

# CHANGE IN HEALTH STATUS IN LONG-TERM CONDITIONS OVER A ONE YEAR PERIOD: A COHORT SURVEY USING PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOME MEASURES

**An Article review by Mr. Patrick Anibbe Ikani, Nigeria**  
(MHM., PhD in Public Health Student of Texila American University)  
*Email id:- patrick.ikani@gmail.com*

## SOURCE:

This is from Michele Peters et.al on article URL <http://www.nqlo.com/1/1/123> a BMC open access publisher. This is a high impact article Michele Peters is the corresponding author with [email.nichele.peters@dph.ox.ac.uk](mailto:email.nichele.peters@dph.ox.ac.uk)

## INTRODUCTION

This article studied quality of life of patients or clients with long-term conditions with focus on self-reported outcome and also reviewing differences between different long-term disease outcomes using variance analysis. This review will specifically summarize the study objective, whether it was effective, design, accuracy, authority, the structure used in analysis, study population and location as well as target selection using an objective critique and finally draw up a conclusion.

## KEYWORDS

Health status, Cohort survey, Patients, PROM, Michele Peters, Patient outcome.

## ARTICLE SUMMARY

The main purpose of this study was to examine quality of life or change in health status in patients suffering from long-term diseases through a cohort analysis for a one year period in the following entities; COPD, asthma, Diabetes, Epilepsy, Heart failure and stroke using baseline and follow up data which was collected from 33 health care providers. The questionnaire was designed to capture basic demography, disease appropriate questions also and this was carried through an IT firm with a brief and concise questions that will only take 5 minutes.

## ARTICLE STRUCTURE

The article layout is simple with a clear view of what it was intended to achieve but I would have thought the period of one year for a long-term disease which includes, epilepsy, heart disease, stroke, COPD would had a long follow up of 2-3 years for you to examine clearly outcomes. The choice of using e-health to me was unique and subcontracting to an independent IT firm is commendable. The background was detailed explaining the aim of the study, location which is England and the effect of care on the health facilities as well.

## ARTICLE CRITIQUE

### *AUTHORITY*

The journal BioMed Central is an Open Access publishers, an international journal. the authors credibility can be linked to the fact that is a peer reviewed article, is reviewed from TAU classified high impact publication. It is also an independent funded by policy research programme in the UK department of Health. Use of PROM an acceptable tool which is largely seen to be a quality of life or patient outcome tool in NHS.

### *ACCURACY*

The source of the information, names of the authors and addresses, current and relevant references well cited but not arranged in alphabetical order and it would have been better without any form of numbering. The study measured differences and variances. There is very description of the PROM tool used and its usefulness described.

### *CURRENCY*

This article was submitted 11, April, 2014, accepted and published this August, 2014. This is a very current article and updated references. The questionnaires was administered between 2010 to 2012 which further explains the currency of this article and using of e-health also a current model but it this reflected in methods only and would have been good to appear on the tables or introduction.

### *RELEVANCE*

This is a relevant article to public health as patient outcome is key and that puts patient in the center of care. It is as it gives generic information and also examined differences from baseline to follow up on key indicators of major concern to health status, recovery or deterioration in health.

### *OBJECTIVITY*

The choice of generic and disease appropriate version of PROM- Patient reported outcome measures is good. The questionnaire had standard demographic data set, commodities, baseline and a follow up survey to monitor changes in health status over a period of one year. The survey was presented for participants who completed from baseline to follow up and also revealed difference and variances between the groups.

### *STABILITY*

The source of this article is very stable as a high impact factor work in academic cum public Health related journal.

### *ANALYSIS OF GRAPH*

There is no graphical representation but article showed detailed tables with a clear explanation of results and consistent with narrative. The data was well presented in tabular form with a detailed corresponding discussion. There is no graph presented to clearly explain and project the study which is a missing gap noted during this review.

## **CONCLUSION**

This article as reviewed and summarized to show that a few significant differences were found between the baseline through to follow up but it was clearly shown that the period of one year was short. There was an indication or suggestion for a retrospective studies and PROM was very useful in identifying key changes found in the study.

## **REFERENCES**

1. <http://www.hqlo.com/content/12/1/123>