National Treatment Strategy Working Group, 2008; Thomas et al., 2011; Watkins &
25 Pincus, 2011). In addition to the realization that optimal care for mental and
26 substance use disorders involves integration, it is also increasingly being
27 acknowledged by many systems that delivery of this integrated optimal care needs to
28 be established in the primary care setting (Addington et al., 2010; Government of
29 Ireland, 2006; Health Canada, 2002; Sandoval, Couris, & Leeb, 2012; Watkins &
30 Pincus, 2011). This change in focus means that indicators which were once designed
31 to measure at the institutional level must now also be reflective of the community
32 level (Sandoval et al., 2012). All of this best practice information has created a
33 substantial change in the structure of mental and substance use disorder care delivery
34 in Canada and the VHA, and has also persuaded Ireland's HSE to consider a similar
35 restructuring from inpatient to outpatient primary care services (Government of
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ireland, 2006).

4
5
6
7 This restructuring of care delivery has fostered the rapid development and use of
8
9
10 electronic systems for administration and medical data management which has
11
12 correspondingly enabled highly efficient collection of information for KPIs (Health
13
14 Canada, 2002; NHS Department of Health, 2012; Watkins & Pincus, 2011). The
15
16 electronic system facilitates the generation of ratios, as opposed to just raw number
17
18 collection, which is regarded as preferable for KPIs reporting (McEwan & Goldner,
19
20 2001). The Canadian Institute of Health Information is one such example of
21
22 electronic web-based reporting which allows data collection from more than six-
23
24 hundred facilities across all provinces in Canada involved in many aspects of health
25
26 care (Canadian Institute of Health Information, 2013). With this heavy reliance on
27
28 automated data collection, caution is warranted in that patient perspectives, often
29
30 represented by the domain ‘acceptability’ in Table 2, may not be effectively captured
31
32 as this data is often collected via survey/audit (Koch, Breland, Nash, & Cropsey,
33
34 2011). Furthermore, uploading of diagnosis-based events may not capture more
35
36 subtle interventions within the encounter. The utility of patient responses in
37
38 improving quality of services, which leads to improved outcomes, cannot be
39
40 neglected.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Discussion**

49
50
51 This review was solely focused on KIPs from the four jurisdictions of Canada, HSE,
52
53 NHS and VHA. In general, this study’s results for MESUDS KPIs are in line with the
54
55 relationships previously outlined by other studies evaluating KPIs for mental health
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Baars et al., 2010; Lauriks et al., 2012). There are no major discrepancies in the
4
5 indicators used; the majority of KPIs assess care processes and outcomes, are
6
7 applicable to general diagnoses, and can be collected through administrative data
8
9 (Baars et al., 2010; Lauriks et al., 2012). Although similar relationships have been
10
11 identified, there are likely differences in the raw number classifications in Table 2 as
12
13 compared to the similar analysis performed by Lauriks et al (Lauriks et al., 2012) for
14
15 mental health indicators. The differences would be attributable to variation in
16
17 definitions used for classification of KPIs.
18
19

20
21
22
23 This highlights that lack of key accepted definitions is one of the reasons why KPI
24
25 development for MESUDS lags behind other conditions (Addington et al., 2010;
26
27 Baars et al., 2010; Kilbourne et al., 2010; Waraich et al., 2010). KPI targets for
28
29 MESUDS continue to vary across the different systems, reflecting the respective local
30
31 definitions and interests of the systems (Lauriks et al., 2012). Similarly, most systems
32
33 have provided some evidence for the content validity of their KPIs, but reliability and
34
35 criterion/construct validity are rarely assessed (Lauriks et al., 2012). Specific to
36
37 outcome measures, the challenge of case-mix adjustment remains. This needs to be
38
39 taken into consideration to ensure that observed differences in outcomes are not due
40
41 to clinical difference in illness severity across patients (Kilbourne et al., 2010).
42
43 Furthermore, transparency of reporting continues to be an issue for private systems
44
45 which hinders not only the advancement of MESUD KPI development, but also has
46
47 arguably a negative impact on the care, in terms of effective treatment in the acute and
48
49 long term, practitioner contacts and hospital admissions, that is received by patients in
50
51 a private system (Druss, Miller, Rosenheck, Shih, & Bost, 2002).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Based on this review of the Canadian, HSE, NHS and VHA systems, we suggest a
4 six-step approach to developing and refining KPIs for MESUDS, which could
5
6
7 include:

- 10 • Identify resources (fiscal, organizational, infrastructural and manpower) which
11 are available to support MESUDS KPI development, collection and analysis.
- 14 • Outline specific aims, goals and objectives of the system, given the
15 aforementioned resources *or* specific idealized aims, goals and objectives and
16 corresponding resources that would be required to facilitate those
17
18 idealizations. This needs to be considered within the context of existing
19
20 infrastructure, degree of systems integration across and within the health care
21
22 spectrum and payor mix and other external drivers.
- 25 • Define key terms to be used and the target population(s).
- 28 • Conduct structured collaborative processes, within the means of the system, to
29
30 outline KPIs that reflect aims, goals and objectives of key stakeholders.
- 33 • For each KPI, consider: rationale / evidence base, criteria by which under /
34
35 over performance will be determined / addressed and validation mechanism.
- 38 • Establish a timely system framework review process with recommendations
39
40 for changes/updates to reflect developing literature and needs of the
41
42 population
43
44

45
46
47 This review was solely focused on KIPs from the four jurisdictions of Canada, HSE,
48
49 NHS and VHA. The search was limited PubMed databases, google searches and
50
51 direct website searches all in the English language. We acknowledge that this review
52
53 discusses major government reports. PRISMA guidelines allowed for establishment
54
55 of an orderly and thorough search of these resources. Only one person screened for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 eligibility and data extraction; although this does lend to consistency as it was the
4 same person for both. The main strength of this study is that it provides
5
6 comprehensive information on KPI development, content and application for both
7
8 mental health and substance use disorders through exemplar systems; this creates a
9
10 framework for future improvements in KPIs for MESUDS.
11
12

13 14 15 16 17 **Conclusions** 18

19
20 Although a comparison between systems' use of types of KPIs was drawn, it is
21
22 important to recognize that systems have unique foci, which means that the data
23
24 generated by these types of KPIs may not be universally applicable or comparable
25
26 between systems, unlike the types of KPIs. For example, a commonly used KPI for
27
28 MESUDS in many systems is hospital re-admission rate; in a system like the HSE,
29
30 whereby the majority of MESUD care is delivered through an in-patient model, it is
31
32 correspondingly going to have a higher re-admission rate as compared to a system
33
34 that delivers care through an outpatient model, such as many of the provinces in
35
36 Canada. The numerical difference in hospital re-admission rate between these
37
38 systems is not a meaningful comparison since the system design varies. KPIs allow
39
40 for meaningful "within-system" or intrasystem evaluations of data, but caution is
41
42 needed by researches when embarking on intersystem comparisons of performance
43
44 using data generated by KPIs. KPIs can be useful at a system, practice or individual
45
46 level depending upon the indicator, denominator and metric.
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 To optimise MESUDS performance measurement for the future, there needs to be
54
55 well defined parameters/descriptions of KPIs established in the literature,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 improvements in the research base, and clinical implementation of evidence-based
4
5 practices for optimal care. In support of this, there needs to be development from the
6
7 information technology sector of cost effective solutions to address the challenges
8
9 facing systematic implementation of electronic infrastructure. Emerging from these
10
11 improvements could be the capabilities for validation and potentially ‘pre-validation’
12
13 (Harris, Kivlahan, Bowe, Finney, & Humphreys, 2009) with predictive algorithms for
14
15 KPIs which would complete the optimisation of comprehensive health care for
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Authors' contributions

CH participated in the design of the study, performed the literature review, classified the findings and drafted the manuscript. JK participated in the design of the study and contributed to the manuscript. CD, DL, DM, TOT contributed to the manuscript. WC conceived of the study, participated in its design and coordination and contributed to the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

CH would like to acknowledge the Graduate Entry Medical School at the University of Limerick for providing this studentship opportunity.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Ethical approval

Research described in this manuscript adheres to international ethical standards; we conducted a review of literature for which no approval from a named research ethics committee was required.

References

- Addington, D., Kyle, T., Desai, S., & Wang, J. L. (2010). Facilitators and barriers to implementing quality measurement in primary mental health care systematic review. *Canadian Family Physician, 56*(12), 1322-1331.
- Alberta Health Services. (2010). *System level performance for mental health and addiction in alberta 2008/2009*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Health Services.
- Anderson, P., & Baumberg, B. (2006). *Alcohol in europe: A public health perspective*. London, UK: Institute of Alcohol Studies.
- Baars, I. J., Evers, Smaa, Arntz, A., & van Merode, G. G. (2010). Performance measurement in mental health care: Present situation and future possibilities. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 25*(3), 198-214. doi: 10.1002/hpm.951
- Canadian Institute of Health Information. (2013). Canadian institute of health information, from <http://www.cihi.ca>
- Druss, B. G., Miller, C. L., Rosenheck, R. A., Shih, S. C., & Bost, J. E. (2002). Mental health care quality under managed care in the united states: A view from the health employer data and information set (hedis). *American Journal of Psychiatry, 159*(5), 860-862. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.159.5.860
- Garnick, Deborah W., Lee, Margaret T., Horgan, Constance M., Acevedo, Andrea, & Washington Circle Public, Sector. (2009). Adapting washington circle performance measures for public sector substance abuse treatment systems. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 36*(3), 265-277. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2008.06.008

- 1
2
3 Glover, G., & Kamis-Gould, E. (1996). Performance indicators in mental health. In G.
4
5 Thornicroft & G. Strathedee (Eds.), *Commissioning mental health services*.
6
7 London: HMSO.
8
9
10 Government of Ireland. (2006). *A vision for change: Report of the expert group on*
11
12 *mental health policy*. Dublin: Stationary office.
13
14 Grant, B. F., Stinson, F. S., Dawson, D. A., Chou, S. P., Ruan, J., & Pickering, R. P.
15
16 (2004). Co-occurrence of 12-month alcohol and drug use disorders and
17
18 personality disorders in the united states - results from the national
19
20 epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. *Archives of General*
21
22 *Psychiatry*, 61(4). doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.61.4.361
23
24
25 Harris, A. H. S., Kivlahan, D. R., Bowe, T., Finney, J. W., & Humphreys, K. (2009).
26
27 Developing and validating process measures of health care quality an
28
29 application to alcohol use disorder treatment. *Medical Care*, 47(12), 1244-
30
31 1250.
32
33
34 Health Canada. (2002). *Best practices: Concurrent mental health and substance use*
35
36 *disorders*. Ottawa, ON: Health Canada.
37
38
39 Hermann, R. C., Finnerty, M., Provost, S., Palmer, R. H., Chan, J., Lagodmos, G., . . .
40
41 Myrhol, B. J. (2002). Process measures for the assessment and improvement
42
43 of quality of care for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*, 28(1), 95-104.
44
45 Hermann, R. C., Leff, H. S., Palmer, R. H., Yang, D., Teller, T., Provost, S., . . .
46
47 Chan, J. (2000). Quality measures for mental health care: Results from a
48
49 national inventory. *Med Care Res Rev*, 57 Suppl 2, 136-154.
50
51
52 Hermann, R. C., Mattke, S, Somekh, D, Silfverhielm, H, Goldner, E, Glover, G, . . .
53
54 Chan, J A. (2006). Quality indicators for international benchmarking of mental
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 health care. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 18(suppl 1), 31-
4
5 38.

6
7 Hermann, R. C., Palmer, H., Leff, S., Shwartz, M., Provost, S., Chan, J., . . .

8
9 Lagodmos, G. (2004). Achieving consensus across diverse stakeholders on
10
11 quality measures for mental healthcare. *Med Care*, 42(12), 1246-1253.

12
13 Hermann, R. C., & Palmer, R. H. (2002). Common ground: A framework for
14
15 selecting core quality measures for mental health and substance abuse care.
16
17 *Psychiatr Serv*, 53(3), 281-287.

18
19 Institute of Medicine. (2001). *Crossing the quality chasm: A new health system for the*
20
21 *21st century*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

22
23 International Labour Organisation. (2000). *Mental health in the workplace*. Geneva:
24
25 International Labour Organisation (ILO).

26
27 Jane-Llopis, E., & Matytsina, I. (2006). Mental health and alcohol, drugs and tobacco:
28
29 A review of the comorbidity between mental disorders and the use of alcohol,
30
31 tobacco and illicit drugs. [Review]. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 25(6), 515-536.
32
33 doi: 10.1080/09595230600944461

34
35 Kenney, B. A., Holahan, C. J., Holahan, C. K., Brennan, P. L., Schutte, K. K., &
36
37 Moos, R. H. (2009). Depressive symptoms, drinking problems, and smoking
38
39 cessation in older smokers. *Addict Behav*, 34(6-7), 548-553. doi:
40
41 10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.03.020

42
43 Kilbourne, A. M., Keyser, D., & Pincus, H. A. (2010). Challenges and opportunities
44
45 in measuring the quality of mental health care. *Canadian Journal of*
46
47 *Psychiatry-Revue Canadienne De Psychiatrie*, 55(9), 549-557.

48
49 Koch, J. R., Breland, A. B., Nash, M., & Cropsey, K. (2011). Assessing the utility of
50
51 consumer surveys for improving the quality of behavioral health care services.
52
53

1
2
3 *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 38(2), 234-248. doi:
4
5 10.1007/s11414-010-9211-1
6

7 Lauriks, S., Buster, M. C. A., de Wit, M. A. S., Arah, O. A., & Klazinga, N. S.

8
9 (2012). Performance indicators for public mental healthcare: A systematic
10 international inventory. *Bmc Public Health*, 12. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-
11 214
12
13
14
15

16 Leslie, D. L., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2000). Comparing quality of mental health care for
17 public-sector and privately insured populations. *Psychiatr Serv*, 51(5), 650-
18 655.
19
20
21
22

23 Lin, E., & Durbin, J. (2008). Adapting the balanced scorecard for mental health and
24 addictions: An inpatient example. *Healthcare Policy*, 3(4).
25
26

27 McEwan, K., & Goldner, E. (2001). *Accountability and performance indicators for*
28 *mental health services and supports: A resource kit*. Ottawa, ON: Health
29 Canada.
30
31
32
33

34 Merikangas, K. R., Mehta, R. L., Molnar, B. E., Walters, E. E., Swendsen, J. D.,
35 Aguilar-Gaziola, S., . . . Kessler, R. C. (1998). Comorbidity of substance use
36 disorders with mood and anxiety disorders: Results of the international
37 consortium in psychiatric epidemiology. *Addictive Behaviors*, 23(6). doi:
38 10.1016/s0306-4603(98)00076-8
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Grp, Prisma. (2010). Preferred
46 reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The prisma
47 statement. *International Journal of Surgery*, 8(5), 336-341. doi:
48 10.1016/j.ijssu.2010.02.007
49
50
51
52
53

54 National Treatment Strategy Working Group. (2008). *A systems approach to*
55 *substance use in canada: Recommendations for a national treatment strategy*.
56
57
58
59
60

Ottawa, ON: National Framework for Action to Reduce the Harms Associated with Alcohol and Other Drugs and Substances in Canada.

NHS Department of Health. (2012). *The nhs performance framework: Implementation guidance*. Whitehall, UK: NHS Department of Health.

Pawsey, Brendan, Logan, Greg, & Castle, David. (2011). Psychological treatments for comorbidity across the life course. *Mental Health and Substance Use*, 4(1), 72-82. doi: 10.1080/17523281.2011.533456

Perlman, C. M., Hirdes, J. P., Barbaree, H., Fries, B. E., McKillop, I., Morris, J. N., & Rabinowitz, T. (2013). Development of mental health quality indicators (mhqis) for inpatient psychiatry based on the interrai mental health assessment. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 13, 15. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-15

Pincus, Harold Alan, Page, Ann Ex, Druss, Benjamin, Appelbaum, Paul S., Gottlieb, Gary, & England, Mary Jane. (2007). Can psychiatry cross the quality chasm? Improving the quality of health care for mental and substance use conditions. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(5). doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.164.5.712

Rohde, P., Lewinsohn, P. M., & Seeley, J. R. (1991). Comorbidity of unipolar depression: Ii comorbidity with other mental-disorders in adolescents and adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100(2). doi: 10.1037/0021-843x.100.2.214

Rush, Brian, Martin, Garth, Corea, Larry, & Rotondi, Nooshin Khobzi. (2012). Engaging stakeholders in review and recommendations for models of outcome monitoring for substance abuse treatment. *Substance Use & Misuse*.

Sandoval, C., Couris, C., & Leeb, K. (2012). New mental health indicators provide a snapshot on performance of the mental health system in canada. *Healthc Q*, 15(2), 14-16.

- 1
2
3 Staiger, Petra K., Richardson, Ben, Long, Caroline M., Carr, Victoria, & Marlatt, G.
4
5 Alan. (2013). Overlooked and underestimated? Problematic alcohol use in
6
7 clients recovering from drug dependence. *Addiction*, *108*(7), 1188-1193.
8
9
10 Thomas, C. P., Garnick, D. W., Horgan, C. M., McCorry, F., Gmyrek, A., Chalk, M.,
11
12 . . . Thatcher, J. (2011). Advancing performance measures for use of
13
14 medications in substance abuse treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse*
15
16 *Treatment*, *40*(1), 35-43. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2010.08.005
17
18
19 Waraich, P., Saklikar, R. S., Aube, D., Jones, W., Haslam, D., & Hamill, K. (2010).
20
21 Quality measures for primary mental healthcare: A multistakeholder,
22
23 multijurisdictional canadian consensus. *Quality & Safety in Health Care*,
24
25 *19*(6), 519-525. doi: 10.1136/qshc.2008.027839
26
27
28 Watkins, K., & Pincus, H. (2011). *Veterans health administration mental health*
29
30 *program evaluation: Capstone report*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND
31
32 Corporation.
33
34 World Health Organisation. (2001). *The world health report 2001: New*
35
36 *understanding, new hope*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
37
38
39 World Health Organisation. (2002). *Reducing risks: Promoting healthy life. World*
40
41 *health report 2002*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Sources of Information

Websites Searched – June 29, 2012		
http://www.gov.bc.ca/health/	http://www.health.alberta.ca/	
http://www.health.gov.sk.ca/	http://www.gov.mb.ca/health/	
http://www.health.gov.on.ca/	http://www.health.gov.nl.ca/health/	
http://www.gov.pe.ca/health/	http://www.gov.ns.ca/DHW/	
http://www.gnb.ca/0051/index-e.asp	http://www.hss.gov.yk.ca/	
http://www.hlthss.gov.nt.ca/	http://www.hss.gov.nu.ca/en/Home.aspx	
http://www.va.gov/health/default.asp	http://www.hse.ie/eng/	
http://www.upmc.com/Pages/default.aspx		
http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/index-eng.php/		
http://www.nhs.uk/Pages/HomePage.aspx		
Google Search – June 29, 2012		
[system] substance abuse performance indicator		
[system] mental health performance indicator		
[system] = Canada, National Health Service, Health Service Executive, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Veterans Health Administration		
PubMed Search Terms – July 24, 2012		
<i>Performance</i>	<i>Health System</i>	<i>Population</i>
Benchmarking, health care [MeSH] OR performance measure* [ti,ab] OR performance indicator* [ti,ab] OR quality measure* [ti,ab] OR quality indicator* [ti,ab]	Public healthcare OR private healthcare OR mixed healthcare OR canada OR health service executive OR national health service OR veterans OR university of pittsburgh medical center	Mental health* OR mental disorder OR substance related disorders [MeSH] or addict*

Table 2. Comparison of Performance Measures for Mental and Substance Use Disorders Across Health Systems (12, 21, 30, 41-43).

Numbers reflect counts of unique key performance indicators for the given classification. Note, raw numbers are not congruent between indicator characteristic categories within a given system example as some KPIs have been assigned to multiple sub-categories.

Development and Implementation Characteristics	Mixed Health Care		Public Health Care	
	<i>Canada</i>	<i>HSE</i>	<i>NHS</i>	<i>VHA</i>
<i>Development method</i>				
Expert opinion	71	12		
Structured consensus				28
Mixed literature and stakeholder			21	28
Literature review / application of pre-existing instruments	71			28
<i>Level of Assessment</i>				
Client	15		3	5
Service/Program	38	7	14	20
System/Health plan	45	11	14	25
<i>Care domain</i>				
Structure/Input	15	2	7	
Process	41	6	12	22
Outcome	18	4	3	6
<i>Dimensions of performance</i>				
Effectiveness	11	1	3	6
Accessibility	12	5	6	3
Acceptability	7		1	5
Competence	17		1	
Safety	8	2	1	3
Efficiency	7		5	
Appropriateness	15	3	1	6
Continuity	8	1	3	5
<i>Diagnosis</i>				
Substance abuse		4	3	5
Mood disorder				4
Psychosis/Schizophrenia				2
Other				4
Multiple diagnoses encompassed	71	8	18	13
<i>Data source</i>				
Survey/Audit			2	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Administrative/Medical data		12	18	28
Multiple sources	71		1	

For Peer Review Only

Table 3. Characteristic Classifications

Taken from McEwand and Goldner (2001), pages 37-56

Indicator Characteristic	Definition
Acceptability	“Services provided meet expectations of service users, community, providers and government.”
Accessibility	“Ability of people to obtain services at the right place and right time based on needs.”
Appropriateness	“Services provided are relevant to service user needs and based on established standards.”
Competence	“Knowledge, skills and actions of individuals providing services are appropriate to service provided.”
Continuity	“The system is sustainable, comprehensive, and has the capacity to provide seamless and coordinated services across programs, practitioners, organizations, and levels of service, in accordance with individual need.”
Effectiveness	“Services, intervention or actions achieve desired results”
Efficiency	“Organizations / programs achieve desired results with the most cost effective use of resources.”
Safety	“Organizations / programs avoid or minimize potential risks or harms to consumers, families, mental health staff and the community associated with the intervention / lack of intervention or the environment.”
System	“System performance measures should provide information about whether the system as a whole is operating with respect to policy, evaluation, governance and funding, and human resource planning.”
Program	“Measures must be related to client outcomes with respect to core programs and services such as case management, crisis response / emergency service, housing, inpatient / outpatient care, consumer initiatives, family self-help and vocational / educational supports.”
Client	“At the client level, aside from information on clinical and functional conditions, client satisfaction and quality of life are important issues for informing and measuring the effectiveness of programs and services.”
Input	“Refers to resources put into mental healthcare and thereby relate[s] to the structural or organizational characteristics of a system or setting. Inputs are often expressed in terms of financial resources or numbers and types of personnel, facilities, etc.”
Process	“Relates to the key activities of a service or system in the provision of care to persons with mental illness... Meaningful process measures are ones where the links to client, program or system outcomes are evident.”
Outcome	“Outcomes reflect the total contributions of all those who fund, plan, and provide service as well as those of clients and their families. An

outcome is a change in service user health status that can be attributed to a program / service.”

* McEwan, K., & Goldner, E. (2001). *Accountability and performance indicators for mental health services and supports: A resource kit*. Ottawa, ON: Health Canada.

http://seniorspolicyens.ca/Root/Materials/Adobe%20Acrobat%20Materials/accountability_and_performance_measures_for_mental_health_services_and_supports.pdf