

Overview of immunization strategies in primary care

Maria Ali Othman Hakami, Somaia Mansour Mohammed Somaili, Noora Ali Othman Hakami,
Ali Abdullah Ali Najmi, Arwa Ali Othman Hakami, Mohammed Ahmed Khormi

Abstract:

In this review we are aiming to understand variations in vaccination management in primary care and highlighted a number of interventions that can help improve immunization rates in developed countries. These include reminding parents in children cases and providers of upcoming and overdue immunizations and educating and providing feedback to the vaccination providers. We conducted search using electronic biomedical databases such as; Medline, and Embase, for studies published up to September 2017 with English language concerning the immunization strategies in primary care, Following MeSh terms were used in our search strategy: “immunization”, “vaccination”, “primary care”, “family medicine”. Maintaining high vaccine uptake rates is an essential component of the success of any vaccination program and in improving the health status individuals. Our review has highlighted a number of interventions that can help improve immunization rates in developed areas. These include reminding parents and providers of upcoming and overdue immunizations and educating and giving feedback to the vaccination providers. Some additional research is needed to test the cost-effectiveness of these interventions and their impact in groups with bad immunization rates or high risks of difficulties from vaccine preventable diseases.

Introduction:

Immunizations are among the leading 10 great public health accomplishments of the 20th century for their success in recognizing considerable declines in cases, hospitalizations, fatalities, and health care prices related to vaccine-preventable illness [1]. Reliable immunizations require an extensive, multi-step procedure in behalf of the doctors and the practice groups in charge. In lots of Western nations, detailed recommendations resolve not only the medical indicators for the numerous vaccinations, however additionally structural and procedural elements of the inoculation management. Although millions of vaccinations are done every year, relatively few studies deal with the every-day difficulties of techniques' vaccination management. Unsystematic observations in our area suggest significant distinctions in between practices with regard to patient info, how you can attain patient consent, the involvement of practice assistants in vaccinations and the vaccine handling.

The high rate of childhood vaccination coverage in a lot of countries suggests that vaccination continues to be an extensively accepted public health step [2]. However, national estimates of vaccination protection do not reflect variability within the nations. Under-vaccinated individuals have the tendency to cluster together, leading to raised transmission of vaccine-preventable conditions [3]. Sub-optimal vaccine protection rates can, partly, be attributed to vaccination hesitancy. Many researches have likewise revealed that even parents that have their youngsters vaccinated could have doubts and even is afraid regarding immunization [4], [5]. Vaccine hesitancy is receiving boosting public health interest in established and developing countries worldwide. Evidence suggests that in North America, Europe, and in other parts of the world,

public confidence in vaccines is decreasing and anti-vaccine activities are becoming more powerful [6]. When confronted with vaccine hesitancy, public health authorities are looking for effective techniques to resolve it.

Several public health treatments to promote vaccination have been based upon a "knowledge-deficit" method presuming that vaccine hesitant people would alter their mind if given the proper information. Nevertheless, research on vaccine acceptance has revealed that individual decision-making relating to vaccination is far more complex and may involve emotional, cultural, social, spiritual or political factors as much as cognitive aspects [7].

In this review we are aiming to understand variations in vaccination management in primary care and highlighted a number of interventions that can help improve immunization rates in developed countries. These include reminding parents in children cases and providers of upcoming and overdue immunizations and educating and providing feedback to the vaccination providers.

Methodology:

We conducted search using electronic biomedical databases such as; Medline, and Embase, for studies published up to September 2017 with English language concerning the immunization strategies in primary care, Following MeSh terms were used in our search strategy: “immunization”, “vaccination”, “primary care”, “family medicine”. more relevant studies were searched in the references list of included studies.

Discussion:

- **Patient-related process quality**

In the medical literature, three teams of treatments were studied as techniques to increase immunization rates in children and grownups: patient-oriented interventions (e.g. written reminders), provider treatments (e.g. preventative services flow sheets in patient graphes) and system interventions (e.g. public immunization projects) [8]. A Cochrane evaluation contrasting RCTs with patient-oriented interventions showed that postcards, letters, autodialers, and person-to-patient telephone call increased immunization rates: phone reminders were most reliable but likewise most costly, yet raised immunization rates up to thirty percent [8]. In 2000, a study amongst 316 US primary care medical professionals showed that 23% of techniques are using mail or phone reminders [9]. This is comparable to our results which revealed that 31% of techniques are using phone, and approximately 14% written reminders, e.g. text, e-mail, or letter. Provider interventions were more constant compared to patient-oriented treatments both in the US study and our study, yet the procedures utilized differ. In decreasing order, US physicians used the following 3 strategies most frequently: preventative service flow sheets in patient graphes (71%), walk-in immunization service (67%), and a plan to examine vaccination condition at each check out [9]. In contrast, our survey revealed that physicians use the technique to control risk groups (95%), provide appointment for following vaccination (90%) and use regular assessments to maximize immunization degrees (90%). These differences could result from health care system elements, physician education, and private preferences. System distinctions additionally play a role with regard to the mode of patient approval and information:

while verbal information and verbal patient consent suffices by German law, US law needs the provision of comprehensive written consent prior to each vaccination [10].

- **Vaccine-related process quality**

Sufficiently educated personnel is of crucial relevance to ensure an excellent quality of vaccine management. This was recorded in an intervention research study in the Atlanta area: everyday temperature tracking of vaccine storage areas was 2-3 times more probable if the assigned coordinator had a greater level of medical education [11]. A study of 221 US practices showed that 83% had actually marked a specific individual as responsible for vaccine storage and handling, with a backup in 63% of practices [11]. An additional US survey amongst 721 primary care workplaces set apart in between purchasing, storing and application of vaccines: in the majority of practices just one individual was accountable for ordering vaccines (75%), 2 or even more team member was accountable for storing (50%) and application of vaccines (77%) [12]. Survey evaluated duties within the practice group: in greater than 70% of techniques it is the single obligation of the physician accountable to pre-select vaccines, while getting, storage space and stock control are commonly passed on to medical assistants. We consider it positive that medical professionals are involved in vaccine pre-selection, as these decisions may prevent programmatic vaccination errors defined in the medical literary works, such as mixed use of brands for the exact same vaccination or making use of various vaccines with comparable names [13].

- **Personnel-related quality**

The definition of our quality indication dealt with three regular elements of personnel-related immunization quality: application of vaccination recommendations, personnel qualification and

the doctor or a designated individual uses the vaccination. Considering the recommendation of catch-up vaccination regimens, studies amongst pediatricians showed a broad variation between doctors [14], which was validated in our study. Utilizing one professional vignette we revealed disparities to current recommendations. These differences could be unconcerned as a result of expertise deficiencies (e.g. with regard to immunization referrals and contraindications), or deliberate due to disagreement with immunization referrals. Both facets have been previously related to the noninclusion of vaccinations, specifically in pediatricians [15] Discussed are likewise significantly complicated immunization schedules as barrier to immunization methods adapt recommendations [16].

- **Storage-related quality**

The definition of our quality indication addressed three common storage-related facets: storage device, maintaining a storage temperature log and regular storage control. In our research, 79% of techniques utilized a separate fridge for vaccines, which was documented in 96% of 695 US health care methods [12], yet just 59% of 172 Australian [17], and 9 to 22% of 135 Canadian techniques [18] All the methods surveyed in our research had actually designated organizers in charge of storage control, which is higher compared to 83% US personal providers who marked a person for the joint tasks vaccine storage and handling [11] Frequently, vaccine storage circumstances are a weak point in the quality chain with the prospective to trigger illness outbreaks [19], to lower the vaccine performance and the tolerability of vaccines [20] A systematic literature review based on 14 studies in developed regions revealed that 13.5% (6.4 to 20.7%) of fridges had temperatures below the freeze limit [21] The difficulty of maintaining fridges within the proper temperature level range becomes clear taking into consideration that even after participating in a treatment research, 50% of the methods fail this criteria [22] In

addition, the storage devices utilized is essential. An Australian study based upon 28 general practitioners showed that the fridge kind used is associated with maintaining proper temperature levels, with objective built vaccine fridges revealing better outcomes. Our outcomes are in arrangement with these searching for: only 92% regularly regulated their storage and just 51% of the techniques kept a storage temperature log. The latter result is much reduced compared with 73% US primary care practices [13], yet equivalent to 53% US personal doctors that do not have a log [12] Therefore, a minimum of in our area, future interventions to boost vaccine-related high quality should attend to the problem of a separate refrigerator, a storage temperature level log and normal storage control as essential material of CME and practice enhancement approaches.

- **Immunization strategies in primary care:**

Provider education

Provider education techniques aim to boost the expertise of the immunization provider via a range of approaches consisting of peer assistance and using educational resources. Educational devices could be one-off sessions or part of continuing clinical education.

Four of the consisted of documents [23], [24] reported on 4 intervention arms researching the impact of informing the supplier of vaccinations on immunization rates. The ordinary high quality score for included research studies was 22.4 (range 20-28). In general, these studies reported a median point modification of 8% (mean 10%, range 1-25%). The educational interventions varied from 1-hour peer education sessions to routine continuing medical education within the practice. Two research studies looked at provider education alone and 2 studies looked at education in combination with other treatments such as patient reminders.

Reminder and recall

Reminders goal to suggest parents of upcoming vaccinations that schedule and remind parents of those kids that are overdue. They differ in method from automated telephone calls and generic postcards to individualized letters and even house visits.

Twenty-two included documents reported on 41 treatment arms researching parental reminders and recalls. Details of the included studies are seen in Table 1. The ordinary score for research study high quality making use of Down and Black's top quality racking up framework was 24.8 from a potential 31 (range 21- 29.5). Fourteen (34%) of the 41 treatment arms revealed a statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) rise in immunization rates. In general, these researches reported an average point adjustment of 11% (mean 10%, array-11% to 24%). Researches contrasting typical care with postal reminders alone reported a total typical point modification of 10% (mean 8.6%, range-- 11% to 19%). Research studies looking at telephone reminders alone reported a total mean factor change of 9.5% (mean 12%; variety 3-24%). Those studies considering the result of the combination of postal and telephone reminders on vaccination rates reported a total mean point adjustment of 10.5% (mean 10.8%, variety 2.8-19%). One research study [26] contrasted a traditional suggestion card with a card created with health idea design in mind. Have et al. reported a 12% boost in immunization rates when the health belief design pointer card was utilized.

Table1. Study characteristics of reminder and recall studies

Paper	Setting and population	Intervention	Outcome
Abramson <i>et</i>	Public health centre and	1. Usual care	Age appropriate immunizations

Paper	Setting and population	Intervention	Outcome
<i>al [25].</i>	children's hospital continuity clinic, Forsyth County, North Carolina, USA; low socioeconomic status	(control group) vs. 2. Postcard reminders followed by telephone reminders	(DTP/OPV/Hib) at 7 months of age 1 vs. 2, net change = 19% ($P < 0.00001$)
<i>Alemi et al [26].</i>	Paediatric outpatient clinic, Cleveland, USA; children under 6 months of age at recruitment; urban; predominantly ethnic minorities; low socioeconomic status	1. Usual care (control group) vs. 2. Computer-generated telephone reminders and recalls	On time immunization with complete series (DTP/OPV/MMR/Hib): 1 vs. 2, net change = 24.4% ($P = 0.0005$)
<i>Alto et al [27].</i>	Family practice clinic, Colorado, USA; children between 2 months and 7 years old; low socioeconomic status	1. Usual care (control group) vs. 2. Specific postcard reminders followed by	Up to date with DTP/OPV/MMR/Hib vaccinations: 1 vs. 2, net change = 8% ($P < 0.011$)

Paper	Setting and population	Intervention	Outcome
		telephone reminders	

Parental reminders have been shown to have an overall positive effect on immunization uptake. These effects have been reported with both generic and specific reminders and with all methods of reminders and recall.

Parental education in case of children vaccination

In the context of this review, we considered just instructional programmes that might feasibly be supplied within the setup of health care and we excluded researches reporting national or regional education and learning programmes.

Two of the consisted of papers reported on 2 intervention arms examining the result of simple parental education and learning programs on immunization uptake [28]. One study examined the impact of a marketing teddy bear featuring the address of an info website for MMR and one studied the influence of an interactive visuals card and verbal explanation on immunisation uptake. The quality of these 2 studies averaged at 23.8 points from a feasible 31. Neither study revealed a significant impact on immunisation rates and the minimal number of researches prevents us from reaching an evidenced-based conclusion on the impact of these approaches on parental behaviour.

Conclusion:

Maintaining high vaccine uptake rates is an essential component of the success of any vaccination program and in improving the health status individuals. Our review has highlighted a number of interventions that can help improve immunization rates in developed areas. These include reminding parents and providers of upcoming and overdue immunizations and educating and giving feedback to the vaccination providers. Some additional research is needed to test the cost-effectiveness of these interventions and their impact in groups with bad immunization rates or high risks of difficulties from vaccine preventable diseases.

Reference:

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ten great public health achievements—United States, 2001-2010. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2011;60(19):619–623.
2. World Health Organization Immunization summary – a statistical reference containing data through 2010 (2012), p. 197
3. S.B. Omer, D.A. Salmon, W.A. Orenstein, M.P. deHart, N. Halsey Vaccine refusal, mandatory immunization, and the risks of vaccine-preventable diseases. *N Engl J Med*, 360 (19) (2009), pp. 1981-1988
4. W.L. Ruijs, J.L. Hautvast, G. van Ijzendoorn, W.J. van Ansem, K. van der Velden, M.E. Hulscher. How orthodox protestant parents decide on the vaccination of their children: a qualitative study
5. S. Hilton, M. Petticrew, K. Hunt. Combined vaccines are like a sudden onslaught to the body's immune system': parental concerns about vaccine 'overload' and 'immune-vulnerability'.
6. E. Dubé, M. Vivion, N.E. MacDonald. Vaccine hesitancy, vaccine refusal and the anti-vaccine movement: influence, impact and implications. *Expert Rev Vaccines* (2014), pp. 1-19.
7. E. Dube, C. Laberge, M. Guay, P. Bramadat, R. Roy, J.A. Bettinger. Vaccine hesitancy: an overview. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*, 9 (8) (2013), pp. 1-11

8. Jacobson Vann JC, Szilagy P (2005) Patient reminder and recall systems to improve immunization rates. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 3.
9. Szilagy PG, Shone LP, Barth R, Kouides RW, Long C, et al. (2005) Physician practices and attitudes regarding adult immunizations. *Prev med* 40(2): 152–161.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2012) *Epidemiology and Prevention of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases*. Washington, DC: Public Health Foundation.
11. Bell KN, Hogue C, Manning C, Kendal AP (2001) Risk factors for improper vaccine storage and handling in private provider offices. *Pediatrics* 107(6): e100.
12. Gazmararian JA, Oster NV, Green DC, Schuessler L, Howell K, et al. (2002) Vaccine storage practices in primary care physician offices: assessment and intervention. *Am J Prev Med* 23(4): 246–253.
13. Maurer W (2000) Vaccine nomenclature: the three-letter code. *Vaccine* 18 (15): 1539–1542.
14. Martin M, Badalyan V (2012) Vaccination practices among physicians and their children. *OJ Pediatr* 2: 228–235.
15. Cohen NJ, Lauderdale DS, Shete PB, Seal JB, Daum RS (2003) Physician knowledge of catch-up regimens and contraindications for childhood immunizations. *Pediatrics* 111(5): 925–932.
16. Shaw JS, Samuels RC, Larusso EM, Bernstein HH (2000) Impact of an encounter-based prompting system on resident vaccine administration performance and immunization knowledge. *Pediatrics* 105 (Suppl 3)978–983.
17. Bailey HD, Kurinczuk JJ, Kusel MM, Plant AJ (1999) Barriers to immunisation in general practice. *Aust Nz J Publ Heal* 23(1): 6–10.
18. Yuan L, Daniels S, Naus M, Brcic B (1995) Vaccine storage and handling. Knowledge and practice in primary care physicians' offices. *Can fam physician* 41: 1169.
19. McColloster P, Vallbona C (2011) Graphic-output temperature data loggers for monitoring vaccine refrigeration: implications for pertussis. *Am J Public Health* 101(1): 46–47.
20. WHO (2006) *Temperature Sensitivity of the Diphtheria Containing Vaccines*. Geneva: WHO.

21. Matthias DM, Robertson J, Garrison MM, Newland S, Nelson C (2007) Freezing temperatures in the vaccine cold chain: a systematic literature review. *Vaccine* 25(20): 3980–3986.
22. Lewis PR, Reimer RF, Dixon AJ (2001) Evaluating the efficacy of vaccine storage in the general practice setting. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health* 25(6): 547–550.
23. Franzini L, Boom J, Nelson C Cost-effectiveness analysis of a practice-based immunization education intervention. *Ambul Pediatr* 2007;7:167–75.
24. Margolis P, Lannon C, Stuart JM, Fried BJ, Keyes-Elstein L, Moore DE Jr. Practice based education to improve delivery systems for prevention in primary care: randomised trial. *BMJ* 2004;328:388.
25. Alemi F, Alemagno S Computer reminders improve on-time immunization rates. *Med Care* 1996;34 Suppl. 10:OS45–51.
26. Alto W, Fury D, Condo A, Doran M, Aduddell M Improving the immunization coverage of children less than 7 years old in a family practice residency. *J Am Board Fam Pract* 1994;7:472–7.
27. 16. Daley M, Steiner J, Brayden RM, Xu S, Morrison S, Kempe A Immunization registry-based recall for a new vaccine. *Ambul Pediatr* 2002;2:438–43.
28. Porter-Jones G, Williams S, Powell C, Pusey L, Roberts RJ Impact of a novel way to communicate information about MMR on uptake of MMR vaccine: a randomized controlled trial. *Public Health* 2009;123:78–80.