JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2024, VOL 7, NO S8

Patient-centered measurement through patient-driven research priorities

Nuha Salah Alsuhaymi[1]
Nidhal Ibrahim Bahadir[2]
Muhammedahmedalsharif[3]
Ameen Abdulmoti Alsaedi[4]
Abdulhmidmohammdeid Ralawfi[5]
Abdallah Suliman Alalassi[6]
Abdallahsaleem Alluqmani[7]
Hussain matar albeladi[8]
Hashem mohammed alSharif[9]
Abdurhman mohammed Abunaji[10]

1. (Family medicine).
2. general practitioner(GP).
3. (Epidemiology Supervision Technican).
4. (Technican Nursing).
5. (Technician-pharmacy).
6. (Technican Nursing).
7. (Technican Nursing).
8. General dentistary
9. Technican Nursing
10. General practitioner

Abstract:
A comprehensive approach is emphasized by patient-centered measurement (PCM), in which patient voices are represented across the spectrum of measurement activities and mirrored in the standardized use of patient-reported outcome and experience measures. Given the difficulties in regularly incorporating patient self- reports into clinical care decisions, the advancement of PCM science requires the opinions of all stakeholders in the healthcare system, particularly patients. The analysis we present here was designed to determine patient-driven research priorities for PCM science advancement. Results: We discovered that patients expressed a wish for PCM to be involved in healthcare decisions. Specifically, they expressed a desire for their personal healthcare needs and priorities to always be at the forefront of all healthcare interactions. By (1) strengtheningthepatient-providerrelationship,(2)supportingpatients' stories, (3) addressing inclusivity, (4) guaranteeing psychological safety, (5) improving healthcare services and systems to better meet patient needs, and(6) strengthening health care system accountability, the patients' comments brought to light intersecting priorities for research on advancing the science of PCM that would help transform care. In conclusion: Future research initiatives that are positioned to advance better health, better care, and better use of resources for both individuals and society as a whole are guided by these priorities.

Keywords: Patient-reported outcome measures, Patient- reported experience measures, Patient-centered measurement, Measurement, Research priorities, Patient engagement.

Introduction

The impact of illness on an individual's health and quality of life (PROMs) and experiences of care (PREMs) can be measured using patient-reported outcome and experience measures (PROMs and PREMs). In order to gather assessments of people's health outcomes that are pertinent to their quality of life, such as their physical and mental health, including symptoms, functional status, and other facets of psychological,social, and spiritual well-being, PROMs are self-report tools (Greenhalgh, 2013).

Research on a wide range of medical conditions has made extensive use of PROMs, and there is evidence that they enhance clinical decision-making and patient-clinician communication. When results are applied to initiatives to enhance clinical outcomes, quality of life [9], healthcare utilization, and even survival, PROMs also show promise. PROMs are increasingly being gathered in clinical settings at the point of care, despite the fact that they have mostly been used in research. PREMs are questionnaires or self-report surveys that gauge how a patient feels about different aspects of the treatment and services they received. PREMs are usually organized around particular dimensions that are acknowledged as significant to patients and aim to document what happened to them from their point of view (Kotronoulas, 2014).

Notwithstanding the potential advantages of PROMs and PREMs, there is still much to learn about the outcomes and experiences that patients value most in ordertoguidethecreationandapplicationofthesemeasuresinvariousclinical, disease,andgeographiccontexts.Furthermore,logisticalissues,measurement difficulties, technological obstacles, and a lack of emphasis on data use are some of the obstacles to regularly incorporating PROMS and PREMS into clinicalcareandhealthcareservicedelivery.TheInternationalSocietyofQuality of Life has developed user guides and recommendations to address these issues, and implementation-specific conceptual models and frameworks (such astheConsolidatedFrameworkforImplementationResearchandtheIntegrated Framework for Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services) have been used and tailored (Yang LY, 2018).

Our analysis, which focused on the qualitative information from the patient focus groups, aimed to determine patient-driven research priorities for furthering the scienceofPCM.Inthispaper,theterm"patient"referstobothpeoplewhohave first hand experience with a health issue and unpaid care givers, such asfriends and family (Boyce MB, 2014).

The Science of PCM:

PROMs have been the main focus of PCM research agendas, which have been led by researchers and healthcare professionals. More diverse stakeholders have been included in some formal priority- setting initiatives. Patients' opinions regarding research priorities to advance the science of PCM have rarely been the focus of these efforts, despite the fact that some of them included patient perspectives. This is in contrast to the focus groups conducted throughout the province of British Columbia, Canada, which produced the findings that are presented here. Our findings were particularly note worthy because the patients were able to express the significance of PCM's role in relation to an individual's health and medical care.In other words, the patients' comments recommended that research be prioritized in areas where PCM may revolutionize both the treatment of individual patients and the larger healthcare system (Noonan, 2017).

The function of PCM:

The prolife ration of PROMs and PREMs research focused on developing specific health or experience outcomes, such as symptom severity, patient satisfaction, and quality of life, and assessing the effectiveness of PROMs and PREMs use on these outcomes contrasts with this focus on the function of PCM, including the ways in which PCM could influence a patient's care and the responsiveness of the healthcare system to their needs. In other words, researchers have concentrated on determining whether the use of particular PROMs or PREMs affects particular health or experience outcomes. Does using a pain PROM, for instance, help people feel less pain?,According to our results, more research, including realist assessments, is necessary to determine how, for whom, and under what conditions PCM can be applied to guarantee that the needs of each patient are given priority in every medicalinteraction. How, for instance, does the use of a pain PROM affect discussions about pain with medical professionals, the examination of the multifaceted effects of pain that are significant to patients, or the presentation of different pain management strategies that patients find appealing? This is in line with are search focus on comprehending andelucidatinghowPCM influences the different aspects of care, asstated by Greenhalghand colleagues (Greenhalgh, 2018).

The patient-provider relationship for quality healthcare:

However, our research's patients also went beyond the "how" to highlightthefundamentalsofthepatient-providerrelationshipforhigh- quality healthcare that is tailored to their specific needs. They promoted PCM that would strengthen this bond. This result would be consistent with studiesthat examine how PCM affects different facets of clinical care, including hared decision-making and communication. For instance, research indicates that PCM may improve symptom awareness, stimulate dialogue, and give patients the chancetogointo further detail about their issues, all of which could improve patient- provider communication (Gibbons, 2021).

Additionally, a more comprehensive understanding of the patient's condition and experiences through PCM, better communication, and the provision of patient-specific information may all have an impact on the therapeutic relationship between the patient and the provider. Our results imply that these clinical care facets are significant research areas, but improving care via PCM could also be examined from the viewpoint of the patient, highlighting ideas like cultural safety, reciprocity, respect, trust, feeling heard, and partnership (Howell, 2020).

The pragmatics of managing health:

For patients and their families, the practicalities of managing health and illness can be enormous. It should come asnosurprise that when the system worked for the patients in our study, they highly valued healthcare services. They desired PCM integration so that services would be more effective, efficient, culturally safe, and responsive to the needs of each patient. There are a number of obstacles and difficulties that prevent PCM from being integrated into current healthcare services. These include technological and logisticalissues pertaining to staff productivity, time and resource needs, integration with current medical records, and procedures that turn data into clinically useful information (Greenhalgh, 2018).

Patient experiences may be enhanced by healthcare services and systems that are effective for employees, but this is not a given. Our result simply that it is necessary to concentrate on theeffects of PCM implementation on patients in particular. Furthermore, the importance of integrated knowledge translation and participatory research principles—whichinvolveallstakeholders,particularlypatients,inthe developmentand implementation of system storecordand make PCM actionable—is becoming increasingly acknowledged (Boyce, 2014).

Engagingpatients:

Involvingpatientsisalsoessentialforcreatingchannelsforexplaining how PCM will be used, making sure they feel comfortable offering feedback that leads to systemic changes, and eventually boosting patient accountability. There is proof that making aggregate PROM data publicly available enhances the standard of patient care. Nevertheless, there is little evidence of the advantages of various reporting techniques from the viewpoint of the patient (Yang, 2018).

Recommendations:

The results of the study highlight how crucialitis to give PCMresearch that attempts to improve both the general healthcare system and individual patient care top priority. The study also emphasizes how importantthepatient-providerrelationshipistohigh-qualityhealthcare and the need for more research supporting PCM's use as a tool to improve trust, communication, and shared decision-making. As a potential tactic to offer significant insights into patients' health and quality of life, novel ways of fusing patient narratives with numerical data should be developed. This will help clinicians better understand individualexperiencesandstrengthentherapeuticalliances.Inorderto make healthcare services more responsive and accountable, the study concludes by highlightingthe need for research into inclusive PCM that takes into account the diversity of patient needs and experiences, especially those from equity-deserving groups, and to involve diverse patients in the design and implementation of PCM systems.

Conclusion:

In Conclusion, there is great potential for reorienting healthcare and health systems around the priorities of individual patients through the transition from PROMs and PREMs to PCM. The study's findings on patient-driven priorities for improving PCM highlight patients' preferences for their healthcare needs and associated priorities, which they believe should always be at the forefront of all healthcare interactions. In order to genuinely advance better health, better care, and better use of resources for both individuals and society as awhole, future research endeavors that are based on patient perspectives will be guided by the priorities outlined in this study.

References:

- Greenhalgh J, Abhyankar P, McCluskey S, Takeuchi E, Velikova G. How do doctors refer to patient-reported outcome measures (PROMS) in oncology consultations? Qual Life Res. 2013;22(5):939–50.
- Kotronoulas G, Kearney N, Maguire R, Harrow A, Di Domenico D, Croy S, et al. What is thevalue of the routine use of patient-reportedoutcomemeasures toward improvement of patient outcomes, processes of care, and health service outcomes in cancer care? A systematic review of controlled trials. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(14):1480–510.
- Yang LY, Manhas DS, Howard AF, Olson RA. Patient-reported outcome use in oncology: a systematic review of the impact on patient-clinician communication. Support Care Cancer. 2018;26(1):41–60.
- Boyce MB, Browne JP, Greenhalgh J. The experiences of professionals with using information from patient-reported outcome measures to improve the quality of healthcare: a systematic review of qualitative research. BMJ Qual Saf. 2014;23(6):508–18.
- NoonanVK,LyddiattA,WareP,JaglalSB,RiopelleRJ,BinghamCO,III,etal. Montreal Accord on patient-reported outcomes (PROs) use series–paper 3: patient-reported outcomes can facilitate shared decision-making and guide self-management. J Clin Epidemiol. 2017;89:125–35.
- Greenhalgh J, Gooding K, Gibbons E, Dalkin S, Wright J, Valderas J, et al. Howdopatientreportedoutcomemeasures(PROMs)supportclinician-patient communicationandpatientcare?Arealistsynthesis.JPatient-RepOutcomes. 2018;2(1):1–28.
- Gibbons C, Porter I, Gonçalves-Bradley DC, Stoilov S, Ricci-Cabello I, TsangarisEetal.Routineprovisionoffeedbackfrompatient-reportedoutcome measurements to healthcare providers and patients in clinical practice. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2021(10).
- Howell D, Li M, Sutradhar R, Gu S, Iqbal J, O'Brien MA et al. Integration of patient-reported outcomes (PROs) for personalized symptom management in real-worldoncology practices: apopulation-basedcohortcomparisonstudyof impact on healthcare utilization. Support Care Cancer. 2020:1–10.