**Download the** poster and more info here>









Hospital Universitario SaludMadrid 12 de Octubre



# Guide for patient-reported experience questionnaire design, validation and implementation in a high-complexity hospital within the Value-Based Healthcare paradigm

Carolina Varela-Rodríguez <sup>1,2</sup>, Ana Salamanca-Castro <sup>1,2</sup>, Asier Pérez <sup>3</sup>, Pilar Espallargas Moya <sup>2</sup>, Pedro Ruiz-López <sup>2</sup> 1 Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain:; 2 Institute for Biomedical Research at the Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre (I+12), Madrid, Spain; 3 Whykers Consulting, Panel. Health, Bilbao, Spain.

### **Background & Objectives**

Value-based healthcare (VBHC) has triggered several efforts to increase patient-centred care and process-centred management. These two previous coexisting paradigms have shown their importance in supporting VBHC. One of the main existing tools linking patient perspective and care process analysis is the Patient-Reported Experience Measures (PREM - questionnaires) and studies (ethnographic or any other qualitative). It is a complex process, and we understood useful to share our problems and facilitators with other hospitals as a help and developed a guide for PREM implementation that was published in Spanish in May 2022 and will be translated into English shortly.

## Materials & Methods

This guide has a sequential development with several intertwined methods: Focal groups with breast and lung cancer patients (on peer review); Delphi study on VBHC key elements (already published); Ethnographic studies in breast and lung cancer patients; Experts individual interviews (Madrilenian Association for Healthcare Quality – AMCA and the Spanish Society of Quality of Care -SECA); Team discussion and expert evaluation (AMCA/SECA). After the field research, a digital PREM solution was chosen to run the questionnaires.

### Results

#### THE ISSUES TO IMPLEMENT PREM IN A COMPLEX INSTITUTION THAT WERE CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL ARE:

### A shared conceptual frame (chapter 2 to 4) from VBHC to Patient experience



• An understanding of outcomes and experience and their different utility for continuous improvement (ch. 6 and 7)

<ul> <li>EXPERIENCE</li> <li>Its measure allows to identify process indicators</li> <li>Subjective</li> <li>Explores emotional and intimate aspects</li> <li>More focused in needs</li> <li>Longitudinal vocation in the care process.</li> <li>Bigger external validity</li> <li>Easier interpretability of the results</li> <li>A more direct identification of improvement actions</li> <li>Identification of critical points in the process and improvement needs (red flags)</li> <li>Direct and fast impact on patients</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>SATISFACTION</li> <li>It allows the measurement of results indicators</li> <li>Very subjective</li> <li>Very influenced by the external context (socioeconomically and cultural)</li> <li>Very influenced by expectations</li> <li>A high transversal component</li> <li>Bigger internal validity</li> <li>Results difficult to interpret</li> <li>Complex identification of improvement actions</li> <li>Alerts on the need for improvement</li> <li>Measure result indicators (at least partially)</li> </ul>	Patient-Reported Experience Measure (PREM)AnonymousAggregatedTransversalHigh positive impact on patients, care- takers and healthcare professionalsLocal sphereFocused on the organizationCentered in process improvementNo need for integration on the Electronic Health RecordInternal organizational decision making around process improvementHighly influence by the healthcare condition considered	Patient-Reported Outcome Measure (PROM)NominalPersonalizedLongitudinalGlobal sphereFocused on the patientCentered in the Quality of Life improve- ment and the effectivityShould be integrated in the Electronic Health Record of each patientUseful for individual clinical decision making, outcome research and compa- rability (benchmark)Highly dependent on the patient's health condition and state
--	--	--	--

#### A clear and strict methodological approach in each institution and the necessary use of technological tools:

#### **Advantages of digital PREMs** • Reference conceptual framework

- Items definition
- Expert draft review
- Piloting (Content validation)
- Reliability analysis
- Construct and criteria validation
- Draft adjustment to a final version • Metric proprieties analysis
- Can be systematic, independent of professionals' time
- Quick and agile. Allowing remote and asynchronous interviews
- Easily scalable. Allowing implementation in multiple processes and services
- Agnostic. Unbiased results
- Major respect for patients' intimacy and time
- Automatized results reporting

#### **Inconveniences of digital PREMs**

- Lack of verbal interaction
- Unavailability for doubt answering
- Anti-machine bias

• Digital gap

### • A reasonable comprehension of the organizational impact of their implementation and the needs to adapt the PREM to the context

## Discussion

5 Institution Accountability and social legitimation.

0

Patients Give answers to patients needs and expectations.

**Population** Benefits for the public health and population health. Sustainability and social responsibility.

**Professionals** Professionals' health, healthy working environment, career development.

**Costs** ROI, added value, investment in efective care and disvest in inefective care.

A qualitative approach to value-based healthcare implementation through patient experience studies is valuable to change the culture and favours innovation acceptance. Patient experience is a powerful and high impact tool for process inefficiencies detection and care improvement for patients wellbeing. Measuring PREM digitally has the potential to be more systematic, methodic and agile.