
Current PROM and PREM use in health system performance measurement: Still a way to go

Claudia Bull

School of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC, 3141, AUSTRALIA; Monash Centre for Health Research and Implementation, Monash University, 43-51 Kanooka Grove, Clayton, VIC, 3168, AUSTRALIA

Emily J. Callander

School of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC, 3141, AUSTRALIA; Monash Centre for Health Research and Implementation, Monash University, 43-51 Kanooka Grove, Clayton, VIC, 3168, AUSTRALIA

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pxjournal.org/journal>



Part of the [Health Services Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bull C, Callander EJ. Current PROM and PREM use in health system performance measurement: Still a way to go. *Patient Experience Journal*. 2022; 9(1):12-18. doi: 10.35680/2372-0247.1664.

This Commentary is brought to you for free and open access by Patient Experience Journal. It has been accepted for inclusion in Patient Experience Journal by an authorized editor of Patient Experience Journal.

Current PROM and PREM use in health system performance measurement: Still a way to go

Cover Page Footnote

This article is associated with the Policy & Measurement lens of The Beryl Institute Experience Framework (<https://www.theberylinstitute.org/ExperienceFramework>). You can access other resources related to this lens including additional PXJ articles here: http://bit.ly/PX_PolicyMeasure

Current PROM and PREM use in health system performance measurement: Still a way to go

Claudia Bull, *School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, claudia.bull@monash.edu*

Emily J. Callander, *School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, emily.callander@monash.edu*

Abstract

There is a growing impetus to “measure what matters” to enable health systems to optimise value-based, person-centred healthcare. This paper describes the critical importance of patient-reported outcome and experience measures (PROMs and PREMs) in this pursuit and provides an in-depth overview of how PROM and PREM programs differ between England, the United States, and Australia. A comprehensive timeline of PROM, PREM, legislation/policy, and value-based purchasing (pay-for-performance) program implementation accompanies this discussion. Importantly, this paper highlights disparities between these nations’ PROMs and PREMs programs, evidencing that we still have a way to go towards equal health system performance measurement globally.

Keywords

Patient-reported outcome measure; patient-reported experience measure; person-centeredness; health system performance measurement

It is unethical to ask patients to comment on their experiences if these comments are going to be ignored.” (Coulter et al, 2014)¹

Patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) and patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) have been in use since the mid 1900’s, primarily in a research capacity. They have evolved into measures capable of contributing to clinical practice by supporting communication between patients and care providers; guiding the diagnosis, management and monitoring of patients’ health conditions; and improving health outcomes.²⁻⁸ PROMs and PREMs are also used to benchmark services and care providers, thereby supporting patient choice about where and by whom they receive care; driving competition within and across services.^{1,9-11}

The United States (US) was the first country to implement nationally mandated patient-reported measures, beginning with the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (CAHPS) Health Plan Survey in 1997,¹² followed by the Medicare Health Outcomes Survey (HOS) in 1998.¹³ The United Kingdom (UK) followed suit quickly with the implementation of the General Practice Patient Survey (GPPS) in 1998.¹⁴ Internationally, the use of PROMs and PREMs for system performance measurement is gaining momentum given their capacity to transform healthcare to be value-based, person-centred, and of higher quality and safety.^{4,15} However, there is also significant variation in how PROMs and PREMs are used to support health system performance measurement globally, thereby limiting opportunities for cross-country

comparisons, and the collection of common metrics to drive person-centred, value-based healthcare.¹⁶

Herein, we provide an overview of how PROMs and PREMs currently contribute to health system performance measurement, specifically in England (UK), the US, and Australia. Whilst we acknowledge the differences in each country’s health systems, they evidence different mechanisms by which PROMs and PREMs contribute to health system performance measurement. Supplementary file 1 ([linked here](#)) supports this discussion by providing a comprehensive timeline of PROM and PREM implementation efforts across these countries, and highlights seminal legislation, policy, and the introduction of prominent Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) and reporting programs. We conclude this piece with recommendations for advancing international PROM and PREM programs.

PROMs and PREMs for system performance measurement in England

The National Health Service (NHS) England implemented its first PROMs program in 2009. PROMs related to hip and knee replacement are administered pre- and post-operatively by all NHS-funded services, gauging the extent to which patient’s conditions improved or deteriorated in the 6-months post-surgery.¹⁷ Originally, PROMs specific to hernia repair and varicose veins were also included in the program, but were removed in 2017.¹⁸ A 2010 report by The King’s Fund identified that the UK Department of

Health was working to extend the PROMs program over a wider range of conditions (including chronic conditions),¹⁹ but there is presently only evidence of pilot studies,²⁰⁻²⁴ with no routine, national implementation. PROM program data is summarised and publicly reported on NHS Digital annually, and available to registered providers on a monthly basis.²⁵ Additionally, PROM data informs the National Tariff Payment System (previously, Best Practice Tariff).²⁶ This is a VBP scheme that links bonus payments to providers that: (i) do not perform statistically significantly worse than the risk-adjusted national average of patient health status improvements, and (ii) have a survey participation rate of $\geq 50\%$.^{27,28}

The NHS England PREM program started in 1998 with the General Practice Patient Survey (GPPS).¹⁴ Several PREMs have been nationally implemented since,^{14,29-35} the most recent of which is the Friends and Family Test (FFT).³⁶ The FFT was first implemented in accident and emergency, inpatient and maternity services, and subsequently extended to all NHS services.³⁶⁻³⁸ PREM data has also been used to inform VBP programs in the UK, starting with the Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF) for primary care providers in 2004,³⁹ and more recently, the Commissioning for Quality and Innovation (CQUIN) payment framework for acute care services (which also incorporates PROM data).^{40,41} Additionally, PREM data informed the development of generic adult and mental health patient experience National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) clinical guidelines and quality standards.⁴²⁻⁴⁵ Thus, whilst England has a multifaceted approach to implementing and using PROMs and PREMs, these programs are largely targeted towards auditing and providing feedback to care providers as opposed to consumers.

PROMs and PREMs for system performance measurement in the US

In 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act mandated that the Centres for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) establish several public reporting and payment programs based on information collected by the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Services (CAHPS) PREMs.⁴⁶ Since launching in 1995, CAHPS measures have been increasingly used to support health plan accreditation; consumer choice of care providers, services, and health plans; and VBP programs (e.g., the Hospital VBP Program^{47,48}) (Table 1). While CAHPS surveys must be completed by all CMS healthcare services and providers (which provide care for 35% of the US population^{49,50} and consume 37% of national health expenditure⁵¹), many private health insurers also elect to participate in the CAHPS program and implement their own VBP programs.⁵²

In addition, the Medicare Health Outcome Survey (HOS) – the first PROM used in Medicare managed care – has been included as a quality indicator in Medicare Advantage Quality Bonus Payments since 2012.⁵⁷ As well as contributing to the quality bonus payments made by Medicare to plan providers (on average US\$886 per enrollee in employer-sponsored plans),⁵⁸ HOS data is presented in the form of Medicare Star Ratings on the Plan Finder website.⁵⁹ Transparent and meaningful public reporting of quality data in the US healthcare system drives competition amongst service and plan providers, and supports quality-informed consumer choice.⁶⁰ Additionally, the US arguably operates the world's most comprehensive VBP initiatives.

PROMs and PREMs for system performance measurement in Australia

Relative to England and the US, Australia's implementation of PROMs and PREMs for health system performance measurement has been slow. There are currently two national patient-reported measure programs in Australia. The Patient Experiences Survey program, first implemented in 2009 by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), reports data annually related to access and barriers to, as well as experiences of, healthcare services across the country.⁶¹ The National Health Survey program, first implemented in 2011 by the ABS, infrequently reports health statistics relative to long-term conditions, mental wellbeing, and health risk factors (e.g., smoking).⁶² Separate to the work conducted by the ABS, the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (ACSQHC) undertakes work to support the use of patient-reported measures by recognising the importance of consumer engagement in safety and quality national standards,⁶³ publishing reports and resources to support uptake and use of instruments in service delivery, and recommending core questions for inclusion on patient experience surveys and clinical registries.⁶⁴ They are also involved with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM), supporting the development, standardisation and adoption of PROMs for international monitoring.⁶⁵

The ACSQHC also developed the Australian Hospital Patient Experience Question Set (AHPEQS) in 2017 for use across any Australian hospital.⁶⁴ While the AHPEQS was intended to “provid[e] an opportunity for national consistency”, the ACSQHC are “unable to mandate the use of particular instruments.”⁶⁴ Instead, they strongly encourage systems and services to implement the AHPEQS of their own accord, which only Queensland has done at the time of writing (Supplementary file 1).⁶⁶ Moreover, almost all reporting on quality and safety across Australia relies on data from administrative datasets (e.g.,

Table 1. Uses of CAHPS surveys for systems performance in the US

Use of CAHPS surveys	Description of use	Outputs	Coverage
Health Plan Accreditation (HPA) by the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) ⁵³	NCQA evaluates commercial and private health insurers across several standards (using CAHPS data alongside Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS) measures) to award health plans an accreditation score out of 5-stars (highest)	Star ratings are publicly reported on the NCQA website, enabling consumers to choose their preferred health insurance plan ⁵⁴	42 US states require or use NCQA HPA, and over 75% of insured Americans are in NCQA accredited health plans ⁵³
Public reporting of CAHPS data via the <i>Care Compare</i> Medicare.gov website	<i>Care Compare</i> collates CAHPS survey data relevant to doctors and clinicians, hospitals, nursing homes (including rehabilitation services), home health services, hospice care, inpatient rehabilitation facilities, long-term care hospitals and dialysis facilities in one online portal accessible by the public ⁵⁵	Consumers can specify their location and the type of provider/service they want to access, and obtain an overall star rating (based on quality of care performance) and a patient survey rating (based on CAHPS performance), supporting their choice of care provider/service ⁵⁵	National (Medicare services)
Public reporting of CAHPS data via the <i>Plan Finder</i> Medicare.gov website	Similar to <i>Care Compare</i> , <i>Plan Finder</i> collates CAHPS survey data to measure how well Medicare Advantage and Part D (Prescription Drug Benefit) plans perform in five categories, including: (i) staying healthy, (ii) managing chronic conditions, (iii) plan responsiveness and care, (iv) member complaints, problems, getting services, and choosing to leave the plan, and (v) health plan customer service ⁵⁶	Consumers can specify their location, identify the type of Medicare coverage they want, and use star ratings to compare plans in their service areas (5-stars represents highest performing plans) ⁵⁶	National (Medicare services)
VBP programs	VBP programs reward providers and services with incentive payments (or penalties) for the quality of care they provide to people covered by Medicare ^{48,52}	Financial incentives that reward high quality care and financial penalties for poor quality ⁴⁸	National (Medicare services) and private insurers on an elective basis ⁵²

^aPerformance criteria differs slightly for Part D plans; CAHPS = Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Services; HPA = Health Plan Accreditation; NCQA = National Committee for Quality Assurance; HEDIS = Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set; US = United States; CMS = Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; VBP = Value-based performance

wait times, complications), incident information systems (e.g., sentinel events) and bespoke data collections (e.g., healthcare associated infections).⁶⁷

There are several Australian state and territory-based surveying programs. In New South Wales for example, the Bureau for Health Information (BHI) established the largest national PREMs program in 2007, which invites up to 300,000 people each year to report on their experiences of care.⁶⁸ The program includes surveys related to emergency department, admitted, rural admitted, maternity, cancer, and more recently, virtual care patients.⁶⁸ However, there is a lack of performance measurement coordination between states, with each state, and even health services within states, having different priorities. Unmandated data collection programs further

compound these challenges, impairing the ability to undertake national benchmarking and evaluation across Australia.

Where to from here?

There is clear impetus to align international PROM and PREM programs to enable global health system performance measurement and to collectively drive person-centred, value-based healthcare. However, as evidenced in this piece, there is also significant variation in current PROM and PREM programs across England, the US and Australia. We propose three key recommendations that are internationally relevant based on the current state of play.

First, countries such as Australia that are developing PROM and PREM programs need to mandate nationally consistent measures and survey programs. The current lack of nationally consistent PROMs and PREMs impedes hospital and health services data collection practices, thereby limiting opportunities for national benchmarking and quality improvement. Moreover, siloed and oftentimes tokenistic surveying programs are resource-intensive and financially burdensome without clear gain, and make poor use of consumers' time in participating.

Second, it is imperative to identify and implement internationally agreed upon and consistent core PROM and PREM items to enable international health systems comparisons and benchmarking. Not only will this ensure that all health systems are striving towards the same general goals of person-centred, value-based healthcare, but this will enhance the capacity of health systems to learn from one another, improving the transferability of programs targeting quality improvement.

Third, health systems (both independently and collectively) need to establish clear priorities for using PROM and PREM data once it has been collected. Public reporting of data (such as demonstrated by the US Centers for Medicare and Medicaid's Plan Finder and Care Compare platforms) should be prioritised for its ability to support consumer choice. As researchers and institutions (both government and private), we have an ethical responsibility to give consumers the opportunity to see the results of what they have contributed their time and information to. Additionally, due consideration should be given to how PROM and PREM data can form the basis of value-based funding programs for public healthcare sectors, moving away from traditional fee-for-service and activity-based funding schemes.

Conclusion

Despite an array of robust PROM and PREM programs internationally, most countries are siloed in their approach to health system performance measurement. Whilst it is unreasonable to assume that all health systems will have the same priorities (i.e., where optimising healthcare accessibility is a priority for some, reducing iatrogenic harm may be a priority for others), having a degree of consistency in how we measure person-centred, value-based healthcare should be a universal priority. This paper describes the different PROM and PREM performance measurement programs employed across England, the US and Australia, and suggests key recommendations for advancing PROM and PREM programs internationally. In combination with the timeline presented in Supplementary file 1, the paper provides a complete and comprehensive overview of the evolving nature of performance measurement from which countries with less established performance measurement activities can learn.

References

1. Coulter A, Locock L, Ziebland S, Calabrese J. Collecting data on patient experience is not enough: They must be used to improve care. *BMJ*. 2014;348.
2. Nelson EC, Eftimovska E, Lind C, Hager A, Wasson JH, Lindblad S. Patient reported outcome measures in practice. *BMJ*. 2015;350:g7818.
3. Porter I, Goncalves-Bradley D, Ricci-Cabello I, et al. Framework and guidance for implementing patient-reported outcomes in clinical practice: Evidence, challenges and opportunities. *J Comp Eff Res*. 2016;5(5):507-519.
4. Weldring T, Smith SM. Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs) and Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs). *Health Serv Insights*. 2013;6:61-68.
5. Valderas JM, Kotzeva A, Espallargues M, et al. The impact of measuring patient-reported outcomes in clinical practice: A systematic review of the literature. *Qual Life Res*. 2008;17(2):179-193.
6. Etkind SN, Daveson BA, Kwok W, et al. Capture, transfer, and feedback of patient-centered outcomes data in palliative care populations: Does it make a difference? A systematic review. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2015;49(3):611-624.
7. Chen J, Ou LX, Hollis SJ. A systematic review of the impact of routine collection of patient reported outcome measures on patients, providers and health organisations in an oncologic setting. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2013;13:211.
8. Damman OC, Jani A, de Jong BA, et al. The use of PROMs and shared decision-making in medical encounters with patients: An opportunity to deliver value-based health care to patients. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2020;26(2):524-540.
9. Williams K, Sansoni J, Morris D, Grootemaat P, Thompson C. Patient-reported outcome measures: Literature review. Sydney: ACSQHC; 2016.
10. De Rosis S, Cerasuolo D, Nuti S. Using patient-reported measures to drive change in healthcare: The experience of the digital, continuous and systematic PREMs observatory in Italy. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2020;20:315.
11. Berwick D, Black N, Cullen D, et al. Recommendations to OECD ministers of health from the high level reflection group on the future of health statistics. Paris: OECD; 2017.
12. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Development of the CAHPS Health Plan survey. AHRQ. <https://www.ahrq.gov/cahps/surveys-guidance/hp/about/Development-CAHPS-HP-Survey.html>. Published 2020. Updated October 2020. Accessed June, 2021.
13. Health Services Advisory Group. Medicare Health Outcomes Survey-Modified (HOS-M) Overview. HSAG. <https://www.hosonline.org/en/hos->

- modified-overview/. Published 2021. Updated 29 June 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
14. Bullen N, Reeves R. *Acute Inpatient Survey: National overview 2001/02*. London: Picker Institute Europe; 2002.
 15. Enticott J, Johnson A, Teede H. Learning health systems using data to drive healthcare improvement and impact: A systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21:200.
 16. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Recommendations to OECD Ministers of Health from the High Level Reflection Group on the future of health statistics: Strengthening the international comparison of health system performance through patient-reported indicators*. Paris: OECD; 2017.
 17. The Health and Social Care Information Centre. *Provisional monthly patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) in England: A guide to PROMs methodology*. UK: NHS; 2010.
 18. NHS Digital. *Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) Official Statistics*. NHS Digital. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/patient-reported-outcome-measures-proms#past-publications>. Published 2021. Updated 11 February 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
 19. Devlin NJ, Appleby J. *Getting the most out of PROMs: Putting health outcomes at the heart of NHS decision-making*. London, UK: The King's Fund; 2010.
 20. Public Health England. *Living with and beyond cervical cancer: A descriptive summary of responses to a pilot of patient reported outcome measures for gynaecological cancer*. London: Public Health England; 2015.
 21. Public Health England. *Living with and beyond ovarian cancer: A descriptive summary of responses to a pilot of patient reported outcome measures for gynaecological cancer*. London: Public Health England; 2015.
 22. Public Health England. *Living with and beyond womb cancer: A descriptive summary of responses to a pilot of patient reported outcome measures for gynaecological cancer*. London: Public Health England; 2015.
 23. Glaser A, et al. *Quality of life of colorectal cancer survivors in England: A report on a national survey of colorectal cancer survivors using Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs)*. London: NHS England; 2015.
 24. NHS. *Cardiac revascularisation PROMs pilot project update*. NHS. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/proms/cardiac-update/>. Accessed July, 2021.
 25. NHS Digital. *Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs)*. NHS. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/patient-reported-outcome-measures-proms#finalised-proms-data-releases>. Published 2021. Updated 29 April 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 26. NHS. *National tariff payment system*. NHS. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/pay-syst/national-tariff/national-tariff-payment-system/>. Published 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 27. Gutacker N, Street A, Gomes M, Bojke C. Should English healthcare providers be penalised for failing to collect patient-reported outcome measures? A retrospective analysis. *J Roy Soc Med*. 2015;108(8):304-316.
 28. NHS. *2020/21 National Tariff Payment System Annex D: Guidance on best practice tariffs*. London: NHS; 2020.
 29. Care Quality Commission. *Adult Inpatient Survey 2020*. NHS. <https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/02-adults-inpatients/>. Published 2020. Accessed June, 2021.
 30. Care Quality Commission. *Children and Young People's Patient Experience Survey 2020*. CQC. <https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/01-children-patient-experience/>. Published 2020. Accessed June, 2021.
 31. Care Quality Commission. *Urgent and Emergency Care Survey 2020*. CQC. <https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/03-urgent-emergency-care/>. Published 2020. Accessed June, 2021.
 32. Care Quality Commission. *Maternity Survey 2021*. CQC. <https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/04-maternity/>. Published 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
 33. Care Quality Commission. *Community Mental Health Survey 2021*. CQC. <https://nhssurveys.org/surveys/survey/05-community-mental-health/>. Published 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
 34. Jenkinson C, Coulter A, Bruster S, Richards N. The coronary heart disease in-patient experience questionnaire (I-PEQ (CHD)): Results from the survey of National Health Service patients. *Qual Life Res*. 2002;11(8):721-727.
 35. Survey Coordination Centre for Existing Methods. *Community Mental Health Survey 2021*. Oxford: Picker Institute Europe; 2021.
 36. NHS England. *NHS England and NHS Improvement guidance: Using the Friends and Family Test to improve patient experience*. London: NHS England; 2019.
 37. NHS England. *NHS England Review of the Friends and Family Test*. London: NHS England; 2014.
 38. NHS. *Organisational level tables (historic)*. NHS. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/fft/friends-and-family->

- test-data/fft-data-historic/. Published 2021. Updated March 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
39. Roland M. Linking physicians' pay to the quality of care: A major experiment in the United Kingdom. *N Engl J Med.* 2004;351(14):1448-1454.
 40. McDonald R, Boaden R, Roland M, et al. Advancing Quality: Background. In: A qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the Advancing Quality pay-for-performance programme in the NHS North West. Southampton, UK: NIHR Journals Library; 2015.
 41. Feng Y, Kristensen SR, Lorgelly P, et al. Pay for performance for specialised care in England: Strengths and weaknesses. *Health Policy.* 2019;123(11):1036-1041.
 42. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Service user experience in adult mental health: Improving the experience of care for people using adult NHS mental health services. NICE. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg136>. Published 2011. Updated February 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 43. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Service user experience in adult mental health services Quality standard [QS14]. UK. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs14>. Published 2011. Updated 31 July 2019. Accessed July, 2021.
 44. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Patient experience in adult NHS services: Improving the experience of care for people using adult NHS services. NICE. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg138>. Published 2012. Updated 17 June 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 45. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Patient experience in adult NHS services Quality standard [QS15]. UK. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs15>. Published 2012. Updated 21 July 2019. Accessed July, 2021.
 46. Anhang Price R, Elliott MN, Zaslavsky AM, et al. Examining the role of patient experience surveys in measuring health care quality. *Med Care Res Rev.* 2014;71(5):522-554.
 47. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program. CMS.gov. <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/HVBP/Hospital-Value-Based-Purchasing>. Published 2021. Updated 18 February 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
 48. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. The Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Program. CMS.gov. <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/HVBP/Hospital-Value-Based-Purchasing>. Published 2021. Updated 18 February 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 49. Elfle J. Percentage of people covered by Medicaid in the United States from 1990 to 2019. *statista.* <https://www.statista.com/statistics/200960/percentage-of-americans-covered-by-medicare/>. Published 2020. Updated 9 October 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 50. Elfle J. Percentage of people covered by Medicare in the United States from 1990 to 2019. *statista.* <https://www.statista.com/statistics/200962/percentage-of-americans-covered-by-medicare/>. Published 2020. Updated 9 October 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 51. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. NHE Fact Sheet. CMS.gov. <https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Statistics-Trends-and-Reports/NationalHealthExpendData/NHE-Fact-Sheet>. Published 2020. Updated 16 December 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 52. NEJM Catalyst. What is pay for performance in healthcare? *N Engl J Med.* <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/CAT.18.0245>. Published 2018. Updated 1 March 2018. Accessed July, 2021.
 53. National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA). Health Plan Accreditation. NCQA. <https://www.ncqa.org/programs/health-plans/health-plan-accreditation-hpa/>. Published 2021. Updated 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 54. National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA). NCQA Health Insurance Plan Ratings 2019-2020 - summary Report (Private/Commercial). NCQA. <https://healthinsuranceratings.ncqa.org/2019/Default.aspx>. Published 2021. Updated 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 55. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Find & Compare. Medicare.gov. <https://www.medicare.gov/care-compare/>. Published 2021. Updated 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 56. Medicare Interactive. How to compare plans using the Medicare Star Rating System. Medicareinteractive.org. <https://www.medicareinteractive.org/get-answers/medicare-health-coverage-options/changing-medicare-coverage/how-to-compare-plans-using-the-medicare-star-rating-system>. Published 2021. Updated 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 57. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Health Outcomes Survey (HOS). CMS.gov. <https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Research/HOS>. Published 2020. Updated 19 November 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 58. Biniek JF, Freed M, Damico A, Neuman T. Medicare advantage in 2021: Star ratings and bonuses. Kaiser Family Foundation. <https://www.kff.org/medicare/issue-brief/medicare-advantage-in-2021-star-ratings-and-bonuses/>. Published 2021. Updated 21 June 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 59. Health Services Advisory Group. About the Health Outcomes Survey. HSAG. <https://www.hosonline.org/en/program-overview/>.

- Published 2021. Updated 29 June 2021. Accessed June, 2021.
60. Faber M, Bosch M, Wollersheim H, Leatherman S, Grol R. Public reporting in health care: How do consumers use quality-of-care information? A systematic review. *Med Care*. 2009;47(1):1-8.
 61. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Patient experiences in Australia: Summary of findings. ABS. <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/health-services/patient-experiences-australia-summary-findings/latest-release#survey-material>. Published 2020. Updated 16 Nov 2020. Accessed September, 2021.
 62. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National Health Survey: First results. ABS. <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/health-conditions-and-risks/national-health-survey-first-results/2017-18#health-risk-factors>. Published 2018. Updated 12 December 2018. Accessed September, 2021.
 63. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The NSQHC Standards. ACSQHC. <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/standards/nsqhc-standards>. Published 2019. Accessed July, 2021.
 64. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. Australian Hospital Patient Experience Question Set (AHPEQS). Canberra: ACSQHC; 2017.
 65. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. About PROMs. ACSQHC. <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/indicators-measurement-and-reporting/patient-reported-outcomes/about-proms>. Published 2019. Accessed July, 2021.
 66. State of Queensland. Have your say - Patient reported experience survey. Queensland Health. <https://www.qld.gov.au/health/services/preom/prem>. Published 2021. Updated 18 March 2021. Accessed July, 2021.
 67. State of Queensland. Queensland reporting hospitals. Queensland Health. <http://www.performance.health.qld.gov.au/Hospital/Index/99999>. Published 2021. Updated 2020. Accessed July, 2021.
 68. Bureau for Health Information. BHI patient surveys. BHI. https://www.bhi.nsw.gov.au/nsw_patient_survey_program. Published 2021. Updated 23 February 2021. Accessed July, 2021.