

Closing the Efficacy-Effectiveness Gap: Translating Both the What and the How From Randomized Controlled Trials to Clinical Practice

Anthony P. Weiss, M.D., M.B.A.; Jenny Guidi, Psy.D.; and Maurizio Fava, M.D.

There is a well-known gap between the clinical outcomes achieved within randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and those seen in real-world clinical practice. This phenomenon, sometimes called the “efficacy-effectiveness” gap, has been cited as a potential barrier to achieving optimal benefit from available treatments.^{1,2} The time lag between medical discovery and routine implementation can at times be extraordinarily long (such as the 264-year gap between the first use and the routine use of lemon juice for treatment of scurvy),³ with current estimates suggesting an average 17-year lapse between initial publication and widespread clinical practice.⁴ This pattern has been demonstrated in multiple settings within health care, including psychiatry.⁵

One major cause of this gap is the failure to consistently implement those treatments identified as efficacious in RCTs. For example, Wang et al.⁶ demonstrated that less than half of all patients treated by mental health specialists received minimally adequate care. Indeed, the rate of concordance with evidence-based mental health care practice may be as low as 10% for certain processes, such as those related to the recognition of and intervention for alcohol use disorders.⁷ In addition to these errors of omission, substantial variation in clinical practice has been identified, with rates of antidepressant initiation varying several-fold even among highly similar specialty mental health clinics.⁸

To encourage adoption of more consistent, evidence-based treatment practices, a number of disorder-specific guidelines and treatment algorithms have been developed.⁹⁻¹² The goal of these guidelines is to replicate the

outcomes achieved in RCTs by advising clinicians to implement those treatments found to be most successful. This approach emphasizes the *what*; that is, it emphasizes translation of the *content* of RCTs as being important for improving real-world clinical practice.

Even in a guideline-driven practice, however, clinical treatment is often associated with wide variations among practitioners. Clinicians may differ, for example, in how they assess the outcomes of treatment (e.g., symptoms, function, side effects), with clinical impression often used instead of objective symptom assessments, even though the former is less accurate.¹³ They may also differ in the degree to which patients are involved in the decision-making process, a concept shown to promote greater medication adherence.¹⁴ These differences in the process of care delivery may result in wide variation in outcome, even if the content of that care is consistent.¹⁵

Therefore, while we strongly agree with the importance of translating the *content* of RCTs to clinical practice, we also believe that clinicians should adopt some of the *processes* that have been shown to be effective in clinical trials, including routine outcomes measurement and involvement of patients in decision making. This implies translating the *how* from RCTs to real-world clinical care, something which has received relatively less attention.

Outcome Measurement and Patient Involvement

As noted by others,^{4,16} progress in the domain of routine outcome assessment is the key to implementing research findings into ordinary practice. Routine and systematic measures of patients' functioning and well-being, along with disease-specific clinical outcomes at appropriate time intervals, have been long recognized as important tools for patient management.¹⁷ Thus, the assessment of clinical effectiveness and efficiency should be based not only on the outcomes achieved across a delivery system (sometimes called traditional or “driven” outcome assessment) but also on the routine outcome assessment performed by clinicians at the front lines of care.¹⁸ In the words of Eisen and Dickey,¹⁹ implicit in this shift is the idea that “although not all clinical practitioners can be

Received Nov. 25, 2008; accepted Feb. 12, 2009. From the Departments of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston (Drs. Weiss and Fava) and the Division of Health Services Research, Partners Psychiatry & Mental Health (Dr. Weiss) Boston, Mass.; and the Department of Psychology, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy (Dr. Guidi).

Financial disclosure appears at the end of the commentary.

Corresponding author and reprints: Anthony P. Weiss, M.D., M.B.A., Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, One Bowdoin Square, Room 734, Boston, MA 02114 (e-mail: aweiss@partners.org).

© Copyright 2009 Physicians Postgraduate Press, Inc.

outcome researchers, all can (and perhaps should) conduct outcome assessment with their clients in their clinical practices.”^(p181) A significant proportion of the available literature is aimed at defining the concepts, boundaries, and characteristics of routine outcome assessment, as well as its application within mental health care settings.^{14,18,20,21}

The use of outcomes instruments may actually enhance, rather than detract from, the patient-centeredness of the mental health care experience. This is important, as a patient-centered approach that facilitates patient participation and actively seeks the patient’s perspective in the treatment interaction has been found to be associated with increased satisfaction and compliance,²² less symptom burden,²³ and fewer misunderstandings.²⁴ The use of patient-reported outcome measures, particularly those that capture important aspects of the patient’s experience (such as quality of life or distress), may increase health professionals’ awareness of and ability to address patients’ concerns.²⁵ These measures might be used as conversation starters, as methods to identify patient preferences and help clinicians to make informed decisions, with an end goal of improving patient-provider communication and shared decision making.^{26,27} With routine collection and feedback at the point of care, these standardized measures, augmented in some cases by individualized patient measures (e.g., how many times did you leave the house this week?), can be used to track treatment success (or lack thereof) from both staff and patient perspectives.¹⁶

Toward a Measurement-Based Treatment Approach

We cannot definitely state that measurement is the “active ingredient” that distinguishes clinical trial outcomes from those in the community. Indeed, a number of factors, including differences in both patient factors (e.g., degree of comorbidity) and care delivery factors (e.g., intensity/frequency of interaction), may contribute to this phenomenon. That said, a growing body of evidence now suggests that outcomes measurement plays an important contributing role. The integration of outcomes measurement and patient involvement, sometimes called *collaborative care* or *measurement-based management*, has formed the basis for recent large-scale clinical trials of both bipolar disorder and unipolar major depression.^{28–32} These studies demonstrated the impact of embedding measurement in an evidence-based algorithmic approach to care, with data indicating favorable outcomes with respect to depressive symptomatology, functioning, and side effects.^{33,34} In fact, in the Sequenced Treatment Alternatives to Relieve Depression (STAR*D) trial, Gaynes et al.³⁵ found that equivalent high-quality depression treatment could be provided in either primary or specialty care, and will produce generally equivalent outcomes when it is delivered within the context of a measurement-based care approach.

In addition to these large-scale trials, the effectiveness of routine outcome assessment with feedback to the point

of care has itself been evaluated in the context of both medication management^{36,37} and psychotherapy.³⁸ Taken together, these studies demonstrate that the use of standardized clinical assessment tools in mental health care is not only feasible but also helpful to clinicians. Furthermore, this approach to care led to actual changes in the course of treatment, resulting in greater functional improvement³⁸ and even fewer psychiatric admissions when compared with treatment as usual.³⁶

It remains unclear why the addition of a relatively simple tool, such as a self-reported questionnaire, would have as large an impact on clinical practice as these studies suggest. The clinician unaided by the use of outcomes tools is making treatment decisions based on elicited responses and clinical observation (Is the patient smiling more? Less restless? More talkative?). Could it be that these tools fill in the assessment gaps that the harried clinician must otherwise leave unfilled due to time constraints? Could our observational skills be flawed or biased in some way, perhaps influenced by outside factors, at least in some percentage of cases? Or do these tools enhance an otherwise thorough and accurate clinical assessment by providing clinicians with greater certainty regarding the patient’s condition, allowing them to more confidently make changes in the treatment approach? At this point, we are left to speculate. Whatever the actual mechanism (and there may certainly be other potential explanations), we should not be put off by the apparent simplicity of the intervention. Recent evidence has shown that simple tools, such as brief checklists used prior to surgery, can in fact have a substantial impact on patient outcome.³⁹

Overcoming Barriers to Implementation

In spite of a growing international consensus that outcomes should be routinely measured in clinical work,^{40,41} routine use of this approach is unfortunately limited. There is certainly no shortage of real-world barriers to adopting measurement-based management, including lack of agreement about what to measure, lack of familiarity with the measurement instruments, lack of faith in the basic psychometric properties of available tools, lack of time and resources needed to complete and review measures, lack of concordance between measures and treatment philosophy, and organizational resistance to change.^{42–44} Measurement-guided care will not become routine until these barriers are addressed. This will require more work within the field to better define and demonstrate the best use of measures in the conduct of clinical care. It will also quite likely require realignment of the financial incentives, which, at this point, do not encourage or reward the effort involved in making this approach a routine component of psychiatric care.

Moreover, routine outcome assessment is more likely to happen if both patients and clinicians can perceive

some benefits. If they can use the information that is routinely collected in a meaningful way in the therapeutic process, they are more likely to comply with the requirements of data collection.¹⁴ Beyond that, measures should be crafted and disseminated in a manner that reflects the complex, time-crunched world of a clinician in clinical practice. Ultimately, this may favor patient self-report instruments seamlessly integrated with documentation systems to avoid duplication of effort. This approach, of course, would require a more integrated information system within mental health care.⁴⁵

Finally, we as clinicians must overcome our general overconfidence in our ability to intuit the condition of the patients we are trying to help. Our internal medicine colleagues no longer use the degree of cyanosis as a measure of a patient's oxygenation; although it is certainly a relevant marker, it is simply too gross a measure to optimally titrate therapy. Why do we in psychiatry still insist on using our own perception of a patient's "mental cyanosis" in determining whether to dose increase, switch, or augment? Like the pulse oximeter, better tools are available. We need to use them.

Financial disclosure: Dr. Fava has received research support from Abbott, Alkermes, Aspect Medical Systems, AstraZeneca, Bio Research, BrainCells, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cephalon, Clinical Trial Solutions, Eli Lilly, Forest, Ganeden, GlaxoSmithKline, Johnson & Johnson, Lichtwer Pharma GmbH, Lorex, Novartis, NARSAD, National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health, Organon, PamLab, Pfizer, Pharmavite, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Shire, Solvay, Synthelabo, and Wyeth-Ayerst; has served on advisory boards for and has been a consultant to Abbott, Amarin, Aspect Medical Systems, AstraZeneca, Auspex, Bayer, Best Practice Project Management, Biovail, BrainCells, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cephalon, Clinical Trial Solutions, CNS Response, Compellis, Cypress, Dov, Eli Lilly, EPIX, Fabre-Kramer, Forest, GlaxoSmithKline, Grunenthal GmbH, Janssen, Jazz, Johnson & Johnson, Knoll, Labopharm, Lorex, Lundbeck, MedAvante, Merck, Methylation Sciences, Neuronetics, Neurotics, Nutrition 21, Organon, PamLab, Pfizer, PharmaStar, Pharmavite, Precision Human Biotechnology, Roche, Sanofi-Aventis, Sepracor, Solvay, Somaxon, Somerset, Synthelabo, Takeda, Tetrigenex, Transcept, Vanda, and Wyeth-Ayerst; has served on speakers boards for Astra-Zeneca, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Cephalon, Eli Lilly, Forest, GlaxoSmithKline, Novartis, Organon, Pfizer, PharmaStar, Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) Psychiatry Academy/Primedia, MGH Psychiatry Academy/Reed-Elsevier, United BioSource Corporation, and Wyeth-Ayerst; has equity holdings in Compellis; has patent applications for Sequential Parallel Comparison Design and for a combination of azapirones and bupropion in major depressive disorder; and receives copyright royalties for the MGH Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire, Sexual Functioning Inventory, Antidepressant Treatment Response Questionnaire, Discontinuation-Emergent Signs and Symptoms, and SAFER. Drs. Weiss and Guidi report no financial or other relationship relevant to the subject of this commentary.

REFERENCES

- Bero LA, Grilli R, Grimshaw JM, et al. Closing the gap between research and practice: an overview of systematic reviews of interventions to promote the implementation of research findings. *BMJ* 1998;317:465-468
- Harrison G, Eaton WW. From research world to real world: routine outcome measures are the key. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 1999;12:187-189
- Berwick DM. Disseminating innovations in health care. *JAMA* 2003;289:1969-1975
- Grant J, Cottrell R, Cluzeau F, et al. Evaluating "payback" on biomedical research from papers cited in clinical guidelines: applied bibliometric study. *BMJ* 2000;320:1107-1011
- Weiss AP. Measuring the impact of medical research: moving from outputs to outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry* 2007;164:206-214
- Wang PS, Lane M, Olfson M, et al. Twelve-month use of mental health services in the United States: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2005;62:629-640
- McGlynn EA, Asch SM, Adams J, et al. The quality of health care delivered to adults in the United States. *N Engl J Med* 2003;348:2635-2645
- Kramer TL, Daniels AS, Ziemann GL, et al. Psychiatric practice variations in the diagnosis and treatment of major depression. *Psychiatr Serv* 2000; 51:336-340
- Depression Guideline Panel. *Depression in Primary Care: Volume 1. Detection and Diagnosis*. Rockville, Md: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; 1993
- Depression Guideline Panel. *Depression in Primary Care: Volume 2. Treatment of Major Depression*. Rockville, Md: US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; 1993
- National Institute for Clinical Excellence. *Depression: management of depression in primary and secondary care*. NICE. Available at: www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/pdf/CG23quickrefguideamended.pdf. Accessed July 28, 2008
- Schulberg HC, Katon W, Simon GE, et al. Treating major depression in primary care practice: an update of the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research Practice Guidelines. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1998;55: 1121-1127
- Biggs MM, Shores-Wilson K, Rush AJ, et al. A comparison of alternative assessments of depressive symptom severity: a pilot study. *Psychiatry Res* 2000;96:269-279
- Priebe S, Bullenkamp J, McCabe R, et al. The impact of routine outcome measurement on treatment processes in community mental health care: approach and methods of the MECCA study. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Soc* 2002;11:198-205
- Trivedi MH, Daly E. Measurement-based care for refractory depression: a clinical decision support model for clinical research and practice. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2007;88(suppl 2):S61-S71
- Slade M, Thornicroft G, Glover G. The feasibility of routine outcome measures in mental health. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 1999; 34:243-249
- Ellwood PM. Shattuck lecture: outcomes management: a technology of patient experience. *N Engl J Med* 1998;318:1549-1556
- Salvador-Carulla L. Routine outcome assessment in mental health research. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 1999;12:207-210
- Eisen SV, Dickey B. Mental health outcome assessment: the new agenda. *Psychotherapy* 1996;33:181-189
- Slade M. Routine outcome assessment in mental health services. *Psychol Med* 2002;32:1339-1343
- Stedman T, Yellowlees P, Mellsop G, et al. *Measuring Consumer Outcomes in Mental Health*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Health and Family Services; 1997
- Roter D, Stewart M, Putnam SM, et al. Communication patterns of primary care physicians. *JAMA* 1997;277:350-356
- Little P, Everitt H, Williamson L, et al. Observational study of effect of patient centredness and positive approach on outcomes of general practice consultations. *BMJ* 2001;323:908-911
- Britten N, Stevenson FA, Barry CA, et al. Misunderstandings in prescribing decisions in general practice: qualitative study. *BMJ* 2000;320: 184-188
- Greenhalgh J. The applications of PROs in clinical practice: what are they, do they work, and why? *Qual Life Res* 2009;18:115-123
- Marshall S, Haywood K, Fitzpatrick R. Impact of patient-reported outcome measures on routine practice: a structured review. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2003;12:559-568
- Detmar SB, Muller MJ, Schornagel JH, et al. Health-related quality-of-life assessments and patient-physician communication: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2002;288:3027-3034
- Nierenberg AA, Ostacher MJ, Borrelli DJ, et al. The integration of measurement and management for the treatment of bipolar disorder: a STEP-BD model of collaborative care in psychiatry.

- J Clin Psychiatry 2006;67(suppl 11):3–7
29. Sachs GS. Strategies for improving treatment of bipolar disorder: integration of measurement and management. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2004;110(suppl 422):7–17
 30. Fava M, Rush A, Trivedi M, et al. Background and rationale for the sequenced treatment alternatives to relieve depression (STAR*D) study. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 2003;26:457–494
 31. Rush AJ, Crismon ML, Kashner TM, et al. Texas Medication Algorithm Project, phase 3 (TMAP-3): rationale and study design. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2003;64(4):357–369
 32. Rush A, Fava M, Wisniewski S, et al. Sequenced Treatment Alternatives to Relieve Depression (STAR*D): rationale and design. *Control Clin Trials* 2004;25:119–142
 33. Rush AJ, Trivedi M, Carmody TJ, et al. One-year clinical outcomes of depressed public sector outpatients: a benchmark for subsequent studies. *Biol Psychiatry* 2004;56:46–53
 34. Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, Crismon ML, et al. Clinical results for patients with major depressive disorder in the Texas Medication Algorithm Project. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2004;61:669–680
 35. Gaynes BN, Rush AJ, Trivedi MH, et al. Primary versus specialty care outcomes for depressed outpatients managed with measurement-based care: results from STAR*D. *J Gen Intern Med* 2008;23:551–560
 36. Slade M, McCrone P, Kuipers E, et al. Use of standardised outcome measures in adult mental health services. *Br J Psychiatry* 2006;189: 330–336
 37. Duffy FF, Chung H, Trivedi M, et al. Systematic use of patient-rated depression severity monitoring: is it helpful and feasible in clinical psychiatry? *Psychiatr Serv* 2008;59:1148–1154
 38. Lambert M. Presidential address: what we have learned from a decade of research aimed at improving psychotherapy outcome in routine care. *Psychother Res* 2007;17:1–14
 39. Haynes AB, Weiser TG, Berry WR, et al. A surgical safety checklist to reduce morbidity and mortality in a global population. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:491–499
 40. Health Research Council of New Zealand. Partnerships for Evidence-Based Policy and Practice. Auckland, New Zealand: Health Research Council of New Zealand; 2003
 41. Trauer T. Routine outcome measurement by mental health-care providers. *Lancet* 2003;361:1137
 42. Gilbody SM, Whitty PM, Grimshaw JM, et al. Improving the detection and management of depression in primary care. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2003;12:149–155
 43. Marks I. Overcoming obstacles to routine outcome measurement. *Br J Psychiatry* 1998;173:281–286
 44. Smith GR, Manderscheid RW, Flynn LM, et al. Principles for assessment of patient outcomes in mental health care. *Psychiatr Serv* 1997; 48:1033–1036
 45. Manderscheid RW, Henderson MJ. From many into one: an integrated information agenda for mental health. *Behav Healthc Tomorrow* 2004; 13:38–41