

A Survey on the Current Status of Patient Reported Outcome Measures(PROMs)

DW. Jung¹, SJ. Park² and BR. Ahn³

ISQUA2023-ABS-2561

1. Analysis Review Development Division, Review Assessment Innovation Department, Health Insurance Review & Assessment service, Wonju, Republic of Korea
2. Big Data Linkage Division, Big Data Department, Health Insurance Review & Assessment service, Wonju, Republic of Korea
3. Human Resource Administration Department, Health Insurance Review & Assessment service, Wonju, Republic of Korea

INTRODUCTION

- ◆ Starting in the 2000s, the world Health Organization (WHO), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development(OECD), among others, defined patient-centeredness as a key element of medical quality.
- ◆ Various countries began to regard the perspective of patients as an essential part in evaluating the quality of medical care and the system of healthcare.
- ◆ Patient-Reported Outcome Measures(PROMs) are drawing attention as a means of measuring patient-centeredness- a key performance indicator of the healthcare system worldwide.
- ◆ South Korea are also required to discuss the policy value and utilization of PROMs at the national level.

AIM

- ◆ The Health Insurance Review and Assessment Service plans to strengthen patient-centered health care as a key objective in the evaluation
- ◆ To measure health outcomes intensively through the development of a patient-centered pool.

RESULTS

- ◆ The following four phases are required to apply PROMs to Korea's medical quality evaluation system :

- (phase 1) defining the purpose of measurement
- (phase 2) selecting an appropriate PROM through the exploration and evaluation of PROMs
- (phase 3) developing and testing a PROM-based outcomes evaluation system
- (phase 4) finalizing and implementing the outcomes evaluation system

<Figure1> PRO-PM Roadmap by National Quality Forum



METHOD

This survey was conducted three stages

1. The concept of PROMs is defined through the theoretical consideration.
 - ▶ referred to the concept of PRO, PROM and PRO-PM presented by National Quality Forum(NQF)
2. We reviewed domestic and foreign PROMs cases.
 - ▶ For domestic cases, we focused on the criteria for
 - ① 'Medical Institutions Accreditation'
 - ② 'Specialty Hospital Designation'
 - ③ 'Rehabilitation Medical Institutions Designation' designated by the Minister of Health and Welfare
 - ▶ We examined the item of
 - ④ 'Inpatient Experience Evaluation' conducted by Health Insurance Review & Assessment Service
 - ▶ For foreign cases,
 - ⑤ OECD PaRIS Initiative
 - ⑥ The Standard Sets by International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement(ICHOM)
 - ⑦ Cases of United States
 - ⑧ Cases of Canada
 - ⑨ Cases of Australia
 - ⑩ Cases of England
3. The direction and contents of this survey were verified through consultation with experts in the healthcare and medical field.

CONCLUSIONS

- ◆ In the past, health care quality evaluation had been conducted by focusing on
 - ▶ Length of hospital stay(Lengthness Index), cost(Costliness Index), surgical complications, mortality as a result of medical service provision.
- ◆ However, PROMs can measure the impact on the patient's quality of life at the individual level and provide real-time data that can be used together with medical staff to make decisions about surgery or treatment.
- ◆ There is a need for continuous patient participation and the expansion of PROMs in the evaluation of medical quality so that patient-centered care can be recognized as a core value within the Korean healthcare system.
- ◆ Furthermore, it is essential to prioritize the diseases with high burden and attention when Korea introduces PROMs.
- ◆ Lastly, to continuously improve survey tools and develop new areas of research, there needs to be an encouragement of the active participation of patients and health care providers.

REFERENCES

1. Do YK, Kim JE, LEE JY, LEE HY, Jo MW, Kim UN et al. A Study on the Development of a Patient-Centeredness Evaluation Model. Wonju, Korea: Health Insurance Review & Assessment Service; 2015.
2. Choi JS, Park YS, Kim JA, Park CS. International Trends on Patient-Reported Outcome Measures for Improving Care Quality and its Implication for South Korea: focus on OECD PaRIS. Quality Improvement in Health Care. 2019; 25(1):11-28.
3. National Quality Forum. Building a Roadmap From Patient-Reported Outcome Measures to Patient-Reported Outcome Performance Measures: TECHNICAL GUIDANCE – FINAL DRAFT. Washington, United States: National Quality Forum; 2021.
4. Canadian Institute for Health Information. PROMs Background Document. Ontario, Canada: Canadian Institute for Health Information; 2015.
5. Center for Medicare & Medicaid Service. Patient-Reported Outcome Measures. Baltimore, United States: Center for Medicare & Medicaid Service; 2022.
6. NHS Digital. Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) in England – A guide to PROMs methodology. Leeds, England: NHS Digital; 2017.
7. Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, Quentin W. Improving healthcare quality in Europe - Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies. Brussels, Belgium: European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2019.
8. Palliative Care Outcomes Collaboration. Patient outcomes in Palliative Care – Australian National report July to December 2021. New South Wales, Australia: Palliative Care Outcomes Collaboration; 2022.
9. Terwee CB, Zuidgeest M, Vonkeman HE, Cella D, Haverman L, Roorda LD. Common patient-reported outcomes across ICHOM Standard Sets: the potential contribution of PROMIS. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2021; 21-259.