

ORTHOPAEDICS

EDITORIAL

Patient-reported outcome and the future of healthcare system

<http://www.lebanesemedicaljournal.org/articles/65-3/editorial2.pdf>

Surgeon satisfaction does not always meet patient satisfaction in orthopaedics. It is not uncommon to encounter a situation where a treatment rated successful from the surgeon perspective fails to deliver patient satisfaction [1].

This gap is more obvious in the outcome of spine care and in total knee arthroplasty (TKA) [2,3]. From an intellectual as well as from an ethical point of view, as healthcare givers, we need to give an explanation to this gap. From another side, because of the increasing cost of health care in all countries and its major financial impact, this gap is nowadays more and more questionable by the developed country healthcare system and the focus of attention is increasingly turned to optimizing outcomes and utilization of healthcare resources [4].

Patient-reported outcome measures (PROM) are *“any report of the status of a patient’s health condition that comes directly from the patient (or in some cases a caregiver or surrogate) without interpretation of the patient’s response by a clinician or anyone else”* [5].

PROM are validated, standardized patients questionnaires used to measure a patient’s pain, physical function, and quality of life [6].

Currently, in USA, in joint replacement, patient-reported outcome (PRO) is voluntary, but reporting will become mandatory in the coming four years [7].

Direct attention to the PRO has the potential to drive quality and efficiency improvements, but only if the quality measures that are developed from them are clinically important, scientifically acceptable, usable and feasible [8].

We consider that refinement of our postoperative objectives as surgeons as well as more attention to validated patient-reported outcome measures will definitely achieve better and more predictable outcome for our patients. Researches and publications need to go in this direction and surgical techniques pathways will follow to achieve this target.

Amer Camille ABDALLAH, MD*
Guest editor

*Faculty of Medical Sciences, Lebanese University, Beirut, Lebanon.

Member of the International Advisory Board of the Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, JAAOS, global research and reviews.

e-mail: ameramd@hotmail.com

1. Choi YJ, Ra HJ. Patient satisfaction after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Relat Res* 2016 Mar; 28 (1): 1-15.
2. Noble PC, Conditt MA, Cook KF, Mathis KB. The John Insall Award - Patient expectations affect satisfaction with total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2006 Nov; 452: 35-43.
3. Robertsson O, Dunbar M, Pehrsson T, Knutson K, Lidgren L. Patient satisfaction after knee arthroplasty: A report on 27,372 knees operated on between 1981 and 1995 in Sweden. *Acta Orthop Scand* 2000; 71: 262-7.
4. Banks SA. What postoperative outcome measures link joint stability to patient satisfaction? *Journal of the AAOS* 2017; 25 (Supplement 1): S1-S3.
5. US Department of Health and Human Services. Food and Drug Administration: Guidance for Industry Patient-Reported Outcomes Measures: Use in Medical Product Development to Support Labeling Claims, 2009. Available at: <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM193282.pdf>
6. Ayers DC. Implementation of patient-reported outcome measures in total knee arthroplasty. *Journal of the AAOS* 2017; 25 (Supplement 1): S48-S50.
7. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services: CMMI Comprehensive care for joint replacement model: Quality measures, Voluntary Data, Public reporting processes for preview reports.
8. MacLean C. Value-based purchasing for osteoarthritis and total knee arthroplasty: What role for patient-reported outcomes? *Journal of the AAOS* 2017; 25 (Supplement 1): S55-S59.