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Abstract
The purpose of this viewpoint is to provide awareness of the current opportunities to enhance a high-value care approach to blood product transfusion. It provides a historical context to the evolution of blood management, as well as of the patient safety and high-value care movement. Leveraging current technology for enhanced education, as well as clinical decision support, is also discussed.

Origins of High-Value Care
The need to improve patient outcomes, with emphasis on patient safety, evidence-based decision-making, and a strong focus on high-value care, stemmed from the US Institute of Medicine’s seminal publication To Err Is Human [1], which was very influential in enhancing awareness of the impact of individual human behavior and decision-making on patients’ outcomes. It was a humbling and necessary perspective that spearheaded a movement toward more effective, efficient, cost-effective, and high-value-oriented practice of medicine.

Historical Perspective on Blood Management
Blood management is not an exception to this movement. Transfusional medicine underwent tremendous development during the second half of the 20th century, faced with specific challenges such as the need for bloodless surgery in patients who refused blood transfusions and the rise of transfusion-associated viral diseases [2]. In addition, there was growing evidence of the adverse consequences associated with liberal blood transfusion, including increased mortality, sepsis, and increased length of hospitalization. This led to an awareness of the need to focus efforts on developing blood product transfusion based on the individual need of the patient, and in 2005, Isbister [3] coined the term “patient blood management.” This is a complex approach that focuses on three pillars: (1) optimizing patient hematopoiesis and enhancing red cell mass, (2) minimizing blood losses with improved source control and optimization of coagulopathy, and (3) enhancing patient tolerance to anemia [2]. In the past 30 years, substantial evidence grew to support a more restrictive transfusional approach once there was evidence that patients could tolerate lower hemoglobin values without major adverse effects; this evidence came from multiple patient populations, such as critically ill patients, older patients with high cardiovascular risk undergoing surgery, and patients with active gastrointestinal bleeding [4]. Another very important aspect that must be considered is the increasing cost associated with transfusion of blood products. Furthermore, procedures aimed to enhance patient safety (eg, pathogen reduction in platelets) substantially increase the overall cost of transfusion. A high-value care approach helps to gain insight...
into nontransfusional alternatives to optimize underlying hematologic conditions, but also to be cost conscious and aware of the financial impact of indiscriminate use of blood [5,6].

**Aim**

The aim of this viewpoint is to allow physicians and clinicians caring for surgical patients who order blood products to reflect on the impact of the high-value care movement in blood management and transfusional medicine, as well as on the currently prevailing opportunities to enhance better decision-making; this is particularly relevant after considering the historical perspective. Ideally, the best scenario would be that patients undergo procedures and hospitalizations with minimal exposure to blood products, aiming to leverage nontransfusional correction of underlying hematologic processes. This requires enhanced awareness of current guidelines and standards of care, as well as leveraging current technology (eg, electronic health records) to help gain insight into current transfusion practices and to provide direct clinical decision-support tools that facilitate best practices in blood product ordering.

There is strong evidence of the increasing complexity of hospitalized and surgical patients [7]. It can be hypothesized that this complexity is also associated with anemia and coagulopathy as increasingly encountered comorbid conditions, especially in surgical patients. The physicians and health care professionals caring for these patients must have enhanced awareness to identify and recognize anemia and coagulopathy, with a subsequent diagnostic approach aiming to not just treat but to identify its etiology to optimize a nontransfusional approach (eg, the use of intravenous iron) [8]. A pharmacologic approach to anemia provides a more efficient and patient-centered optimization of these comorbidities with consequent enhanced treatment effectiveness and decreased adverse outcomes associated with unnecessary blood transfusion [4].

**Current Challenges**

The current 2023 Association for the Advancement of Blood & Biotherapies (AABB) red blood cell transfusion guidelines have reinforced this parsimonious approach to blood transfusion, with even more conservative and restrictive levels to trigger transfusion in patients with acute coronary syndromes and pediatric patients [9]. Nonetheless, more widespread enhanced adherence to the AABB guidelines in regard to red blood cell transfusion is a necessity. In addition, plasma transfusion offers a strong opportunity for improvement in health care delivery, especially as there is a need to minimize unnecessary plasma transfusion as well as its inappropriate dosing; plasma should be transfused with weight-based dosing and in appropriate clinical scenarios. Undertransfusion of plasma, by not using weight-based dosing, is a current challenge as this not only does not have a therapeutic corrective effect on coagulopathy but is a source of wastage [10]. Enhanced education efforts worldwide, as well as leverage of current technology, create awareness and encourage adoption of a high-value approach to plasma and red blood cell transfusion. Another element to consider as a balancing measure to enhanced patient safety is the increased associated cost; in the case of platelet transfusion, in the United States the current standard of care is the use of pathogen-reduced platelets; this approach increases costs of individual blood products substantially [6].

The perioperative continuum of care provides different stages to ensure that patients are properly evaluated and treated. In the preoperative setting, the optimization of anemia carries the most significant value through raising hemoglobin values to levels high enough to minimize reaching the transfusion threshold while also enhancing overall oxygen delivery [4]. In the intraoperative setting, the leverage of cell-saver technology, as well as optimization of coagulopathy, can mitigate the risk of blood product use; however, awareness of appropriate indications as well as of dosing of blood products promotes a high-value approach and minimizes wastage [9,10]. In the postoperative realm, it involves ensuring appropriate monitoring of ongoing blood losses, as well as monitoring the patient for potential complications associated with postsurgical anemia, such as myocardial ischemia in noncardiac surgery [11].

**Potential Solutions and Opportunities**

What can be done to mitigate the inappropriate overuse of blood products, inappropriate dosing, and lack of awareness of the associated costs? Appropriate data bank analysis and data-driven interventions, as well as the implementation of human factors engineering and newer technologies such as artificial intelligence within the current workflow (like the electronic health record), can enhance the effectiveness of patient blood management efforts [12]. This entails having a database of all patients being transfused in a hospital or health care system and being able to have granularity to drill down to data on the individual patient, ordering physician, and baseline and posttransfusion laboratory values (eg, complete blood count), as well as associated outcome metrics like readmissions, length of stay, and cost of care. In addition, short-cycle data, which allow immediate identification of patients who can benefit from further stratification and assessment of underlying anemia and coagulopathy, permits guiding clinicians to pursue real-time high-value care and evidence-based interventions supported by clinical decision support tools. Also, data governance of anemia and coagulopathy assessment, as well as blood transfusion practices, provides a platform for permit auditing, benchmarking best practices, and providing real-time feedback to individual physicians, increasing awareness of areas of success and opportunities [13].

The electronic health record also provides a strong platform for education, as clinical decision-support tools can be embedded in the orders [14]. For instance, in our institution, we default red blood cell transfusion orders to single units and have a formal indication: What is the current transfusion threshold? This allows the ordering health care professional to reflect and select a reason when the order does not follow the current AABB guidelines. Also, when plasma is ordered, there is an indication to use weight-based volumes to minimize undertransfusion, as well as education that transfusion for an international normalized ratio <1.8 will not have a meaningful impact. Order overriding...
can occur, but with the need to provide a rationale. The more the orders are used and experience increases with blood product transfusion, the more exposure there will be to this workflow, allowing for enhanced education. Also, the electronic health record can facilitate improved documentation of blood product transfusions, allowing the development of increased insight into potential blood product overuse [15].

In this issue of JMir Perioperative Medicine, we provide the opportunity to outline the evidence for evaluation and optimization of perioperative anemia in different surgical populations, as well as to discuss the opportunities for leverage of current technologies to enhance the effectiveness of approaches to improve patient outcomes and enhance the high-value care approach, minimizing not only financial costs, but more importantly, decreasing patient harm.
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Abstract

Background: As of 2022, patient adherence to postoperative guidelines can reduce the risk of complications by up to 52.4% following laparoscopic abdominal surgery. With the availability of various preoperative education interventions (POEIs), understanding which POEI results in improvement in patient outcomes across the procedures is imperative.

Objective: This study aims to determine which POEI could be the most effective on patient outcomes by systematically reviewing all the POEIs reported in the literature.

Methods: In total, 4753 articles investigating various POEIs (eg, videos, presentations, mobile apps, and one-on-one education or coaching) were collected from the PubMed, Embase, and Scopus databases. Inclusion criteria were adult patients undergoing abdominal laparoscopic surgery, randomized controlled trials, and studies that provided postoperative outcomes. Exclusion criteria included studies not published in English and with no outcomes reported. Title and abstract and full-text articles with POEI randomized controlled studies were screened based on the above criteria through a blinded, dual review using Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation). Study quality was assessed through the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. The included articles were analyzed for educational content, intervention timing, intervention type, and postoperative outcomes appropriate for a particular surgery.

Results: Only 17 studies matched our criteria, with 1831 patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bariatric surgery (gastric bypass and gastric sleeve), and colectomy. In total, 15 studies reported a statistically significant improvement in at least 1 patient postoperative outcome. None of these studies were found to have an overall high risk of bias according to Cochrane standards. In total, 41% (7/17) of the included studies using direct individual education improved outcomes in almost all surgery types, while educational videos had the greatest statistically significant impact for anxiety, nausea, and pain postoperatively ($P<0.01$). Direct group education demonstrated significant improvement in weight, BMI, exercise, and depressive symptoms in 33% (2/6) of the laparoscopic gastric bypass studies.

Conclusions: Direct education (individual or group based) positively impacts postoperative laparoscopic surgery outcomes.

Trial Registration: PROSPERO CRD42023438698; https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=438698

(JMIR Perioper Med 2024;7:e51573) doi:10.2196/51573
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Introduction

Background

Adherence to postoperative guidelines can impact the risk of complications by up to 52.4% after laparoscopic surgery, as shown by a 2022 prospective study [1]. The enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocol is a systematic approach to minimize postoperative pain, complications, and duration of hospital stay in patients undergoing surgical procedures [2-4]. The protocol, established by the ERAS Society, a not-for-profit multiprofessional multidisciplinary medical-academic society, aims to determine the optimal approach for delivering care to patients undergoing surgical procedures, with the goal of facilitating quicker postoperative recovery [4]. The ERAS protocol consists of patient education, preemptive analgesia, and other practical procedures to improve patient outcomes [4,5]. The ERAS protocol continues to be implemented in a wide range of surgical fields and has been shown to significantly decrease patient complications from 35.7% to 16.4% in a prospective cohort study in 2016 [6].

As the ERAS protocol demonstrates, patient compliance after laparoscopic abdominal surgery is essential to reducing postoperative complications [7]. Nonadherence to the recommendations set by the surgical team, such as medication consumption or general lifestyle suggestions, can have a significant impact on postoperative recovery and patient complications [1,8]. For instance, studies have documented that poor compliance in patients undergoing gastric banding surgeries results in poorer outcomes, including reduced weight loss postoperatively [9]. Educating patients on their surgical procedure, potential postoperative consequences, and preventive steps to minimize complications has improved patient compliance and reduced hospital stays following laparoscopic surgery [5,10]. These preemptive measures may play a profound role in mitigating the psychological burden of pain, anxiety, and fear during recovery [11].

Objectives

As the laparoscopic approach in surgical procedures is considered to be newer, the research following its patient education for postoperative care is limited [12]. To adapt to these novel approaches, modernized educational formats that have been shown to improve surgical patient outcomes include verbal, written, multimedia, mobile apps, and one-on-one or group counseling [11,13,14]. As intervention types continue to be explored, there is no gold standard preoperative education intervention (POEI) that has shown consistent improvement in patient outcomes across the procedures. The aim of this study is to systematically review the literature on POEIs to ascertain which POEI is more effective in improving outcomes in patients undergoing laparoscopic abdominal surgery.

Methods

Our review adhered to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement and EQUATOR (Enhancing the Quality and Transparency of Health Research) guidelines. This protocol is registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42023438698) [15].

Search Strategy

A systematic search was performed using 3 databases: PubMed, Embase, and Scopus. The search strategy was developed through an iterative process, using the methodology recommended by the Study Center of the German Society of Surgery, and included key terms related to laparoscopic abdominal surgeries and patient education [16]. The full search algorithm was used to identify potential articles in all 3 databases (Multimedia Appendix 1).

Article Selection

A total of 4753 articles investigating POEI were collected from the 3 databases after the removal of duplicates. Inclusion criteria were inclusion of a patient education intervention, adult patients undergoing abdominal laparoscopic surgery, randomized controlled trials (RCTs), and articles including postoperative outcomes (Figure 1). Exclusion criteria were articles not published in English, no patient education intervention included, nonabdominal laparoscopic procedures, pediatric patients, and articles without outcomes reported. Eligibility criteria are described using the population, intervention, comparator, outcomes, timing, and setting framework (Table 1). Title and abstract and full-text articles were screened using the inclusion and exclusion criteria via a blinded, dual review with 2 independent reviewers using Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation). If the decision was not unanimous, discrepancies were resolved after further review until a consensus was reached to determine final article inclusion or exclusion.
Figure 1. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) flowchart illustrating the process of selecting articles.
Table 1. Population, intervention, comparator, outcomes, timing, and setting eligibility criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>• Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adults (ie, aged &gt;18 years) undergoing an abdominal laparoscopic procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pediatric (ie, aged &lt;18 years) patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not an abdominal laparoscopic procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>• Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of a patient education intervention preoperatively including direct individual education (7 studies), direct group education (2 studies), educational video (4 studies), multimedia presentation (2 studies), and mobile app (2 studies). Some education interventions continued postoperatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No inclusion of a patient education intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>• Randomized controlled trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Usual preoperative care (eg, surgeon consult and required presurgical routine before bariatric surgery) was the control group. Some interventions included the usual preoperative care along with the education intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If applicable, preoperative measures were compared to postoperative measures in the intervention group and between intervention and control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>• Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcomes analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Varied between intervention type (ie, nausea, pain, anxiety, fatigue, percentage of unexpected hospitalizations, quality of life, weight, caloric intake, complication rate, first exhaust time, first defecation time, intensive care unit admissions, BMI, exercise, depressive symptoms, Self-Care Mean Agency scores, Body Image Scale scores, and postoperative patient compliance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Articles without outcomes reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcomes were categorized into 3 categories: patient discomfort, surgical outcomes, and quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>• Interventions with any follow-up period were included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>• Any care setting (including in-patient clinics or outpatient and ambulatory care)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Extraction and Analysis and Study Quality

Study quality was assessed through the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool as all included studies were RCTs [17]. Each domain assessed (ie, sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other sources of bias) were evaluated as “high,” “low,” or “unclear” risk of bias. An abstraction form was developed through an iterative process to standardize the data extraction process (Multimedia Appendix 1). Data extraction was performed via a blinded, dual review with 2 independent reviewers on Covidence, with any discrepancies resolved after further review. Study variables analyzed in this systematic review included educational content, intervention timing and duration, intervention type, surgery type, and postoperative outcomes related to a particular surgery. POEIIs included educational videos, multimedia presentations, mobile apps, direct individual education, and direct group education. All extracted data were compiled for analysis using Google Sheets (Google Drive; Google, LLC).

Results

Literature Selection

Using PubMed, Embase, and Scopus, the initial search yielded 6131 articles, of which 1378 (22.5%) duplicates were removed, leaving 4753 (77.5%) articles. Of the 4753 articles, during the title and abstract screening, we included 4713 (99.2%) and included 40 (0.8%). During the second phase, after a full-text review of the 40 articles, 17 (42.5%) were included in this systematic review. From the 17 studies that matched the inclusion criteria, 15 (88.2%) reported a statistically significant improvement in ≥1 patient postoperative outcomes (Table 2) [18-34].
Table 2. Summary of the included articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing + duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Abbasnia et al [18]    | Laparoscopic cholecystectomy      | 145 patients (average age 43.54 years) with cholecystitis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy | Educational video (animation 1 shown 2 hours before the surgery and animation 2 shown after the surgery; preoperative and postoperative) | • Content  
  - Animation 1 was used before surgery to reduce anxiety.  
  - "A 40-year-old man entered the operating room with a nurse. History-taking was carried out by an anesthesiologist, and the patient entered the operating room. The equipment and devices that were connected to the patient for monitoring and the method of general anesthesia were shown to the patient. After anesthesia, the recovery room and dressings of the operation site were displayed to the patient. Subsequently, the anatomy of the gall-bladder and its function, as well as the gallbladder surgery by laparoscopy, were demonstrated. Moreover, the patient observed the advantages of the laparoscopy method compared with open surgery."  
  - Animation 2 was used after surgery to manage pain.  
  - "A 40-year-old man was seated in a semisitting position, and the narrator states that this condition made it easier to breathe and reduce the pressure inside the abdomen, thereby reducing the pain. Deep breathing and effective coughing were displayed to the patient step by step, and an emphasis was put on the importance of causing faster CO2 (carbon dioxide) gas release from the abdominal cavity and secretions. In addition, the method of fixing the surgical incision with the help of a hand or a small pillow, which helps to reduce pain during coughing, deep breathing, and movement in bed, was demonstrated to the patient. Thereafter, movement in bed was shown to prevent blood clots and encourage faster expulsion of gas from the abdominal cavity. These movements included exercising the sole of the feet, ankles, and thighs. Finally, the patient was shown how to get out of bed step by step."  
• Modality: virtual reality headsets | There was a statistically significant improvement in preoperative state anxiety, the Bonferroni test for anxiety and patient distraction, pain reported by the VAS⁴, and quality and intensity of subjective pain reported by the McGill Pain Questionnaire. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Böllschweiler et al [20] | Laparoscopic cholecystectomy | 76 patients (average age 55.16 years) with cholecystitis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy | Multimedia presentation (preoperative education session was provided) | - Content  
  - Chapters with disease features, therapeutic alternatives, and the hospital stay, including a description of the operation itself. Certain pages are mandatory for the procurement of informed consent.  
  - The chapters focus on the following:  
    - Why does the operation need to be performed? The risks of gallstones are presented.  
    - Preoperative examinations are described in detail. Complex examinations are presented with videos of each procedure.  
    - The chapter explaining that the operative procedure is divided into different sections. The cholecystectomy is clarified using an animated graphic of the operation with a parallel description of the procedure by the surgeon. For interested patients, video from an actual operation is also available.  
    - Potential complications from surgery or postoperative risks are related objectively, without focusing on emotional aspects. All risks are shown with rates of occurrence (as described in the literature) and a severity index. Each topic is shown on a navigation bar. By clicking on a risk, background information appears.  
    - “The next 4 weeks” chapter includes practical information regarding the length of hospital stay, postoperative nutrition, and aspects of wound treatment for the first 4 weeks after the operation.  
  - Modality: in-person with a combination of documents, presentations, and videos | There was a statistically significant improvement in perceived information; however, no statistically significant improvement was found in the Knowledge and Skills Acquisition for anxiety. |
| da Silva Schulz et al [21] | Laparoscopic cholecystectomy | 43 patients (average age 69.35 years) with cholecystitis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy | Direct individual education (ie, fourth, eighth, 12th, 18th, and 25th day postoperative) | Content  
  - “The experimental group received the ‘Telephone Consultation’ intervention from a researcher on the 4th (D4), 8th (D8), 12th (D12), 18th (D18) and 25th (D25) postoperative day; a total of 5 telephone consultations were attempted for each participant in the experimental group. During the patient’s follow-up, we used the guidelines developed by NIC standardization and a literature review (e.g., questions about mobility at home, food intake and wound care).”  
  - Modality: telephone consultation intervention from a researcher | There was a statistically significant decrease from first to second evaluation and from first to third evaluation for loss of appetite with nausea in the experimental group. Both groups saw a significant decrease from first to third evaluation for pain and reduction was observed in the experimental group for postoperative expectations. |
<p>| Stergiopoulou et al [30] | Laparoscopic cholecystectomy | 60 patients (average age 51.5 years) with cholelithiasis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy | Educational video (20-minute preoperative session was performed in the patient ward; information leaflet and MCD² was available to patients for as long as they wished for) | | Groups A, B, and C showed a statistically significant increase in knowledge score regarding laparoscopic cholecystectomy when compared to group D. Furthermore, there was a statistically significant decrease in postoperative pain and nausea during the first 16 hours across all intervention-al groups when compared to control. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subirana Magdaleno et al [31]</td>
<td>Laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>62 patients (average age 46.8 years) with cholelithiasis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>Direct individual education (15-30 days before the scheduled surgery; preoperative)</td>
<td>- Content: “Multimedia CD contains animation, narration, and photographs with six sections: fundamental elements of bile anatomy and physiology, aspects of the disease, details on the procedure and alternative options, possible complications and duration of hospital stay, and advice about recovery and life after laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Each section has pages, with a total of 28 pages, six of which contained extra photographs and animations. Each page had text fields and the same layout and background graphics. Content was selected in collaboration with surgeons and was written in simple Greek at a senior high school grade level. Leaflet and personalized presentation was developed using the exact contents of MCD.”&lt;br&gt; - Modality: multimedia CD with a laptop or leaflet</td>
<td>No statistically significant differences were found in terms of pain levels or postoperative nausea, morbidity, percentage of unexpected hospitalizations, quality of life, or degree of satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toğac and Yilmaz [32]</td>
<td>Laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>124 patients (average age 48.72 years) with cholelithiasis undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>Educational video (30- to 45-minute session in 4 stages; preoperative)</td>
<td>- Content: Intensified preoperative education with personalized oral and written information of the entire surgical and anesthetic process from a specialized nurse. They were informed about the following points of the process: type of operation, symptoms to be treated in the postoperative period, probable complications, wound care, and diet.&lt;br&gt; - Modality: oral and informative brochure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Surgery type</td>
<td>Patient demographics</td>
<td>Intervention type (timing+duration)</td>
<td>Content and modality of patient education</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Udayasanker et al [33] | Laparoscopic cholecystectomy | 50 patients (average age 40.14 years) undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy | Multimedia presentation (preoperative) | • Content  
  - Information about the surgical procedure and planned anesthetic was given via a PowerPoint presentation on a mobile phone or tablet. The information was a customized collection of graphical representations of surgical and anesthetic procedures that were limited but appropriate.  
  - Modality: PowerPoint presentation on a mobile phone or tablet. | There was a statistically significant decrease in the VAS-pain and VAS-nausea scores of the intervention group at postoperative hours 0, 2, 4, 6, and 8. In addition, the 24-hour VAS-pain score of the intervention group was significantly lower than that of the control group. The VAS-vomiting scores of the control group were higher than those of the intervention group at postoperative hours 6 and 8. Moreover, a significant difference was noted between the intervention and control groups in terms of changes in the VAS-pain, nausea, and vomiting scores over time. Before the intervention, there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of the STAI-I scores; however, a statistically significant difference was determined before surgery and at the postoperative hour 24. There was also a significant difference between the groups in terms of the changes in the STAI-I scores over time. No significant difference was observed between the 2 groups in relation to the STAI-II scores obtained before the intervention, before surgery, and at postoperative hour 24. When the patient learning needs subscale scores were compared before education, there was a significant difference between the 2 groups in terms of activities of living, community and follow-up, feelings related to condition, and enhancing quality of life. Statistically significant reduction was observed in anxiety in ERAS group compared to control on the day before surgery and 6 hours postoperatively. In addition, there was a statistically significant reduction in hunger, thirst, fatigue, and overall perioperative experience. |
<p>| | Laparoscopic gastric bypass | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Deniz Doğan and Arslan [22] | Laparoscopic gastric bypass or sleeve gastrectomy | 51 patients          | Mobile app (before the operation and first, second, and third months after the operation; preoperative and postoperative) | • Content  
  - "The app includes care, nutrition, and exercise training for patients undergoing bariatric surgery, starting from the preoperative period, and covering the first 3 months after surgery, as well as a food and an exercise diary, and weight tracking interfaces that will help patients develop healthy lifestyle behaviors while adapting to their new lives. In addition to these, there is a live consultation where patients can communicate with researchers and interfaces with questionnaires and answers to frequently asked questions by patients."  
  - Modality: mobile app and live consultation with researchers and interfaces | There was a statistically significant decrease in the first, second, and third month BMI (kg/m^2) mean scores of the experimental group; no statistically significant difference was found between Self-Care Mean Agency scores and mean scores of the Body Image Scale. |
| Kalarchian et al [23]  | Laparoscopic gastric bypass                       | 40 patients          | Direct individual education (4 months of meal plans with monthly individual telephone calls with dietary coach consisting of 4 calls of 15 minute each; postoperative) | • Content  
  - "That patient intervention included 4 monthly deliveries of portion controlled foods and a personalized menu plan for grocery store items. The participants also received menus that included 3 small meals and 1-2 snacks per day to maintain their portion sizes."  
  - Modality: delivered meal and menu plans | There was a statistically significant improvement in improved weight trajectory and reduced caloric intake relative to a control group. |
| Kalarchian et al [24]  | Laparoscopic gastric bypass                       | 143 patients         | Direct individual education (24 weekly contacts, including 12 face-to-face and 12 telephone sessions; postoperative) | • Content  
  - "consisted of participation in any physician-supervised diet program, in promoting post-surgery weight loss and minimizing complications in comparison with usual care."  
  - Modality: face-to-face and telephone education sessions | There was a statistically significant weight loss from enrollment to postintervention follow-up compared to control. However, at 24 months, the intervention group lost less compared to control. |
<p>| Mata et al [26]        | Laparoscopic gastric bypass                       | 97 patients          | Mobile app (education intervention was given preoperatively, daily during hospital stay, and at 4 weeks; postoperative) |                                                                                                             | There was no statistically significant improvement of this app on mean adherence to a bundle of 5 postoperative interventions (ie, mobilization, GI motility stimulation, breathing exercises, and consumption of oral liquids and nutritional drinks) that are dependent on patient participation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nijamkin et al [28] | Laparoscopic gastric bypass | 144 patients (mean age 44.8 years) undergoing Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. |                                    | Postoperatively, participants randomized to the intervention group received a tablet computer (Apple iPad, Cupertino, USA) containing a novel mobile app. In brief, it included three sections:  
(1) Milestones checklist: A checklist was always visible in the app’s home page listing the day’s recovery goals with a brief description of the requirements to achieve each one. Next to each description, a button icon was available for the patients to press when the milestone was achieved, and an overall score of the number of milestones achieved compared to the total number for that day was constantly visible in the app’s main dashboard.  
(2) Daily clinical questionnaires: A brief questionnaire assessing adherence and outcomes for the previous day. In contrast with the milestones checklist, which assessed progress for the present day, the clinical questionnaire assessed the previous day to give an overall summary. Items regarding bowel function and passage of gas were modified for the group of patients with a stoma (i.e., Did you pass stool? Or, did your bag have stool?). After submitting the information, the app displays a total score of the number of milestones met (one for every enhanced recovery pathway element of interest they achieved), with a brief phrase of encouragement for goals that were achieved and advice for how to reach the milestones that were not yet achieved. Patients could review this feedback at any time in the app’s home page.  
(3) Education: access to educational material was always available in the app’s home page. Accessing one of the modules produced a detailed description of the milestones for each postoperative day. An exact replica of the education booklet received in their preoperative visit was also included in the educational module. |         |
At preoperative and 6 months postoperatively, there were no significant differences between intervention and control groups. However, at 12 months, both groups lost significant weight, with the intervention group losing significantly greater weight and significantly greater BMI reduction. Walking mean time, intensity of exercise, and involvement in physical activity was also significantly increased compared to control group at 12 months. No significant difference was found in daily energy intake and number of meals between groups.

**Content**

- "The first session of the education intervention addressed the daily meal planning guide and the maintenance diet. It provided recommendations on identifying and avoiding unhealthful foods, tips to promote proper nutrition by controlling portion size, new routine eating habits, and using an exchange list for weight management. This session was based on the Dietary Guidelines for Americans due to their reliable science-based advice on promoting health and lowering risk for chronic diseases via diet and physical activity. Daily energy intake was limited to 1,000-1,400 kcal and the minimum daily protein intake was 60-70 g with the goal of preserving lean tissue and prevent nutritional deficiencies. Additionally, the session also emphasized characteristics of typical Hispanic diets and the dietary changes that come with acculturation. The session also emphasized traits of typical Hispanic diets and the dietary changes that come with acculturation. Throughout the program, the importance of physical activity and a healthy diet were stressed in the postoperative life. The following session was designed to guide sedentary individuals to begin a regular exercise program and understanding how physical activity can aid in keeping weight off after bariatric surgery. Sessions 3 through 6 focused on emotional support interventions. These include behavior change strategies, stress relief without food, self-motivation, and relapse prevention. Overall, the intervention provided strategies that could facilitate change, increase self-esteem, help establish a consistent exercise program, recognize binge eating problems, and other motivational strategies."

- **Modality:** comprehensive nutrition and lifestyle educational intervention with a registered dietician

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       |              |                      | Direct group education (intervention was given 7 months postoperatively, education was received for 90 minutes every other week for a total of 6 sessions in small groups and frequent contact with a registered dietician; patients were re-assessed at 12 months following surgery) | • Content  
  - "The first session of the education intervention addressed the daily meal planning guide and the maintenance diet. It provided recommendations on identifying and avoiding unhealthful foods, tips to promote proper nutrition by controlling portion size, new routine eating habits, and using an exchange list for weight management. This session was based on the Dietary Guidelines for Americans due to their reliable science-based advice on promoting health and lowering risk for chronic diseases via diet and physical activity. Daily energy intake was limited to 1,000-1,400 kcal and the minimum daily protein intake was 60-70 g with the goal of preserving lean tissue and prevent nutritional deficiencies. Additionally, the session also emphasized characteristics of typical Hispanic diets and the dietary changes that come with acculturation. The session also emphasized traits of typical Hispanic diets and the dietary changes that come with acculturation. Throughout the program, the importance of physical activity and a healthy diet were stressed in the postoperative life. The following session was designed to guide sedentary individuals to begin a regular exercise program and understanding how physical activity can aid in keeping weight off after bariatric surgery. Sessions 3 through 6 focused on emotional support interventions. These include behavior change strategies, stress relief without food, self-motivation, and relapse prevention. Overall, the intervention provided strategies that could facilitate change, increase self-esteem, help establish a consistent exercise program, recognize binge eating problems, and other motivational strategies."  
  - **Modality:** comprehensive nutrition and lifestyle educational intervention with a registered dietician | Statistically significant decrease of depressive symptoms and greater excess body weight loss were found 12 months after surgery in the interventional group. |

|       |              |                      | Direct group education (preoperative baseline, 6 months, and 12 months postoperatively) | Content  
  - "Those in the comprehensive support intervention received a total of 6 educational sessions focused on behavior change strategies and motivation along with nutrition counseling in groups of up to 12 participants, in addition to the postbariatric standard care. Sessions were conducted every other week in English or Spanish, according to participants’ preference, in a nonjudgmental and nonconfrontational approach, expressing empathy and accepting participants’ unwillingness to change. Group meetings started immediately after the randomization at 6 months after surgery. A psychologist and a registered dietitian guided the educational sessions. Every meeting lasted approximately 90 minutes."  
  - **Modality:** educational support interventions | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yayla and Menevşe [34]</td>
<td>Laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy</td>
<td>66 patients (average age 37.09 years) with obesity undergoing laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy</td>
<td>Educational video (3 times a day at 09 AM, 3 PM, and 9 PM the day before surgery [preoperative] and every postoperative day [days 1-5])</td>
<td>• Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The 9-minute animation education, which was prepared for postoperative sleeve gastrectomy patients, was written and directed by the researchers. The nurse explained how the deep breathing exercise was done using the benefits of respiration exercises (2 minutes) in the first part and the diaphragmatic breathing exercises and incentive spirometry (4 minutes) in the second part. In the third part, the researcher first showed how to do the exercises and then repeated the exercises with the patients (3 minutes).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: animated video sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al [25]</td>
<td>Laparoscopic colectomy</td>
<td>200 patients (average age 55.75 years) undergoing laparoscopic radical resection of colorectal cancer</td>
<td>Direct individual education (unscheduled preoperative or perioperative length, but education continued until discharge)</td>
<td>• Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The preoperative issues were communicated to the patients in ERAS group through face-to-face communication, written notice, or multimedia. Preoperative education includes anesthesia and surgical procedure, encouragement of early postoperative feeding and activity, promotion of pain management and respiratory therapy, presetting discharge criteria, and notification of follow-up and readmission pathway. The education continues through the entire process of the perioperative period until the patient is discharged.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: face-to-face communication, written notice, or multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molenaar et al [27]</td>
<td>Laparoscopic colectomy</td>
<td>251 patients (average age 70 years) with colorectal cancer undergoing colorectal cancer resection</td>
<td>Direct individual education (assessments were performed at baseline, preoperatively [approximately 4 weeks after baseline, except for CPET⁴], and 8 weeks postoperatively. Surgical outcomes were evaluated 30 days after surgery)</td>
<td></td>
<td>There was a statistically significant reduction in the rate of severe complications and fewer medical complications observed in patients undergoing prehabilitation compared with standard care. Secondary outcomes regarding admission to intensive care unit were significantly reduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The supervised training consisted of a 1-hour session of aerobic and strength exercises 3 times per week with resting days in between. The aerobic part, preferably performed on a bicycle, consisted of a high-intensity interval training using baseline CPET-derived variables. It consisted of 4 intervals of 2-minute high-intensity bouts conducted at 85% to 90% of peak power, alternated with 4 intervals of 4-minute moderate intensity bouts at 30% of peak power. Resistance exercise consisted of 2 series of 10 repetitions targeting major muscle groups. The intensity was set at 65% to 70% of the calculated baseline indirect 1 repetition maximum (1 RM). Professional strength equipment, body weight, elastic bands, or calibrated dumbbells were used. Based on nutritional assessment and dietary habits, a registered dietitian provided a full nutritional intervention. The program aimed to balance macronutrients and to achieve a daily amount of proteins of 1.5g per kg. Additionally, participants were provided with a whey protein supplement and were instructed to ingest 30g within 1 hour after the in-hospital training session and 1 hour before sleeping daily. Vitamin D and multivitamin supplements were also provided. Anxiety-coping interventions consisted of relaxation techniques and deep breathing exercises provided by psychology trained personnel in a 1-to-1 session. If a high risk of mental distress was detected by medical history or baseline scores of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-item scale of 10 or higher or Patient Health Questionnaire 9-item of 15 or higher, participants were additionally referred to a medical psychologist. A smoking cessation program was offered, if indicated. The program consisted of individual counseling and nicotine replacement therapy.

Content and modality of patient education

- **Content**
  - “For the standardization of patient education, an education booklet was prepared in consultation with academic nursing experts. The content included information on the operating room environment and surgical team, anesthesia process, postoperative care, and surgical process. The patient education was not given by the researchers in order to prevent research bias. To avoid any differences between the educators, all education was carried out by one voluntary service nurse and one operating room nurse. About two hours of education was given to the nurses to ensure they adopted a similar approach in patient education and to prevent bias caused by individual factors.”

- **Modality:** 4-week multimodal personalized in-hospital supervised preoperative program

There was a statistically significant improvement in anxiety levels (Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory) directly after the intervention; however, no statistically significant difference was found in anxiety or pain (ie, VAS) levels in the postoperative period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient demographics</th>
<th>Intervention type (timing+duration)</th>
<th>Content and modality of patient education</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aydal et al [19] | Mixed laparoscopic abdominal surgery | 135 patients (average age 43.96 years) undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy (n=77, 57%), appendectomy (n=27, 20%), hernia repair (n=15, 11.1%), colon resection (n=7, 5.2%), or gastrectomy (n=6, 4.5%) | Direct individual education (20- to 30-minute preoperative education session) | Content
  - “The supervised training consisted of a 1-hour session of aerobic and strength exercises 3 times per week with resting days in between. The aerobic part, preferably performed on a bicycle, consisted of a high-intensity interval training using baseline CPET-derived variables. It consisted of 4 intervals of 2-minute high-intensity bouts conducted at 85% to 90% of peak power, alternated with 4 intervals of 4-minute moderate intensity bouts at 30% of peak power. Resistance exercise consisted of 2 series of 10 repetitions targeting major muscle groups. The intensity was set at 65% to 70% of the calculated baseline indirect 1 repetition maximum (1 RM). Professional strength equipment, body weight, elastic bands, or calibrated dumbbells were used. Based on nutritional assessment and dietary habits, a registered dietitian provided a full nutritional intervention. The program aimed to balance macronutrients and to achieve a daily amount of proteins of 1.5g per kg. Additionally, participants were provided with a whey protein supplement and were instructed to ingest 30g within 1 hour after the in-hospital training session and 1 hour before sleeping daily. Vitamin D and multivitamin supplements were also provided. Anxiety-coping interventions consisted of relaxation techniques and deep breathing exercises provided by psychology trained personnel in a 1-to-1 session. If a high risk of mental distress was detected by medical history or baseline scores of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-item scale of 10 or higher or Patient Health Questionnaire 9-item of 15 or higher, participants were additionally referred to a medical psychologist. A smoking cessation program was offered, if indicated. The program consisted of individual counseling and nicotine replacement therapy.” | |
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A total of 1831 patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bariatric surgery (ie, gastric bypass and gastric sleeve), and colectomy were included. There were a wide range of patient postoperative outcomes reported in the included studies, including nausea, complication rate, and weight loss (Table 3). These patient outcomes were categorized into patient discomfort, surgical outcomes, and quality of life. No included studies had an overall high risk of bias (Table 4). The PRISMA flowchart illustrates the process of selecting articles in Figure 1 [35].

### Table 3. Patient education interventions and patient outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention type (number of studies)</th>
<th>Surgery type</th>
<th>Patient outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct individual education (n=7)</td>
<td>Laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>• Nausea(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pain(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Percentage of unexpected hospitalizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct individual education (n=7)</td>
<td>Bariatric surgery: laparoscopic gastric bypass</td>
<td>• Weight(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Caloric intake(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct individual education (n=7)</td>
<td>Laparoscopic colectomy</td>
<td>• Complication rate(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• First exhaust time(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• First defecation time(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Intensive care unit admission(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational video (n=4)</td>
<td>Laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>• Anxiety(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pain(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nausea(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational video (n=4)</td>
<td>Bariatric surgery: laparoscopic gastric sleeve</td>
<td>• Pain(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct group education (n=2)</td>
<td>Bariatric surgery: laparoscopic gastric bypass</td>
<td>• Weight(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• BMI(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exercise(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Depressive symptoms(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia presentation (n=2)</td>
<td>Laparoscopic cholecystectomy</td>
<td>• Anxiety(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fatigue(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile app (n=2)</td>
<td>Bariatric surgery: laparoscopic gastric bypass</td>
<td>• BMI(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-Care Mean Agency Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Body Image Scale scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Postoperative patient compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(P < .05\).

\(^b\) \(P < .01\).
Table 4. Risk of bias of the included studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sequence generation</th>
<th>Allocation concealment</th>
<th>Blinding of participants and personnel</th>
<th>Blinding of outcome assessors</th>
<th>Incomplete outcome data</th>
<th>Selective outcome reporting</th>
<th>Other source of bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbasnia et al [18]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aydal et al [19]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollschweiler et al [20]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva Schulz et al [21]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deniz Doğan and Arslan [22]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalarchian et al [23]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalarchian et al [24]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al [25]</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mata et al [26]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molenaar et al [27]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijamkin et al [28]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petasne Nijamkin et al [29]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stergiopoulou et al [30]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subirana Magdaleno et al [31]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toğac and Yılmaz [32]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayasankar et al [33]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yayla and Menevşe [34]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patient Discomfort

The Patient Discomfort category consisted of nausea, pain, and anxiety as patient’s postoperative outcomes.

Nausea was significantly ($P<.05$) reduced in 2 intervention types. Following laparoscopic cholecystectomy, 43 patients who received direct individual education demonstrated a decrease in postoperative nausea, as measured by the Mini Nutritional Assessment test and the simplified Apfel scale [21]. Educational videos preoperatively also proved to decrease patients’ reporting of nausea [30,32]. The educational video study by Toğac and Yılmaz [32] was conducted on 124 patients, and the results were obtained using the Visual Analog Scale (VAS). The study by Stergiopoulou et al [30] was conducted on 60 patients, and the results were obtained using the Numerical Rating Scale ranging from 0 to 10. These 2 studies demonstrated statistical significance.

Pain was reduced postoperatively following 2 main interventions: direct individual education [21] and educational videos [18,30,32,34]. Direct individual education and educational videos displayed a statistically significant reduction in pain ($P<.05$ and $P<.01$, respectively). The educational video study conducted by Abbasnia et al [18] included 145 patients, and results were obtained with the VAS and McGill Pain Questionnaire. Yayla and Menevše [34] analyzed 66 patients via the VAS.

Anxiety was shown to be statistically decreased ($P<.01$) in POEIs that incorporated both educational videos [18,30] and presentations [33]. The educational video intervention used by Abbasnia et al [18] included 145 patients and collected data via the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. While Stergiopoulou et al [30] collected data via the Amsterdam Preoperative Anxiety Scale and Information, Udayasankar et al [33] focused on 50 patients and reported a reduction in preoperative anxiety ($P=.003$) and postoperative anxiety after 6 hours ($P=.001$).
Surgical Outcomes

Surgical outcomes category consisted of percentage of unexpected hospitalizations, complication rate, intensive care unit (ICU) admission, first exhaust time, and first defecation time. These varying patient outcomes provide insight into the patient’s condition after surgery. Percentage of unexpected hospitalizations postoperatively was not significantly reduced when direct individual education intervention type was introduced [31]. Complication rate, ICU admission, first exhaust time, and first defecation time were all reduced postoperatively when patients were debriefed via individual education or coaching intervention [25,27]. Molenaar et al [27] included 251 patients and measured their results via Comprehensive Complication Index ($P=0.2$). Li et al [25] obtained their results via observation indicators.

Quality of Life

Factors that affect quality of life were also considered to have a detrimental effect on a patient’s long-term well-being. This category consisted of patient outcome factors such as weight, BMI, caloric intake, exercise, depressive symptoms, fatigue, Self-Care Mean Agency scores, and Body Image Scale scores. Patient weight was found to be statistically significantly decreased in both direct individual and group education POEIs ($P<0.01$) [23,24,28,29], Petasne Nijamkin et al [29] and Nijamkin et al [28] included 144 patients in a group education setting and reported weight loss in patients who received a POEI 12 months postoperatively ($P<0.001$). Kalarchian et al [23,24], using a structured intervention, included 40 patients in a direct individual education method and had patients lose weight in the POEI arm at 4 months ($P=0.003$).

BMI was also found to be statistically significantly decreased in patients provided with direct group education or coaching ($P<0.01$) [28] and in patients provided with a POEI using a mobile app ($P<0.05$) [22]. Deniz Doğan and Arslan [22] included 51 patients in the mobile app intervention and recorded a reduced BMI ($P<0.05$) in the first 3 months postoperatively.

Caloric intake was statistically decreased ($P<0.05$) when patients received a direct individual education POEI [24]. An increase in exercise and a decrease in depressive symptoms was found to be statistically significant ($P<0.01$) when patients received a direct group education POEI [28,29]. In the study by Nijamkin et al [28], exercise was measured via the Short Questionnaire to Assess Health Enhancing Physical. In the study by Petasne Nijamkin et al [29], depression was measured via the Beck Depression Inventory questionnaire and demonstrated a decrease in depression incidence after 12 months ($P<0.001$).

Patient fatigue postoperatively was decreased when patients were given an educational presentation ($P=0.008$) [33]. Self-Care Mean Agency scores and Body Image Scale scores had no significant increase in patients when provided with a POEI via a mobile app [22]. Deniz Doğan and Arslan [22] assessed Self-Care Mean Agency scores via a Likert-type Scale ranging from 0 to 4 with 35 items and Body Image Scale via a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 to 5 with 40 items. The direct group education intervention had a significant positive effect on weight, BMI, exercise, and depressive symptoms for patients after laparoscopic bariatric surgery, suggesting potential future physician consideration as a preferred intervention choice [28,29].

Direct Individual and Direct Group Education

POEIs included direct individual education, direct group education, video education, multimedia presentations, and mobile apps. Direct individual education methods included supervised and personalized training programs lasting from 1 to 3 months postoperatively as well as nutritional guidance delivered by nurses and physicians via in-person sessions or telehealth [19,27]. POEIs that incorporated personalized training programs led to a decrease in the rate of severe complications ($P<0.05$) and anxiety ($P<0.05$) [19,27]. Direct individual education also involved personalized preoperative education brochures and advice given by the patient’s surgeon, which reduced nausea postoperatively ($P<0.05$) [21]. In addition, patients received postoperative portion-controlled meal deliveries and counseling over 4 weeks, provided by a registered dietitian, leading to weight loss ($P<0.01$) and reduced caloric intake ($P<0.05$) [24]. Direct group education POEIs for bariatric surgeries involved 4 to 6 comprehensive lifestyle and behavioral or motivational sessions with the research teams and registered dieticians, and it resulted in a significant decrease in weight, BMI, and depressive symptoms ($P<0.01$) and a significant increase in exercise ($P<0.01$) [28,29].

Educational Videos and Multimedia Presentations

Video education modalities involved short animations that served the goal of assuaging anxiety and operative fear. These animations were shown to the patient up to 3 times preoperatively and daily postoperatively for 1 week, which led to decreases in anxiety, pain, and nausea ($P<0.01$) [18,34]. Likewise, preoperative multimedia presentations administered by registered nurses in the form of CDs and additional animations or brochures provided additional material to the patient before surgery, educating patients about the primary purpose of the surgery, preoperative examinations, and potential complications [20,30,33]. These POEIs led to statistically significant decreases in anxiety and fatigue in patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy ($P<0.01$) [20,30,33].

Mobile App

Finally, mobile app POEIs developed by the research teams allowed patients to access educational resources on their own time, and it included information about postsurgical care, weight tracking, nutrition, and exercise regimens with recovery goals during the first 3 months of surgery [22,26]. Patients receiving this POEI experienced a decrease in BMI ($P<0.05$); however, there was no statistically significant decrease in Self-Care Mean Agency scores, Body Image Scale scores, or postoperative patient compliance [22,26].

Discussion

Principal Findings

In this systematic review of RCTs, 17 studies were included, analyzing a total of 1831 patients. Approximately 38% (3/8) of the laparoscopic cholecystectomy studies tested an educational
video, which led to a statistically significant decrease in postoperative anxiety, pain, and nausea [18,30,32,34]. Nearly 50% (7/17) of the studies included in this review found that direct individual education improved outcomes for a variety of surgical procedures. Educational videos were most effective at reducing anxiety, nausea, and pain after surgery [18,30]. In about 33% (2/6) of the studies on laparoscopic gastric bypass, direct group education was shown to be effective in improving weight, BMI, exercise, and depressive symptoms. To decrease postsurgery complication rates, ICU admission, as well as first exhaust and defecation time for patients, direct individual education POEIs can be implemented before surgery [25,27].

**Direct Individual Education and Direct Group Education**

Direct individual education was the most effective POEI across all included procedure types: laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bariatric surgery, and colectomy [19,21,23-25,27,31]. Direct individual education has been shown to be effective in other surgical procedures as it provides patients with a personalized intervention tailored to their specific needs, which allows for patients to freely communicate and better understand their condition, treatment plan, and postoperative care [36,37]. For example, in hip or knee arthroplasty, patient education led to a significantly shorter length of stay (P < .001), suggesting that the effectiveness of one-on-one education or coaching found in this review is not only limited to abdominal laparoscopic procedures [10]. Direct group education had significantly improved outcomes across laparoscopic gastric bypass for weight, BMI, exercise, and depressive symptoms (P < .01) [28,29]. A group setting allows for bonding with others and building a support system, which can be a critical influence toward lifestyle changes necessary for improved outcomes after bariatric surgery [38,39]. In a prior systematic review analyzing POEIs in patients undergoing major surgery, the authors found that increased frequency of message exposure improved outcomes; however, this review suggests that the frequency of message exposure may not be as important as POEI type since all frequencies of one-on-one and group education or coaching POEIs had similar effectiveness across all procedure types [13]. Although the included studies incorporated in-person direct individual and group education, there are emerging technologies, such as virtual reality, that offer a new avenue to provide patients with individual or group education and coaching through a distanced modality [40,41].

**Educational Videos and Multimedia Presentations**

POEIs with educational videos or a presentation had the most statistically significant improvements on anxiety, pain, and fatigue after laparoscopic cholecystectomy (P < .01) [18,20,30,32-34]. The use of videos to educate patients allowed for increased standardization, cost-effectiveness, and accessibility due to the prerecorded nature of this intervention that can be applied broadly throughout multiple disciplines of medicine [42,43]. Incorporation of educational videos also allows for patients to receive the POEI from the convenience of their own home and reduces health care inequity related to access to transportation and proximity to the hospital [44-46]. Preoperative video education has been shown to improve physical symptoms in the literature, as suggested by this review; however, this POEI has also been shown to improve knowledge, preparedness, satisfaction, psychological well-being, quality of life, and health care use in other surgery types [47]. Presentations allow for patients and caregivers to engage with the material and ask questions to better understand the content [48]. Both forms of POEI have demonstrated effectiveness in improving specific patient outcomes based on the content of the education; if the content is tailored toward focusing on additional aspects of the patient’s postoperative recovery, more patient outcomes may be improved [49].

**Mobile Apps**

Newer forms of technology are also being tested for POEIs; however, more development is required within this area. In the 2 interventions that leveraged a mobile app for their POEI, there was improvement in BMI (P < .01); however, no statistically significant improvement was observed in Self-Care Mean Agency scores, Body Image Scale scores, or postoperative patient compliance [22,26]. Although there were limited significant improvements in patient outcomes while using mobile apps, coupling newer technology with aspects of tested POEIs, such as in-person education, educational videos, or presentations, may be a feasible option to optimize patient outcomes after laparoscopic abdominal surgery. Use of mobile apps in plastic surgery has been shown to significantly improve understanding of the surgery and postoperative patient compliance; this suggests that this modality of POEI has the potential to also improve patient quality outcomes for abdominal laparoscopic procedures if researched further [14]. Benefits of using technology through mobile apps, virtual reality, or artificial intelligence may provide increased accessibility to populations with limited mobility or access to clinical settings. These forms of communication can serve as a vital platform for enhancing the patient-physician rapport [50-53]. There are challenges associated with implementing these tools as the technology of these POEIs encompasses the associated expenses, accessibility, and maintenance. In addition, these platforms will require extensive training to ensure a user-friendly platform for different patient populations [54,55].

**Limitations**

This study can be considered in light of the following limitations. First, the tools to report patient outcomes were not consistent across the included studies, thus a meta-analysis or further synthesis is not possible. Second, only laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bariatric surgery (ie, gastric bypass and gastric sleeve), and colectomy surgeries were included because these were the only available surgery types with RCTs published regarding POEI. The heterogeneity of the included studies within the review provides a more diverse and holistic review of the published POEIs, which allows a narrative analysis of the pros and cons of individual interventions in each type of surgery included; however, it limits the ability to statistically compare the interventions to determine the most efficacious POEI in laparoscopic abdominal surgery. There are numerous types of abdominal laparoscopic surgeries where POEI may be beneficial, but they were not included in this systematic review due to a lack of published RCTs. Some included studies did not
report all aspects of the POEI, such as information regarding the process of developing the education content or the provision of training, supervision, or assistance with the POEI, including if there was any prototype testing or stakeholder feedback through co-design sessions. This limited the quantification of the effects of these features and their relationship with outcomes as there was significant variability in the published literature. Furthermore, the included studies may have been used for a more comprehensive, multidisciplinary intervention, confounding their direct impact on patient outcomes. However, this study provides informative insights into the current knowledge base pertaining to POEI and its applications in the field of abdominal laparoscopic surgeries.

Conclusions
This systematic review analyzed 17 RCTs that demonstrated the effect of POEIs on postoperative patient outcomes after abdominal laparoscopic surgeries. A total of 1831 patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy, bariatric surgery (ie, gastric bypass and gastric sleeve), or colectomy were included in this analysis, and 15 studies reported a statistically significant improvement in at least 1 patient postoperative outcome. Overall, direct individual education was the most effective POEI across all included procedure types; direct group education had the most significantly improved outcomes primarily among bariatric surgeries. POEIs that incorporates educational videos or presentations demonstrated the most statistically significant improvements in anxiety, pain, and fatigue following laparoscopic cholecystectomy. Direct education, whether individual or group based, has been shown to have a more positive impact on postoperative outcomes than newer POEIs, such as mobile apps. The practicality of this allows surgeons to personalize the health care delivered to each patient and provide the appropriate POEI based on which outcomes are more important for that patient. Future directions include expanding the use of POEIs to additional surgical procedures and further testing POEIs that incorporate more recent technology.
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Abstract

Background: Pip is a novel digital health platform (DHP) that combines human health coaches (HCs) and technology with patient-facing content. This combination has not been studied in perioperative surgical optimization.

Objective: This study’s aim was to test the feasibility of the Pip platform for deploying perioperative, digital, patient-facing optimization guidelines to elective surgical patients, assisted by an HC, at predefined intervals in the perioperative journey.

Methods: We conducted an institutional review board–approved, descriptive, prospective feasibility study of patients scheduled for elective surgery and invited to enroll in Pip from 2.5 to 4 weeks preoperatively through 4 weeks postoperatively at an academic medical center between November 22, 2022, and March 27, 2023. Descriptive primary end points were patient-reported outcomes, including patient satisfaction and engagement, and Pip HC evaluations. Secondary end points included mean or median length of stay (LOS), readmission at 7 and 30 days, and emergency department use within 30 days. Secondary end points were compared between patients who received Pip versus patients who did not receive Pip using stabilized inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Results: A total of 283 patients were invited, of whom 172 (60.8%) enrolled in Pip. Of these, 80.2% (138/172) patients had ≥1 HC session and proceeded to surgery, and 70.3% (97/138) of the enrolled patients engaged with Pip postoperatively. The mean engagement began 27 days before surgery. Pip demonstrated an 82% weekly engagement rate with HCs. Patients attended an average of 6.7 HC sessions. Of those patients that completed surveys (95/138, 68.8%), high satisfaction scores were recorded (mean 4.8/5; n=95). Patients strongly agreed that HCs helped them throughout the perioperative process (mean 4.97/5; n=33). The average net promoter score was 9.7 out of 10. A total of 268 patients in the non-Pip group and 128 patients in the Pip group had appropriate overlapping distributions of stabilized inverse probability of treatment weighting for the analytic sample. The Pip cohort was associated with LOS reduction when compared to the non-Pip cohort (mean 2.4 vs 3.1 days; median 1.9, IQR 1.0-3.1 vs median 3.0, IQR 1.1-3.9 days; mean ratio 0.76; 95% CI 0.62-0.93; P=.009). The Pip cohort experienced a 49% lower risk of 7-day readmission (relative risk [RR] 0.51, 95% CI 0.11-2.31; P=.38) and a 17% lower risk of 30-day readmission (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.65-1.05; P=.09).
Introduction

The annual surgical volume in the United States is estimated at 48.4 million procedures [1]. Though heart disease and stroke may be the 2 leading causes of worldwide mortality (25% or 15 million deaths) [2,3], before the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, postoperative surgical mortality was the third leading contributor to death in the United States [2]. Furthermore, the occurrence of postoperative 30-day complications is expected to rise to 15% among all patients and cost over US $11,000 per case, or US $31.35 billion nationally, on an annual basis [4,5]. Improving surgical quality of care to reduce mortality, complications, readmissions, and emergency department (ED) visits represents an enormous opportunity for the health care system. To reduce surgical complications and improve postoperative outcomes, focus has shifted to optimizing patients preoperatively and postoperatively through strategies such as prehabilitation, improvement in medical comorbidity, and enhanced recovery after surgery protocols [6]. Because mobile and wireless technologies have become increasingly accessible and capable on a global scale [7], digitization of protocols and other health interventions is being developed as a means to improve quality of care while reducing cost.

The field of digital health has grown over the past several years with advances in digital health platforms (DHPs) or telemedicine services, which have allowed deployment in select patient populations to improve chronic health conditions [8]. Several mobile apps have been developed and used as tools to help provide perioperative instructions as well as protocol guidance for patients. Feasibility studies have shown these DHP are convenient for patients to use in orthopedic surgery [9,10] and gastrointestinal surgery [11-13]. Yet, outcomes results have been mixed [14,15] or not yet studied to date. Furthermore, the DHP content is often narrow and applied to one surgery type or a specific problem, such as activity or pain management, rather than more holistic prehabilitation and curated to each patient’s needs based on patient comorbidity, activity level or ability, or nutritional status. Additionally, these DHPs did not use a one-on-one human health coach (HC) in addition to the DHP to assist patients in achieving their goals. Finally, there continues to be a significant unmet need within health care to provide patients undergoing surgery with high-quality education, optimization, and care coordination throughout the complex preoperative and postoperative journey. Our hospital desired to pilot an integrated DHP with human digital HCs to improve patient preoperative optimization, surgical care coordination, and outcomes. To address this need, we partnered with a novel perioperative DHP company, Pip Care, to create digitized perioperative patient-facing optimization guidelines and surgical instructions for our surgical population. Pip simplifies the patient’s health care plan into definable, easy-to-understand, and complete daily tasks and uses regular HC contact to improve outcomes, thus setting Pip apart from other DHPs. The aim of this study was to test the feasibility and acceptability of the novel Pip platform in deploying perioperative patient-facing optimization guidelines to elective surgical patients both digitally and with the assistance of an HC at predefined intervals in the perioperative journey and to report clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction with the use of Pip.

Methods

Overview

We partnered with Pip Care to develop perioperative content and test the deployment of Pip perioperatively. Pip is a HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act)-compliant, personalized, and interactive DHP that functions on both iOS (Apple Inc) and Android (Google Inc) operating systems.

Design of Clinical Pathways and Pip Functionality

A multidisciplinary team in perioperative care at our academic medical center from anesthesiology, surgery, and nursing defined the pathway content and patient tasks to be digitized on the Pip platform. These perioperative clinical pathways included preoperative nutrition, preoperative fitness, smoking cessation, preparation for surgery, day-before surgery planning, home preparation, and recovery after surgery. Patients were digitally assigned the appropriate clinical pathways by the human HC following the initial HC-patient intake and the HC’s review of the patient’s comorbidities from the electronic medical record. The tasks were prompted to the patient at appropriate intervals. Certified human HCs employed by Pip Care received education regarding the clinical pathways and were trained to interact with the electronic medical record for data collection and communication. HCs were responsible for motivating patients to reach their pre- and postsurgery goals through at least weekly one-on-one video or audio sessions; during these sessions, HCs would also answer any questions, provide educational content, track patient-reported outcomes (PROs), communicate patient progress to the provider, and facilitate referrals and resources if needed, in coordination with the perioperative clinical team members (Table 1). In addition to HC follow-up, patients were invited to explore a host of educational multimedia resources on disease processes and why optimization of said diseases is important before surgery.

Conclusions: Pip is a novel mobile DHP combining human HCs and perioperative optimization content that is feasible to engage patients in their perioperative journey and is associated with reduced hospital LOS. Further studies assessing the impact on clinical and patient-reported outcomes from the use of Pip or similar DHPs HC combinations during the perioperative journey are required.
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Pip contains 4 key features, which are represented by separate pages within the DHP user experience. The first is Pip My Plan, which displays the assigned personalized care plans and tasks by their HC (Figure 1). The second is Pip Appointments. Patients were asked to schedule weekly digital HC sessions through the Appointments page. The HC also populated the patient’s surgery-related appointments into this section for easy patient viewing (Figure 2). Third, patients have access to unlimited engagement with their HC through the Pip Messages page (Figure 3). Finally, patients have further unlimited access to a library of health system-approved education content, including articles and videos, to assist with their surgery preparation and recovery (Figure 3).
Table 1. Pip health coach (HC) tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and tasks</th>
<th>Task description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the EMR® Pip List for newly added patients.</td>
<td>HC reviews the EMR to identify and validate referred patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred patient data transfer</td>
<td>HC transcribes the appropriate patient information into the Pip database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot enrollment and activation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute the enrollment conversion plan.</td>
<td>HC executes a time-cadence enrollment conversion plan until the patient has enrolled in the pilot study or until the enrollment conversion plan ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execute the patient activation conversion plan.</td>
<td>HC executes a time-cadence activation conversion plan until the patient has scheduled an “Initial HC Session” or until the activation conversion plan ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surgery coaching and care plan management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly health coaching sessions.</td>
<td>For an estimated 4 weeks before surgery and 4 weeks postsurgery, HC conducts 30-minute weekly coaching sessions with patients to assist with surgery preparation and recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching session documentation</td>
<td>HC documents “encounter notes” from each coaching session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching session scheduling</td>
<td>HC schedules the subsequent coaching session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midweek patient check-in</td>
<td>In between weekly sessions, the HC sends at least 1 message (in-app or SMS text message) to the patient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient communication through the in-app message</td>
<td>HC responds to the patients’ messages when they are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of surgery-related educational materials</td>
<td>HC sends patients applicable educational content on best practices for surgery preparation and recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient care plan assignment and management</td>
<td>HC assigns and manages the patient’s care plans, including fitness, nutrition, smoking cessation, and discharge planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly patient progress report sent through EMR Encounter Note</td>
<td>HC’s encounter note in the EMR is sent to the clinical provider, detailing the patient’s status and adherence to protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMR InBasket communication</td>
<td>When an HC receives an out-of-scope question from a patient or learns of an escalated clinical issue, the HC messages the provider through EMR InBasket to escalate the clinical issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider synchronization calls</td>
<td>HC participates in daily and weekly synchronization calls with the provider team to ensure good communication and proper workflows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Care coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery-related appointments</td>
<td>HC reviews the EMR and ensures all surgery-related clinical appointments are properly displayed within the Pip app. The HC encourages attendance at these appointments through messaging and during coaching sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating health system resources for patients</td>
<td>HC facilitates health system-specific surgery-related resources for the patient as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient-reported outcome and satisfaction data collection</strong></td>
<td>HC sends an anonymous patient satisfaction survey to patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting patient satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>HC collects PROs upon the patient’s completion of the pilot program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting PROs b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service recovery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital platform trouble shooting</td>
<td>HC assists with any issues with the technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

aEMR: electronic medical record.
bPRO: patient-reported outcome.
Figure 1. Screenshots of Pip with personalized protocols and daily tasks in My Plan.

Figure 2. Pip patient engagement map. HC: health coach.
Feasibility Study

This study is an institutional review board/quality improvement review committee–approved (ID 3949) descriptive and prospective feasibility study of patients scheduled for elective abdominal, spine (cervical, lumbar, thoracic, and combined), and total joint replacement (hip or knee) surgery, invited to enroll in Pip from 2.5 to 4 weeks preoperatively through 4 weeks postoperatively at a single academic medical center from November 22, 2022, to March 27, 2023. Inclusion criteria were being aged 18 years or older; ability to speak and understand English; scheduled elective abdominal, spine, or joint replacement surgery; having more than 1 comorbidity linked to increased surgery risk (eg, type 2 diabetes, being aged 70 years or older, having a BMI greater than 40 kg/m², high blood pressure, and smoking history); no recent hospitalization for a medical comorbidity that may impact surgical timing, such as heart failure (in order to ensure surgical date was likely); daily access to a tablet or smartphone; and technological literacy (ability to navigate digital devices with oversight or perioperative team assistance). Exclusion criteria include surgery not scheduled, canceled or delayed, or a change in scheduled surgery type.

Patients were recruited continuously from our perioperative clinic until the desired pilot sample size of approximately 150 patients was reached. All patients received our standard perioperative risk assessment, optimization, and educational content from our perioperative clinic. After enrollment, patients downloaded and enrolled in Pip. Patients scheduled their first digital one-on-one session with the HC through the Pip platform after enrollment, and this first HC visit was typically scheduled within 1 week or less. HC visits were offered weekly preoperatively and weekly following hospital discharge. If at any time the patient desired to leave the study, they were able to withdraw (Figure 2).

The number of patients who were invited, enrolled, activated, and completed the program was collected. The number of health coaching sessions attended and the time from enrollment to surgery were collected. Patient-specific characteristics included age, institutional perioperative risk score (low being less than 2%, intermediate being between 2% and less than 5%, and high being 5% or more risk of mortality or major adverse cardiac or cerebrovascular events) [16], type of surgery, length of stay (LOS), readmission, and ED visits. Primary end points include patient satisfaction, patient engagement, and Pip HC evaluations. We used industry benchmarks to compare our DHP enrollment rate [17,18], surgery completion with enrollment [18], and
postsurgery engagement rates [17,18]. Patients’ overall satisfaction was assessed by the topline patient satisfaction surveys with score ratings from 1 to 5, with 1 denoting the lowest satisfaction and 5 denoting the highest satisfaction [19]. Pip HCs were evaluated based on a scaled numerical response to the question, “How much do you agree with the statement: My Pip Health Coach Helped Me Prepare for and Recover from Surgery?” using a score rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 denoting “strongly disagree” and 5 denoting “strongly agree.” The Pip experience was evaluated for acceptability using the net promoter score with the question, “Using a scale of 1 to 10, how likely are you to recommend Pip to a friend or colleague?” with 1 denoting “least likely” and 10 denoting “most likely.” Secondary endpoints included LOS, 7- and 30-day readmission rates, and ED use within 30 days. In order to evaluate the effect of Pip, patients receiving the Pip program were compared with a non-Pip group of patients. This control group of patients included patients who were aged 18 years or older and underwent elective surgery of the same type from January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022.

Statistical Analysis

The primary end points are descriptive. Secondary end points required further statistical analysis. Continuous variables were summarized using the mean (SD) or median (IQR) when appropriate. Categorical variables were summarized by frequencies and percentages. The chi-square test was used for differences in proportions for categorical variables, and the Student t test or nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test was used to determine the differences in the distribution of continuous data between the Pip and non-Pip groups. Stabilized inverse probability of treatment weighting (SIPTW) was created to reduce selection bias and balance the patient characteristics (ie, age, procedures, and perioperative risk score) in the Pip and non-Pip groups [20,21]. A marginal structural model with log-linked gamma distribution and SIPTW were used to estimate the relative risk of 7-day hospital readmission, 30-day hospital readmission, and 30-day ED use [21]. All tests were two-sided and a P value of less than .05 was used to indicate statistical significance. SAS (version 9.4; SAS Institute) was used for statistical analyses.

Ethical Considerations

The study was granted a waiver of consent as the risk to the patient was considered to be minimal and was considered to be a quality improvement study. All patient participation was voluntary, and no patient received compensation.

Results

Engagement Outcomes

Out of 283 patients invited to participate in Pip, 172 (60.8%) were enrolled, compared to industry benchmarks (5%-30%). A total of 5 patients who enrolled were excluded from this analysis due to surgery delay, cancellation, or alternative surgery scheduled. Of those enrolled, 83.1% (143/172) had ≥1 HC session. Of the patients who had ≥1 HC session, 97.2% (138/142) proceeded to surgery, an improvement compared to industry benchmarks (90%-93%) [17,18]. After surgery, 70.3% (97/138) patients engaged with Pip postoperatively, compared to the industry benchmarks (31%-52%; Figure 4). Pip demonstrated an 82% weekly engagement rate, defined as repeat attendance at HC sessions. There was an average of 27 (range 7-108) days of lead time from enrollment to surgery, and patients attended an average of 6.7 (range 3-19) HC sessions. Pip received a total of 95 patient satisfaction survey submissions. Patients reported an overall high level of satisfaction based on the topline survey (mean 4.8/5; n=95; Table 2). Patients strongly agree that HC helped them throughout the perioperative process based on the Pip HC evaluation (mean 4.97/5; n=33). To measure acceptability, the net promoter score rating score was obtained; of the 33 respondents, the mean score was 9.7 out of 10.

Figure 4. Pip patient engagement map. *Data set does not include 2 patient referrals who were out of scope of pilot parameters. ** Exclusions to analysis are as follows: patient did not need surgery (n=1); patients referred for alternative lower-risk therapy (n=2); surgery delayed and patient rescheduled (n=1); surgery delayed and Pip could not access the patient’s chart (n=1).
Table 2. Aggregate patient satisfaction scores (average score rating was 4.8 out of 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Surveys completed (n=95), n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77 (81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinical Outcomes

There were a total of 367 patients in the non-Pip group and 138 patients in the Pip group. After creating SIPTW based on age, procedures, and perioperative risk score, a total of 268 patients in the non-Pip group and 128 patients in the Pip group had appropriate overlapping distributions of SIPTW for the analytic sample. Before SIPTW, age and preoperative risk score were shown to be significantly different between the Pip and non-Pip groups (Table S1 in Multimedia Appendix 1). Baseline patient characteristics weighted by SIPTW showed a balanced age, procedure type, and preoperative risk score between the 2 groups (Table 3). The Pip cohort was associated with both mean and median reductions in LOS when compared to the non-Pip cohort (mean 2.4 vs 3.1; median 1.9 IQR 1.0-3.1 vs median 3.0, IQR 1.1-3.9). Pip was significantly associated with a 24% reduction in postoperative LOS (mean ratio 0.76; 95% CI 0.62-0.93; P=0.009 Table 4). Pip care was associated with a 49% lower risk of 7-day readmission (relative risk [RR] 0.51; 95% CI 0.11-2.31; P=0.38) and a 17% lower risk of 30-day readmission (RR 0.83; 95% CI 0.30-2.31; P=0.73), though not statistically significant. Pip and non-Pip groups had similar risk in 30-day ED returns (RR 1.06; 95% CI 0.56-2.01; P=0.85).

Table 3. Weighted patient characteristics by Pip versus non-Pip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Pip (n=268; 68%)</th>
<th>Pip (n=128; 32%)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>63.8 (13.1)</td>
<td>63.6 (10.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>66 (56-73)</td>
<td>65 (59-71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum-maximum</td>
<td>19-88</td>
<td>20-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>155 (57.8)</td>
<td>64 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>113 (42.2)</td>
<td>64 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>235 (87.7)</td>
<td>114 (89.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25 (9.3)</td>
<td>11 (8.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (1.5)</td>
<td>3 (2.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or declined</td>
<td>4 (1.5)</td>
<td>1 (0.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk level, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>224 (83.6)</td>
<td>109 (85.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>40 (14.9)</td>
<td>16 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4 (1.5)</td>
<td>3 (2.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major abdominal</td>
<td>31 (11.6)</td>
<td>15 (11.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spine</td>
<td>69 (25.7)</td>
<td>35 (27.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJR² hip</td>
<td>75 (28)</td>
<td>36 (28.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJR knee</td>
<td>93 (34.7)</td>
<td>42 (32.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTJR: total joint replacement.
Table 4. Comparison of secondary end points between non-Pip and Pip patients using marginal structural models with stabilized inverse probability of treatment weighting (SIPTW).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary end points</th>
<th>Non-Pip (n=268; 68%)</th>
<th>Pip (n=128; 32%)</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay (days)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Minimum-maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 (2.8)</td>
<td>2.9 (1.1-3.9)</td>
<td>0-27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 (2.4)</td>
<td>2.4 (2.4)</td>
<td>1.9 (1.0-3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-day readmission</td>
<td>Patients, n (%)</td>
<td>Relative risk (95% CI)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (3.4)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day readmission</td>
<td>Patients, n (%)</td>
<td>Relative risk (95% CI)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 (4.9)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day emergency department return</td>
<td>Patients, n (%)</td>
<td>Relative risk (95% CI)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 (9.7)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

**Primary Result and Comparison With Previous Work**

Our results demonstrate that Pip, a novel mobile DHP that combines both human HCs and technology, is feasible to use to engage patients during their perioperative journey. Pip engagement was also associated with reduced hospital LOS. Of the patients who attended ≥1 HC session, over two-thirds completed the program, which is far better than industry benchmarks. As the mean age of our Pip cohort was 63 (range 20-84) years, this demonstrates great engagement and feasibility across many ages.

There are multiple DHPs that have been developed in recent years, some focusing on chronic medical conditions or symptom monitoring [8,22]. There are also other mobile DHPs that are designed to provide enhanced recovery after surgery protocol guidance, presurgical instructions, and patient adherence to said protocols to help improve outcomes for both patient and hospital [13,23-25]. However, this is one of the first perioperative DHPs to involve a human-HC interaction to help allay patients' anxiety, alleviate clinical and administrative burden, and digitize perioperative protocols and instructions, not only through the preoperative period but also in the postoperative setting.

Our primary outcomes focused on human-technology and human-human engagement [26], that is, how the user interacts with both the technology and the emotional response to the human interaction. The excellent short-term user experience patient satisfaction scores and net promoter scores demonstrate high patient satisfaction and the commercializability of the product. Over 95% (93/95) of patients were satisfied with Pip and would recommend it. Pip generated impressive patient satisfaction scores when discussing patient-HC interaction, and nearly all respondents agreed that they would refer a friend or colleague going through surgery to use Pip. Furthermore, the patient capture rate and DHP use are far in excess of industry benchmarks. As 70% (97/138) of the patients who proceeded to surgery completed the program, this is also an advantage to health systems for cost reduction with shorter LOS and decreased complications with improved optimization.

Positive comments on the use of Pip in the perioperative journey supported that both the HC and the DHP, in concert with the HC, helped to relieve anxiety, hold patients accountable using encouragement, and empower patients to take responsibility for their care. These comments reflect observations that high-level engagement, representing a partnership for shared leadership, is very important [27]. Furthermore, the patients’ desire to be not only heard (as a token of involvement) but listened to (reflecting a deeper conversation addressing the core issues at the center of the patient’s thoughts) is essential to continued patient engagement with the platform [28].

An interesting finding was the significant LOS reduction with Pip use. While impressive, we acknowledge that this is a small cohort and the study was not powered for this outcome. Nevertheless, using a marginal structural model with SIPTW, the sample size is preserved close to the original data and produces an appropriate estimation of the main intervention effect while maintaining an appropriate type I error rate. Pip was significantly associated with a 24% reduction in postoperative LOS (mean ratio 0.76; 95% CI 0.62-0.93), and Pip was associated with 49% and 17% lower risk in readmissions at 7 and 30 days (though not statistically significant). Though we have matched for age, procedure, and perioperative risk score and feel that the likely effect is the Pip intervention, further studies powered for these outcomes are necessary. As all patients in the Pip and standard of care cohorts attended our perioperative risk stratification and optimization clinic, these findings may be even more pronounced when a robust perioperative clinic is not readily available in smaller health systems or when patients have limited access to care.

https://periop.jmir.org/2024/1/e52125

JMIR Perioper Med 2024 | vol. 7 | e52125 | p.35

(page number not for citation purposes)
Furthermore, we feel that the personalized contact from the HC offers advantages over other content-only DHPs. The DHP and HC combination, personalized optimization protocols, and high satisfaction correlate with positive patient outcomes. Further studies examining the type and frequency of Pip DHP or HC interaction based on patient comorbidity would offer interesting insights into more widespread deployment of the DHP and HC resources for those most likely to benefit.

Limitations
This study has several limitations. Because all patients were computer literate and had ready access to smartphones, there may have been a participation bias that influenced this feasibility study. Adding a web-based interface or the ability to add a caregiver could reduce the technological barrier for some patients. Additionally, those patients who chose to participate in Pip may have contributed to selection bias for patients who are more motivated to optimize before surgery. Our patient satisfaction data are limited to descriptive statistics, and further information will be collected in the future. Additionally, the satisfaction question assessing the HC was framed positively, and this may have skewed the patient rating. Regarding secondary end points, while the LOS reduction is significant and the readmission rate reduction trends reasonably, this study was neither designed nor powered for these outcomes. Additionally, because many referrals took place within the health system network, there may have been other factors contributing to these outcomes. Further study is required with a larger cohort designed to examine both clinical outcomes and PROs.

Conclusions
In summary, Pip is a novel mobile health care digital platform that combines human HCs and preoperative optimization content that is feasible to engage surgical patients during their perioperative journey, with high patient enrollment and very high engagement with the HCs. Patient satisfaction was high for those participating in Pip. When compared to a similar cohort without Pip, surgical patients that participated in Pip experienced a reduced LOS in our feasibility study. Further studies are required to better assess the clinical and PRO impacts of the use of Pip or similar DHPs combined with HCs during the perioperative journey, as the use of an HC may offer improved patient-centered outcomes.
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Abstract

Background: Exposure to opioids after surgery is the initial contact for some people who develop chronic opioid use disorder. Hence, effective postsurgical pain management, with less reliance on opioids, is critical. The Perioperative Opioid Quality Improvement (POQI) program developed (1) a digital health platform leveraging patient-survey-reported risk factors and (2) a postsurgical pain risk stratification algorithm to personalize perioperative care by integrating several commercially available digital health solutions into a combined platform. Development was reduced in scope by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Objective: This pilot study aims to assess the screening performance of the risk algorithm, quantify the use of the POQI platform, and evaluate clinicians’ and patients’ perceptions of its utility and benefit.

Methods: A POQI platform prototype was implemented in a quality improvement initiative at a Canadian tertiary care center and evaluated from January to September 2022. After surgical booking, a preliminary risk stratification algorithm was applied to health history questionnaire responses. The estimated risk guided the patient assignment to a care pathway based on low or high risk for persistent pain and opioid use. Demographic, procedural, and medication administration data were extracted retrospectively from the electronic medical record. Postoperative inpatient opioid use of >90 morphine milligram equivalents per day was the outcome used to assess algorithm performance. Data were summarized and compared between the low- and high-risk groups. POQI use was assessed by completed surveys on postoperative days 7, 14, 30, 60, 90, and 120. Semistructured patient and clinician interviews provided qualitative feedback on the platform.

Results: Overall, 276 eligible patients were admitted for colorectal procedures. The risk algorithm stratified 203 (73.6%) as the low-risk group and 73 (26.4%) as the high-risk group. Among the 214 (77.5%) patients with available data, high-risk patients were younger than low-risk patients (age: median 53, IQR 40-65 years, vs median 59, IQR 49-69 years, median difference five years, 95% CI 1-9; P=.02) and were more often female patients (45/73, 62% vs 80/203, 39.4%; odds ratio 2.5, 95% CI 1.4-4.5; P=.002). The risk stratification was reasonably specific (true negative rate=144/200, 72%) but not sensitive (true positive rate=10/31, 32%). Only 39.7% (85/214) patients completed any postoperative quality of recovery questionnaires (only 14, 6.5%
patients beyond 60 days after surgery), and 22.9% (49/214) completed a postdischarge medication survey. Interviewed participants welcomed the initiative but noted usability issues and poor platform education.

Conclusions: An initial POQI platform prototype was deployed operationally; the risk algorithm had reasonable specificity but poor sensitivity. There was a significant loss to follow-up in postdischarge survey completion. Clinicians and patients appreciated the potential impact of preemptively addressing opioid exposure but expressed shortcomings in the platform’s design and implementation. Iterative platform redesign with additional features and reevaluation are required before broader implementation.
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patient-oriented research; patient-reported outcome measures; risk prediction; pain; individualized risk; surgery; anesthesia; opioid analgesia; short-term opioid use; care planning; digital health platforms

Introduction

Background

The ongoing opioid overdose epidemic has contributed to unprecedented and unnecessary deaths, with an estimated 100,306 deaths from prescription and illegal opioid use in the United States in the 12 months before April 2021 [1] and 5360 deaths in Canada in the first 9 months of 2022 [2]. For many patients with an opioid use disorder, the perioperative period represents the source of initial exposure (>6% compared to 0.4% in a control cohort without surgery in the United States) [3]. Hence, effective postoperative pain management, with less reliance on the prescription of opioids, could be a valuable mechanism to reduce the development of subsequent opioid use disorder. Postsurgical opioids are most frequently prescribed by the surgeon and followed up by the patient’s primary care physician [4]. Anesthesiologists are uniquely positioned to manage acute postoperative pain effectively with multimodal analgesia to decrease perioperative opioid exposure and prevent subsequent persistent opioid use [3].

Perioperative health care is being optimized through enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) pathways [4-6], multimodal analgesic plans [5,7,8], and regional anesthesia techniques [9]. Further opportunities to improve postsurgical pain trajectories are offered by prehabilitation programs [10-12], our developing understanding of the risks of persistent postsurgical pain [13-17], and the feasibility of accessing and analyzing large volumes of data. A critical step is identifying patients at high risk of significant postsurgical pain and long-term opioid use [3].

The Perioperative Opioid Quality Improvement (POQI) program was designed to address the ongoing opioid use epidemic in British Columbia, where opioid use disorder continues to be one of the most pressing public health concerns. Recent studies have highlighted the scale of the local opioid problem and highlighted the case for addressing opioid risk during routine clinical care, including surgery: 12% of our population received an opioid prescription in 2017, with the number of people who receive a high dose (>90 morphine milligram equivalents [MME]/day) increasing during the period from 2013 to 2017 [18]; patients with opioid overdose have often had previous clinical encounters for pain (50%) and surgery (5%) [19].

The POQI program was funded in 2019 by DIGITAL, Canada’s Global Innovation Cluster for digital technologies, as a consortium between digital health companies, health care organizations, and university partners. It aimed to develop and implement a postsurgical pain risk stratification algorithm by integrating several commercially available digital health solutions into a combined POQI digital health platform for prehabilitation and postsurgical care planning. The COVID-19 pandemic adversely impacted the ability to engage clinicians and patients in co-designing and testing the solution iteratively. Hence, the project faced significant delays, and the scope of the POQI platform development was reduced. Specifically, planned features for 2-way communication and personalization of educational information for patients were not included in the prototype tested in this study.

Objectives

The specific objectives of the pilot deployment of the POQI platform were to assess (1) the screening performance of the risk stratification algorithm to facilitate subsequent risk score optimization and (2) the use, utility, and perceived benefit of the POQI platform among end users (clinicians and patients).

Methods

Study Design and Approval

The study involved the design, implementation, and pilot evaluation of the POQI digital health platform at Providence Health Care’s (PHC’s) St. Paul’s Hospital in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The target users were clinicians and patients. The patient population for pilot-testing had undergone a designated set of colorectal surgeries; this population was selected because the colorectal surgical clinic was an early adopter of an electronic health history questionnaire (HHQ) upon which the platform expanded. As a result of this initiative, the Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine at PHC established a new Transitional Pain Clinic for patients at risk of persistent postoperative pain or opioid use after surgery. It held weekly clinics during the study period and continued to serve St. Paul’s Hospital patients after the study concluded.

The POQI platform incorporated an algorithm [20] that classified patients as low risk or high risk for persistent postsurgical pain and long-term opioid use. Clinicians used this classification to assign patients to low-risk or high-risk pathways for personalized prehabilitation, patient education, and care planning. Specifically, patients were told that there were resources that they could use to learn about pain and nonpharmacologic strategies for pain management and that they
could keep track of their medication use and pain scores over time in the system. The performance of this risk stratification was evaluated based on observed postoperative inpatient opioid use. The clinician and patient user experiences were evaluated using mixed methods.

**Ethical Considerations**

The University of British Columbia PHC Research Ethics Board determined this work to be a quality improvement project (reviewed on October 13, 2020), for which they do not require ethical review under Article 2.5 of the Canadian Tri-Council Policy Statement [21]. Hence, this project was run as a quality improvement pilot project governed by Privacy Impact Assessment and Security Threat and Risk Assessment. This manuscript adheres to the SQUIRE 2.0 (Standards for Quality Improvement Reporting Excellence) reporting guidelines [22].

**The POQI Digital Health Platform**

Development of the POQI platform combined existing technologies from 3 industry partners (Figure 1): a preoperative survey and POQI platform for low-risk patients (POQI-L), supplied by Thrive Health; a POQI platform for high-risk patients (POQI-H), supplied by Careteam Technologies; and a data broker, supplied by Excelar Technologies (also incorporating Xerus Medical from 2021). Additional components were identified and developed based on the needs of the clinical implementation partners (the anesthesiologists and perioperative care team at St. Paul’s Hospital). The platform’s original scope of development work was scaled back due to resource and time constraints during the COVID-19 pandemic. The resultant POQI platform used in this study should be considered an initial prototype. Original development plans included (1) additional iterations of user testing and design refinement; (2) additional features, such as 2-way communication between patients and clinicians; and (3) personalization of educational materials to meet patients’ needs optimally.

**Figure 1.** Workflow in the perioperative quality improvement (POQI) platform showing the integration of clinical and patient-reported data from patient-facing components and the electronic medical record (EMR) integrated by a data broker. PHN: personal health number; PII: personally identifiable information; POQI-H: POQI platform for high-risk patients; POQI-L: POQI platform for low-risk patients; QoR: quality of recovery.

The prototype POQI platform allowed for the collection of patient-specific data, including a presurgical HHQ (questions selected as risk factors for modeling are presented in Multimedia Appendix 1) and patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) at baseline. Furthermore, data were collected postoperatively using quality of recovery-15 (QoR-15) questionnaires [23] and additional PROM surveys to collect self-reported medication use and pain (scores). The platform was linked to an automated export from the Cerner electronic medical record (EMR) system (Cerner Corp), which allowed for collecting surgery details and oral and intravenous opioid use data from inpatient medication administration records.

Initial HHQ data were used to stratify patients for risk of persistent postsurgical pain and opioid use, using a previously
developed risk score, which was based on the data collected from 122 patients who underwent colorectal surgery; 22 (18\%) of them had high postoperative opioid use, which was strongly associated with a history of chronic pain, substance use disorder, and open surgery [20]. Patients were categorized into high-risk and low-risk groups using a point-based prediction model that considered 11 risk factors with different weights [20]: substance use disorder (risk score weight=5); current prescription of opioid (risk score weight=5), benzodiazepine (risk score weight=4), or antidepressant (risk score weight=4); recreational drug use (risk score weight=4); history of chronic pain (risk score weight=4), anxiety or panic attacks (risk score weight=2), depression (risk score weight=2), or poorly controlled pain after surgery (risk score weight=2); female sex (risk score weight=2); and age <40 years (risk score weight=1; refer to relevant HHQ questions in Multimedia Appendix 1). The algorithm flagged a patient as high risk if the risk score was >7 out of 35, after which a clinician manually onboarded the patient to the POQI-H platform or confirmed that they should remain on the POQI-L platform. The clinician could override the algorithm’s proposed risk label if they deemed it clinically appropriate. In addition, clinicians could use their clinical judgment to manually onboard patients directly to POQI-H after the St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Clinic consultation, even when no electronic HHQ data were available.

High-risk patients were given a care plan that provided them with education about pain and opioid management and prompted them to record their medication use and pain scores (refer to the Study Design and Approval section for details). Some high-risk patients were also seen preoperatively in St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Clinic for prehabilitation, education, and pain management planning when the responsible clinician deemed it appropriate. Postoperatively, high-risk patients were flagged by St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Clinic providers for closer follow-up by the Acute Pain Service clinicians in the hospital.

Regardless of the risk categorization, patients who used a significant quantity of opioids postoperatively (>90 MME) were also followed by St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Service for optimization of their postdischarge pain management and opioid weaning; 90 MME was chosen as the threshold for referral, as it is recommended in the 2017 Canadian Guideline for Opioids for Chronic Non-Cancer Pain that patients using >90 MME per day be weaned to the lowest effective dose, potentially including discontinuation [24].

**Participants and Recruitment**

Pilot use of the POQI platform was initiated at St. Paul’s Hospital in December 2021 and formally adopted on January 1, 2022. The target population for pilot-testing included patients undergoing a designated set of colorectal surgeries during the active enrollment period (Multimedia Appendix 2) and excluded patients who underwent screening and minimally invasive diagnostic procedures such as endoscopies. Patients who had a surgery that was not included in the designated set or had undergone procedures with a surgical time of <20 minutes were excluded. Furthermore, patients who underwent surgery before January 1, 2022, were excluded, as the complete POQI platform implementation was not available for clinical use until then. Only the surgical encounter closest to the most recently recorded HHQ was considered when patients had multiple procedures.

Eligible patients were enrolled for the pilot through routine clinical care by the medical office assistant in surgical clinics (Figure 2). Postoperative data collection continued for up to 120 days after surgery, with surveys potentially completed on postoperative days 7, 14, 30, 60, 90, and 120.

**Figure 2.** Clinical workflow of the perioperative quality improvement platform as piloted at St. Paul’s Hospital. This figure illustrates the flow of patients through their perioperative care journey and delineates which pieces the system performs and when the patient is involved in this process; it shows key decision points, such as when the patient is risk stratified before their procedure and whether patients require enhanced follow-up after discharge. A poor patient-reported outcome measure (PROM) score (bottom right) was indicated if the patient reported having an unplanned hospital admission for pain, having to seek urgent care for pain, or if they were still taking opioids beyond postoperative day 7. HHQ: health history questionnaire; MOA: medical office assistant; OR: operating room.

**Data Collection and Management**

The patient-specific data, including preoperative baseline HHQ, QoR-15 questionnaires, and PROM surveys, were fed directly to the data broker from the respective POQI-L or POQI-H platforms. The surgery details and opioid use data from the medication administration record were extracted from the EMR. These data were made available in a data lake by the Excelar...
data broker for analysis. The unifying variables used to link the multiple platforms were the patient’s personal health number and the ThriveID, assigned at the initial onboarding for HHQ completion. Data for this evaluation were aggregated and deidentified (Figure 2). The deidentified data sets were then exported to the research team for analysis.

**Outcomes**

**Risk Stratification**

To evaluate the risk stratification, we elected to focus on inpatient opioid use. Analyzing long-term opioid use was not possible: records of opioids dispensed from the provincial medication system (PharmaNet) were not made available due to provincial policy constraints at the time, and patient self-report was deemed to be unfeasible and incomplete or biased. Therefore, the primary outcome used to evaluate the accuracy of the risk stratification was based on inpatient daily opioid use, using a threshold of >90 MME per day to indicate high opioid use, in line with the recommendations for opioid therapy and chronic noncancer pain [24]. MME was computed by multiplying the dosage of opioids delivered to the patient with the MME conversion factor of the corresponding drug and route of administration (Multimedia Appendix 3). For oral methadone, the MME conversion factor varies with the dosage administered per day; consequently, an aggregation algorithm was used to calculate the total methadone administered per day.

Patient-controlled analgesia was typically used for in-hospital intravenous opioid administration. Nurses regularly recorded the number of doses delivered to the patient, and the patient-controlled analgesia pump was reset every 12 hours at the end of their shift. The net amount of drug delivered to the patient was computed using the number of doses and the amount of drug in each dose. The MME values from intravenous and oral administration were then summed for every patient over a 24-hour period, starting at 6 AM and ending at 6 AM the following day.

EMR data structures and export limitations prevented us from including MMEs of drugs delivered through continuous opioid infusion or boluses; these patients were excluded from MME evaluation. Intraoperative opioids were not included when computing MME/day; that is, on the day of surgery, only opioids administered after the surgery up to 6 AM the following day were included for the MME/day calculation.

**Use, Utility, and Perceived Benefit**

The user experience outcomes of use, utility, and perceived benefit were evaluated using mixed methods.

Use was measured quantitatively by evaluating both uptake and attrition with the platform. Uptake was measured by the number of patients completing the HHQ survey and the number completing the preoperative baseline QoR-15. Attrition was evaluated by measuring continued use of the system postoperatively, that is, by the number of patients completing at least 1 postoperative QoR-15 survey, at least 1 PROM survey, and their postoperative data collection period up to the 90-day mark. Utility and perceived benefit were evaluated through a series of semistructured interviews with both patients and clinicians via Zoom (Zoom Video Communications). To obtain a representative sample, a randomly selected group of 10 patients deemed high risk for significant postsurgical pain and a random group of 10 patients deemed low risk for significant postsurgical pain were contacted approximately 1 week after hospital discharge and invited to participate. For clinicians, we included anesthesiologists and nurses in St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Clinic and aimed for a sample of 5 clinicians.

Brief (approximately 10-15 minutes) interviews focused on three domains: (1) experience with the platform technologies, (2) perceived benefit of the platform for the health care experience, and (3) feedback or concerns about the platform (Multimedia Appendix 4). Interviews were conducted in a safe environment of mutual respect and facilitated by a medical student (SS) assisting with the project. Transcripts were automatically obtained from Zoom and downloaded from the videoconferencing platform for all interviews. A research team member (MDW) thematically analyzed the transcripts using NVivo (QSR International).

**Additional Secondary Outcomes**

Additional secondary outcomes included emergent readmissions; pain scores over the first 3 postoperative days; and continued opioid use at 30, 60, and 90 days, collected through the additional PROM surveys. To determine the number of patients who had emergent readmissions, we filtered the inpatient and emergency department visit data sets for patients with prior surgery. We confirmed that the admission time in the new visit was after the discharge time following the surgery. As inpatients could have had nonemergent readmissions for scheduled procedures and not all emergent visits require admissions, only the inpatient visits categorized as “urgent/emergent” and the patients admitted after emergency visits were included. The data set was split into readmissions within 30 days and readmissions within 180 days after discharge.

**Statistical Analysis**

The available data were summarized for high- and low-risk patients, including patient count, age distribution, surgical wait time (time to surgery after referral for surgical care), procedure duration, length of hospital stay, the identified risk factors from the HHQ (refer to The POQI Digital Health Platform section), preoperative and postoperative QoR-15 scores, the proportion of the population that completed the QoR-15, length of follow-up, the number of emergent readmissions, in-hospital opioid use in MME/day, and most prevalent surgeries. Frequency data are reported as n/N (%); the denominator N changes due to data linking issues and loss of follow-up during the study period.

Due to the small sample size, data for low- and high-risk groups were compared using nonparametric statistical tests: the Fisher exact test for counts and the Mann-Whitney U test for continuous data. A logistic regression of all risk factors for high in-hospital opioid use was performed to generate adjusted odds ratios (ORs), reported with 95% CIs. Analyses were performed using Python (version 3.10; Python Software Foundation):
Pandas (version 1.5.0; Wes McKinney), SciPy (version 1.9.3; Enthought), and NumPy (version 1.23.3) were used for data cleaning, processing, and analysis; Matplotlib (version 3.6.0) was used to generate plots; and Openpyxl (version 3.0.10) was used to create analysis reports. R software (version 4.2.2; The R Foundation) was used for statistical comparisons.

The accuracy of the risk stratification was assessed to determine if the algorithm was sensitive enough to categorize patients based on their health history. This was achieved by constructing confusion matrices using the high- and low-risk labels generated by the risk prediction algorithm (using HHQ data, not POQI-L or POQI-H enrollment labels) and the outcome, that is, high (>90 MME/day) and low (≤90 MME/day) opioid use. These data were used to estimate sensitivity, specificity, false negative rate, false positive rate, and positive and negative likelihoods.

Figure 3. Platform uptake, attrition, and data completeness in high-risk and low-risk patients. EMR: electronic medical record; HHQ: health history questionnaire; MAR: medication administration record; QoR: quality of recovery.

Results

Population

A total of 276 eligible patients were admitted for one of the colorectal procedures selected for inclusion in the study at St. Paul's Hospital between January 01, 2022, and September 30, 2022, and completed the HHQ before surgery (Figure 3). The denominators vary in the result tables due to the selective completion of surveys and the availability of linked data.
Risk Stratification Characteristics

Of the 276 patients, the risk stratification algorithm identified 203 (73.6%) patients as low risk and 73 (26.4%) as high risk. The most common surgeries for low-risk patients were laparoscopic resection of the anterior colon, transanal resection of a rectal lesion by assisted microsurgery, and laparoscopic resection of the bowel. The most common surgeries for high-risk patients were laparoscopic resection of the anterior colon, laparoscopic resection of the bowel, and lysis of adhesions.

The most substantial differences in risk factors between the high-risk and low-risk groups were history of depression (OR 29.4, 95% CI 9.2-125; risk score weight=2), antidepressant prescription (OR 23.4, 95% CI 7.9-85.2; risk score weight=4), current opioid prescription (OR 20.4, 95% CI 4.2-196.4; risk score weight=5), and history of chronic pain (OR 19.4, 95% CI 6.9-63.3; risk score weight=4; Table 1).

Table 1. Risk factor distribution among cohort and risk groups, with odds ratios for being in the high-risk group. While risk factor details were not available in all cohort patients, the label from the calculation was available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Total sample (N=214), n (%)</th>
<th>Low-risk group (n=161), n (%)</th>
<th>High-risk group (n=53), n (%)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance use disorder</td>
<td>9 (4.2)</td>
<td>3 (1.9)</td>
<td>6 (11.3)</td>
<td>6.6 (1.4-42.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current opioid prescription</td>
<td>13 (6.1)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>11 (20.8)</td>
<td>20.4 (4.2-196.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepine prescription</td>
<td>9 (4.2)</td>
<td>3 (1.9)</td>
<td>6 (11.3)</td>
<td>6.6 (1.4-42.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressant prescription</td>
<td>28 (13.1)</td>
<td>5 (3.1)</td>
<td>23 (43.4)</td>
<td>23.4 (7.9-85.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational drug use</td>
<td>29 (13.6)</td>
<td>10 (6.2)</td>
<td>19 (35.8)</td>
<td>8.3 (3.3-22.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of chronic pain</td>
<td>29 (13.6)</td>
<td>6 (3.7)</td>
<td>23 (43.4)</td>
<td>19.4 (6.9-63.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of anxiety</td>
<td>46 (21.5)</td>
<td>18 (11.2)</td>
<td>28 (52.8)</td>
<td>8.8 (4.0-19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of depression</td>
<td>27 (12.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>23 (43.4)</td>
<td>29.4 (9.2-125.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of poorly controlled</td>
<td>26 (12.1)</td>
<td>11 (6.8)</td>
<td>15 (28.3)</td>
<td>5.3 (2.1-14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pain</td>
<td>90 (42.1)</td>
<td>59 (36.6)</td>
<td>31 (58.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (1.2-4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex</td>
<td>32 (15.0)</td>
<td>20 (12.4)</td>
<td>12 (22.6)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.8-4.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High-risk patients were younger than low-risk patients (age: median 53, IQR years, vs median 59, IQR years, median difference [MD] 5 years, 95% CI 1-9; P=.02) and were more often female (45/73, 62%, vs 80/203, 39.4%; OR 2.5, 95% CI 1.4-4.5; P=.002; Table 2). Furthermore, high-risk patients reported lower baseline (preoperative) QoR scores (median 122, IQR 91-136, vs median 131, IQR 116-140, MD 12, 95% CI 2-23; P=.02).
Table 2. Preoperative and surgical characteristics of the overall cohort and separate risk groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample (N=276)</th>
<th>Low-risk group (n=203)</th>
<th>High-risk group (n=73)</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Median difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (y), median (IQR)</td>
<td>59 (47-68)</td>
<td>59 (49-69)</td>
<td>53 (40-65)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5 (1 to 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.5 (1.4 to 4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>151 (54.7)</td>
<td>123 (60.6)</td>
<td>28 (38.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125 (45.3)</td>
<td>80 (39.4)</td>
<td>45 (61.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery type, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.5 (0.9 to 2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>183 (66.3)</td>
<td>140 (69.0)</td>
<td>43 (58.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>93 (33.7)</td>
<td>63 (31.0)</td>
<td>30 (41.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to surgery (days), median (IQR)[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-4.9 (-13.3 to 2.7)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of surgery (hours), median (IQR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.0 (-0.3 to 0.4)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative QoR-15[c] score, median (IQR)[d]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>12 (2 to 23)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\]Not applicable.

\[b\]Data available: total, n=267; low-risk patients, n=195; high-risk patients, n=75. This indicates the number included in the analysis (eg, surgical decision time is not available for all patients).

\[c\]QoR-15: quality of recovery-15.

\[d\]Data available: total, n=110; low-risk patients, n=77; high-risk patients, n=33. This indicates the number included in the analysis.

Postoperative Outcomes

Overall inpatient opioid use was not significantly different between the 2 risk groups, with a median of 20 IQR (10-45) MME/day in low-risk cases versus a median of 25 IQR (10-50) MME/day in high-risk cases (MD = -2, 95% CI -5 to 0; P=.10; Table 3). Similarly, no significant difference was observed in opioid use across the recovery profile of low- versus high-risk patients over the first 10 postoperative days (Figure 4). Our risk factors were not strong predictors for high MME/day: none of the ORs from logistic regression were significant (ie, 95% CI range included 1 for all predictors), which differs from our original model building cohort [20] (Table 4, right column).

Table 3. Inpatient opioid use in patients with patient-controlled analgesia or oral opioid medications (n=231)\[a\].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n=231)</th>
<th>Low-risk group (n=165)</th>
<th>High-risk group (n=66)</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Median difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MME[b]/day (mg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>24 (10-47)</td>
<td>20 (10-45)</td>
<td>25 (10-50)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-2 (-5 to 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MME (mg), median (IQR)</td>
<td>48 (15-145)</td>
<td>43 (15-130)</td>
<td>65 (18-237)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-10 (-38 to 1)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients using &gt;90 MME/day, n (%)</td>
<td>31 (13.4)</td>
<td>21 (12.7)</td>
<td>10 (15.1)</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.2 (0.5 to 2.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\]Some patients, not included here, had continuous opioid infusion only or no opioid medications.

\[b\]MME: morphine milligram equivalent.

\[c\]Not applicable.
Figure 4. Box plots of morphine milligram equivalents (MME) per day comparing high-risk and low-risk patients.
Table 4. Risk factor distribution among cohort and outcome groups, with the odds ratios for patients using >90 morphine milligram equivalent (MME) per day for which the presurgical health history questionnaire details were available. The adjusted odds ratios from the derivation cohort [20] are provided for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk factor</th>
<th>Total sample (n=201), n (%)</th>
<th>≤90 MME/day (n=177), n (%)</th>
<th>&gt;90 MME/day (n=24), n (%)</th>
<th>Unadjusted odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)a</th>
<th>Adjusted odds ratio in the derivation cohort [20] (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance use disorder</td>
<td>9 (4.5)</td>
<td>7 (4.0)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>2.2 (0.2-12.6)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.2-9.5)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.0-2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current opioid prescription</td>
<td>12 (6.0)</td>
<td>9 (5.1)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.4-11.8)</td>
<td>2.9 (0.5-12.4)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.7-1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepine prescription</td>
<td>9 (4.5)</td>
<td>8 (4.5)</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.0-7.4)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.0-4.4)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.8-1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressant prescription</td>
<td>28 (13.9)</td>
<td>23 (13.0)</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
<td>1.8 (0.5-5.5)</td>
<td>1.6 (0.4-6.2)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.7-1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational drug use</td>
<td>28 (13.9)</td>
<td>25 (14.1)</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.2-3.2)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.1-2.5)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.6-1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of chronic pain</td>
<td>28 (13.9)</td>
<td>24 (13.6)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
<td>1.3 (0.3-4.3)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.2-3.1)</td>
<td>1.6 (1.0-2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of anxiety</td>
<td>44 (21.9)</td>
<td>35 (19.8)</td>
<td>9 (37.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.9-6.5)</td>
<td>2.5 (0.8-7.5)</td>
<td>0.8 (0.5-1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of depression</td>
<td>26 (12.9)</td>
<td>22 (12.4)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.3-4.8)</td>
<td>0.8 (0.2-3.2)</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6-1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of poorly controlled pain</td>
<td>25 (12.4)</td>
<td>23 (13.0)</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.1-2.8)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.1-2.1)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.6-1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex</td>
<td>82 (40.8)</td>
<td>72 (40.7)</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.4-2.7)</td>
<td>0.8 (0.3-2.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.6-1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (&lt;40 years)</td>
<td>30 (14.9)</td>
<td>26 (14.7)</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.3-3.9)</td>
<td>1.2 (0.3-4.0)</td>
<td>1.0 (0.9-1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open surgery</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.2 (0.7-2.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aValues derived from multivariate logistic regression, including all other risk factors.
bNot applicable.

Readmissions and other postoperative outcomes did not differ between high- and low-risk groups, although the overall median postoperative QoR-15 score was higher in the low-risk group than in the high-risk group (MD 11, 95% CI 4-19; P=.002; Table 5).

Table 5. Postoperative outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Total (n=231)</th>
<th>Low-risk group (n=165)</th>
<th>High-risk group (n=66)</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Median difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total readmissions, n (%)</td>
<td>75 (32.5)</td>
<td>51 (30.9)</td>
<td>24 (36.4)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.5 (0.8 to 2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent readmissions (within 30 days of surgery), n (%)</td>
<td>20 (8.7)</td>
<td>13 (7.8)</td>
<td>7 (10.6)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.5 (0.5 to 4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent readmissions (30 to 180 days following surgery), n (%)</td>
<td>7 (3.0)</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.1 (0.3 to 12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of hospital stay (days), median (IQR)</td>
<td>4 (2-6)</td>
<td>4 (2-6)</td>
<td>5 (1-7)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>0 (~1 to 0)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall postoperative QoR-15 score, median (IQR)c</td>
<td>118 (100-133)</td>
<td>121 (107-134)</td>
<td>108 (89-128)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>11 (4 to 19)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aNot applicable.
cData available: total, n=85; low-risk patients, n=59; high-risk patients, n=26. This indicates the number included in the analysis.

**Risk Stratification Performance**

In terms of performance, with an incidence of opioid use of >90 MME/day as the primary outcome, the pilot risk stratification algorithm was reasonably specific (true negative rate=144/200, 72%) but not sensitive (true positive rate=10/31, 32%). These equate to a high false negative rate of 68% (21/31), with a false positive rate of 28% (56/200), a positive likelihood of 1.15, and a negative likelihood of 0.94.

**Postoperative Use of the POQI Platform**

Data are available for 214 (77.5%) of the 276 patients who completed the HHQ and were risk stratified by the POQI platform (low-risk patients: 161/203, 79.3%; high-risk patients: 53/73, 73%). Of the 276 patients, 85 (30.8%) completed any
postoperative QoR-15 questionnaire (low-risk patients: 59/203, 29.1%; high-risk patients: 26/73, 36%). Similarly, 31 (15.3%) of the 203 low-risk patients and 3 (4.1%) of the 73 high-risk patients reported any postoperative opioid use (Table 6).

Table 6. Postoperative use of the perioperative quality improvement (POQI) platform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total sample (n=276)</th>
<th>Low-risk group (n=203)</th>
<th>High-risk group (n=73)</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Median difference (95% CI)</th>
<th>Odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data available from preoperative HHQ, n (%)</td>
<td>214 (77.5)</td>
<td>161 (79.3)</td>
<td>53 (72.6)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>— b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at least 1 postoperative questionnaire, n (%)</td>
<td>85 (30.8)</td>
<td>59 (29.1)</td>
<td>26 (35.6)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of follow-up postsurgery (days), median (IQR)</td>
<td>25 (11-54)</td>
<td>24 (11-53)</td>
<td>29 (11-57)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed follow-up questionnaires at POD&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 31 to 60, n (%)</td>
<td>15 (5.4)</td>
<td>11 (5.4)</td>
<td>4 (5.5)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed follow-up questionnaires beyond POD 90, n (%)</td>
<td>3 (1.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (4.1)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients reporting postoperative medication use, n (%)</td>
<td>34 (12.3)</td>
<td>31 (15.3)</td>
<td>3 (4.1)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>HHQ: health history questionnaire.

<sup>b</sup>Not applicable.

<sup>c</sup>Data available: total, n=85; low-risk patients, n=59; high-risk patients, n=26. This indicates the number included in the analysis.

<sup>d</sup>POD: postoperative day.

Qualitative Interviews

We conducted feedback interviews with 3 (15%) patients (2 POQI-L users and 1 POQI-H user) of the 20 invited patients; most patients (17/20, 85%) approached declined to participate in this portion of the study. We interviewed all 4 clinicians (anesthesiologists and nurses who used both platforms) involved in the platform deployment in St. Paul’s Hospital Transitional Pain Clinic.

Perceived Benefit of the Platforms for the Health Care Experience

Patients recognized that the POQI-L had improved their health care experience by making them mindful of their behavior, such as “stating how I was feeling, anxiety about things, etc.” which gave them “a sense of agency” over their care. It also provided a sense of reassurance that the health care team was continually monitoring their health status after they returned home following hospital discharge. Similarly, the POQI-H user believed there was a potential benefit:

[The platform] provided people with resources to manage their pain well while they’re at home [with] an option to access further information [as needed]

The clinical users identified benefits of the POQI-L, which administered the HHQ to all patients as a screening and triage tool: clinicians reported that it was helpful to display the pain risk score and “to see whether they’re a high or low risk as a quick way to screen patients.” Integrating patient information in a single document was also helpful:

[It was] also useful as a way to gather all the patient’s medical history.

User Experience With the Platforms

Patients experienced issues using both platforms, although this may have resulted from poor communication of the purpose of the application and potential benefits for them:

I’m not sure what that tool is trying to be. [POQI-L user]

[…] I didn’t feel like I had much guidance in using [it]. [POQI-H user]

Furthermore, there was a lack of clarity in instructions for using both platforms; for example, the POQI-L users expressed frustration about redundant emails or SMS text messages, which were unclear about “what was supposed to be completed and when,” and the POQI-H user said as follows:

I wasn’t sure if I was supposed to initiate certain things, or if like somebody from my care team would go in.

Furthermore, the 2 POQI-L participants were unaware of their postoperative risk score and its details and viewed this as a
missed opportunity to benefit from understanding their personalized risk for significant postsurgical pain.

Similarly, usability issues during the initial deployment contributed to attrition among clinical users; for example, 1 clinician admitted that they had not signed patients up on the POQI-H for 4 months, as they did not find it easy to use, were not satisfied with the functionality, and could not quickly locate necessary information; another clinician had “stopped using [POQI-L] as a method to look up patients and filter them out to see who should be put on [POQI-H].” The clinicians who had used both platforms expressed concerns with quality assurance and usability:

I think both platforms have much potential when they’re working...[but]there have been many [issues] to deal with in the development of the programs, which have been both challenging and frustrating.

Both patients and clinicians expressed a desire for greater platform integration. One patient stated as follows:

[I] would have hoped that there would have been things populated in it [to] show the integration of services that I was accessing post-surgery.

Clinicians indicated that there should be a single platform with a unified vision; for example, a clinician stated as follows:

I want to be able to do everything from one platform; I don’t want to have to be on multiple different platforms. So that’s my ideal scenario.

Discussion

Principal Findings

A pragmatic risk prediction algorithm was used to categorize 276 patients who underwent colorectal surgery into high-risk or low-risk groups for significant postoperative pain. The algorithm’s performance was evaluated using a primary outcome threshold of >90 MME/day during in-hospital recovery: it was found to be reasonably specific (true negative rate=14/200, 72%) but not sensitive (true positive rate=10/31, 32%). Furthermore, the risk categorization was used to drive dedicated preoperative and postoperative patient surveys using the high-risk (POQI-H) or low-risk (POQI-L) platforms. Preoperative surveys, including HHQ, were completed by 214 (77.5%) of the 276 patients, but there was a significant loss to follow-up with postoperative surveys, including QoR-15, completed by only 85 (39.7%) of the 214 patients. Qualitative feedback from clinician and patient users indicated shortcomings in the design and implementation of the patient- and clinician-facing components of the POQI platform.

Comparison With Prior Work

The motivation was that POQI would establish a platform to support personalized multimodal pain management techniques and patient preparation or education to reduce reliance on opioids (both in-hospital and postdischarge opioid use) during recovery from surgery. Identifying those at most significant risk of postoperative pain and providing tailored care plans based on their risk levels may help reduce initial opioid consumption. A recent systematic review suggested that a higher risk of developing persistent postsurgical pain is associated with younger age, female sex, and preoperative pain [25], which are consistent with the characteristics observed in the patients classified as high risk by our algorithm (Table 2). Furthermore, a recent multicenter study in the United States identified preoperative opioid use as the most significant predictor of prolonged opioid use after surgery [26]. Again, this factor was a significant distinguishing characteristic of our high-risk patients, along with a history of depression, antidepressant use, and chronic pain (Table 2).

Virtual care solutions for patients in the postsurgical period, including web-based tools and mobile apps, can support tracking various postoperative outcomes, including prescription drug use. Although the development of perioperative eHealth or mobile health solutions for telemonitoring is still maturing [27], these technologies show promise as not only their implementation is feasible but they can also streamline clinical workflow and improve patient outcomes [28,29]. Web-based patient portals integrated with the EMR can improve patient satisfaction, enable more effective health care use [30], and improve outcomes such as glycemic control in patients with diabetes [31]. However, there are several barriers to successful implementation, as our experience with poor patient retention indicates (Figure 3). To improve patient engagement through an EMR portal, it is essential to avoid high attrition rates, which requires addressing the requirements of diverse patients, focusing on usability and functionality, and adopting implementation science approaches [32]; using apps can also have a positive impact [33]. Perioperative solutions must be designed with frequent and meaningful clinician and patient input and evaluated in large, robust clinical trials [27,29]. Particular attention is needed when developing and evaluating tools for vulnerable populations, such as patients with chronic pain issues and older patients, although a recent systematic review reported generally positive results from 7 studies on patients aged ≥65 years [34]. In contrast, our population was relatively younger, with a median age of 59 (IQR) (47-68) years. Furthermore, an evaluation of a patient-centric digital pain management app reported acceptable patient engagement and improved anxiety and pain catastrophizing in similarly aged patients who had experienced chronic pain of moderate to severe intensity for at least 3 months [33].

The lack of follow-up data prevented us from effectively evaluating or optimizing the risk stratification algorithm we implemented. The risk model was reasonably specific, based on in-hospital MME, but with poor sensitivity and a subsequent high false negative rate, as it failed to identify patients who may have benefited from the POQI-H platform. None of our 11 patient-reported preoperative risk factors had a significant adjusted OR for high in-hospital MME/day, in which the 95% CI range excluded 1 (Table 4). This indicates that by themselves, none of the risk factors would have predicted high postoperative opioid use in this cohort, although these are recognized risk factors. This contradicts the findings from our retrospective study in the same hospital, which found that a history of chronic pain and substance use disorder was associated with high postoperative opioid requirements [20]. The small sample sizes in both our retrospective and prospective
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cohorts may have limited our ability to detect these associations reliably in the chosen population. Alternatively, despite being evidence based [24], our selected threshold of >90 MME/day may not be optimal. Future work should explore other potentially self-reportable risk factors, such as open surgery, pain catastrophizing, or lack of planned regional anesthesia, as well as interactions between synergistic or antagonistic risk factors. Finally, data science approaches show promise in predicting postsurgical outcomes, with generally positive findings in a recent systematic review [35]. Such technology has been used to predict prolonged opioid use after orthopedic surgery [36] or estimate the risk of an adverse outcome within 30 days of an opioid dispensation [37]. These techniques may help refine local models, such as our algorithm, but we need more data at this stage.

Importantly, our platform was an amalgamation of various existing (or slightly adapted) technologies that lacked adequate workflow integration and did not adapt to varying clinical or patient needs to allow evaluation when there were any deviations from the predefined workflow. For example, we could not access clinically relevant long-term outcomes for many high-risk patients. Improving access to available administrative and clinical data could facilitate improved prediction performance using machine learning techniques [37].

Lessons Learned

We cannot report a fully realized solution due to a lack of integration with the provincial medication system and the reduced scope of the platform in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the problems that we encountered and the lessons learned during our implementation can benefit other research, specifically clinical and industry teams endeavoring to build perioperative virtual care solutions to improve postoperative opioid use after discharge. Any work addressing this critical public health problem should ensure frequent engagement of patient and clinical partners, including co-design [38], to confirm that the design addresses patient and provider needs and delivers meaningful benefits to patient care and health care practice.

Next, when including a research component in health care system technical development and implementation, it is essential to ensure that research end points are integrated into project plans. This ensures that industry partners and clinical teams contribute to and approve evaluation plans so that the teams understand and support each other’s priorities. We also suggest including all partners in frequent data quality assessments and using an objective committee to oversee project activities, focusing on system-level goals while enabling each partner to achieve their respective objectives.

Given the likelihood that the requirement for virtual care solutions in the perioperative setting will grow, preparing for the transition to a long-term sustainable implementation is essential [39,40]. This should leverage experiences from stakeholders; focus on user experience; and ensure data are collected, validated, and delivered to the right people at the right time to improve the quality of care. Feedback is essential to a learning health system [41]: process metrics, patient trajectories, and benchmarking tools will enable clinicians to learn from their patients. PROMs and patient-reported experience measures [42] will be fundamental to improving the quality of care provided, focusing on patient-relevant outcomes rather than only system-relevant ones and enabling the personalization of care.

Limitations

In addition to the implementation issues already discussed, we must acknowledge many limitations in the data that we have presented. First, restrictions to hospital access due to the COVID-19 pandemic care considerations leading up to and during the pilot recruitment period likely caused significant delays. It also hampered effective engagement between patients, the research team, clinical teams, and industry partners and disrupted the opportunity to refine the software solution through further design iterations.

Second, it is unclear from our data how patients used the information provided through the platform. The qualitative results from a limited number of patients willing to be interviewed and clinicians suggest that some patients glimpsed the potential value of the tool. However, they did not use or benefit from the educational materials and saw the platform as a survey tool rather than a virtual care platform. This may have contributed to the observed attrition rate and lack of interest in participating in usability interviews. Further design iterations were needed to respond to end user concerns and improve engagement in the platform. The lack of long-term follow-up was further compounded by technical issues and the lack of completed PROM survey data from patients. To prevent this from happening in the future, it may be better to engage and support patients’ needs through a prospective approach that uses a near real-time data pipeline and integrated interfaces directly into workflows at the point of care. The lack of bidirectional EMR integration is a limitation of our implementation. It likely contributed to our high attrition rates and compromised the quality of the data we could report on. As discussed, improving patient engagement through an EMR portal requires a more robust implementation approach than we could apply here.

Third, the primary aim of the algorithm to identify persistent postoperative opioid requirements could not be determined without access to prescription data to verify dispensed medications after discharge. Gaining such access using patient-directed or authorized access through the British Columbia Health Gateway was a project goal, and implementation was explored. However, it was found to be impossible due to provincial policy constraints. Hence, we cannot know whether the intervention impacted prolonged opioid use after surgery. Future studies should explicitly include long-term follow-up but may have to augment it with self-reports to capture the difference between dispensed and taken medications.

Finally, this analysis is limited due to a small sample size from a single center (including only 24, 11.9% of the 201 patients who used opioids >90 MME/day) and missing follow-up outcomes from many patients designated as high risk for significant postsurgical pain and opioid use. This is partly due to low engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic and
challenges in achieving the project’s objectives within a limited funding period. Similarly, we planned to recruit 10 patients from the POQI-L group, 10 from the POQI-H group, and 5 clinicians to participate in semistructured interviews. However, we only obtained feedback from 3 patients (2 POQI-L users and 1 POQI-H user) and 4 clinicians. A broader sample would have provided more insight into the shortcomings and potential benefits of the system and should be built into any future evaluation.

Again, this final limitation was, at least in part, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. On the other hand, the COVID-19 pandemic created a greater motivation for developing and implementing systems that support virtual care through the perioperative process. This may be particularly relevant in a hospital such as St. Paul’s Hospital, a tertiary care academic hospital with patients from all over British Columbia, a geographically vast Canadian province with a widely distributed population. Finally, pain management requires multidisciplinary care that may not be available in rural communities. A well-designed platform could fill this gap and enable patients to benefit from personalized risk prediction and virtual prehabilitation while overcoming potential resource constraints.

Conclusions

Our POQI platform categorized patients who underwent colorectal surgery into high-risk or low-risk groups for significant postoperative pain and opioid use, using a pragmatic risk prediction algorithm. The algorithm’s performance was reasonably specific but not sensitive in predicting in-hospital opioid requirements. However, a significant loss in follow-up with postdischarge surveys suggested shortcomings in the design and implementation of the platform, which may have been improved with additional development work and the opportunity to engage patients more comprehensively. Important lessons learned during implementation included the early and frequent engagement of patients and clinical partners in the design and evaluation process. Finally, POQI platform users appreciated its potential impact on reducing opioid exposure, streamlining perioperative care, and improving patient outcomes, suggesting a redesign and evaluation before wider implementation is desirable.
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Abstract

Background: Osteoarthritis is a significant cause of disability, resulting in increased joint replacement surgeries and health care costs. Establishing benchmarks that more accurately predict surgical duration could help to decrease costs, maximize efficiency, and improve patient experience. We compared the anesthesia-controlled time (ACT) and surgery-controlled time (SCT) of primary total knee (TKA) and total hip arthroplasties (THA) between an academic medical center (AMC) and a community hospital (CH) for 2 orthopedic surgeons.

Objective: This study aims to validate and compare benchmarking times for ACT and SCT in a single patient population at both an AMC and a CH.

Methods: This retrospective 2-center observational cohort study was conducted at the University of Colorado Hospital (AMC) and UCHealth Broomfield Hospital (CH). Cases with current procedural terminology codes for THA and TKA between January 1, 2019, and December 31, 2020, were assessed. Cases with missing data were excluded. The primary outcomes were ACT and SCT. Primary outcomes were tested for association with covariates of interest. The primary covariate of interest was the location of the procedure (CH vs AMC); secondary covariates of interest included the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) classification and anesthetic type. Linear regression models were used to assess the relationships.

Results: Two surgeons performed 1256 cases at the AMC and CH. A total of 10 THA cases and 12 TKA cases were excluded due to missing data. After controlling for surgeon, the ACT was greater at the AMC for THA by 3.77 minutes and for TKA by 3.58 minutes ($P<.001$). SCT was greater at the AMC for THA by 11.14 minutes and for TKA by 14.04 minutes ($P<.001$). ASA III/IV classification increased ACT for THA by 3.76 minutes ($P<.001$) and increased SCT for THA by 6.33 minutes after controlling for surgeon and location ($P=.008$). General anesthesia use was higher at the AMC for both THA (29.2% vs 7.3%) and TKA (23.8% vs 4.2%). No statistically significant association was observed between either ACT or SCT and anesthetic type (neuraxial or general) after adjusting for surgeon and location (all $P>.05$).

Conclusions: We observed lower ACT and SCT at the CH for both TKA and THA after controlling for the surgeon of record and ASA classification. These findings underscore the efficiency advantages of performing primary joint replacements at the
CH, showcasing an average reduction of 16 minutes in SCT and 4 minutes in ACT per case. Overall, establishing more accurate benchmarks to improve the prediction of surgical duration for THA and TKA in different perioperative environments can increase the reliability of surgical duration predictions and optimize scheduling. Future studies with study populations at multiple community hospitals and academic medical centers are needed before extrapolating these findings.

(JMIR Perioper Med 2024;7:e45126) doi:10.2196/45126
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Introduction
Hip and knee osteoarthritis (OA) are pervasive causes of disability and pain globally, and the burden of OA is expected to increase due to population aging and the rising prevalence of obesity [1]. Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) and total hip arthroplasty (THA) are 2 of the most common and well-accepted surgical interventions to improve quality of life for patients with end-stage joint deterioration [2]. Therefore, a considerable increase has been projected for TKA and THA cases (673% and 174%, respectively) from 2005 to 2030 in the United States [3]. The anticipated demand for joint replacements combined with the importance of the operating room (OR) in hospital revenue and margins emphasize the importance of identifying factors that decrease cost and maximize efficiency in the OR [4,5]. One such process is establishing benchmarks that are accurate predictors of surgical duration in order to improve hospital operations, optimize OR schedule modeling and management, reduce health care costs, and improve patient satisfaction and experience.

Prior efforts have been made to assess OR efficiency using mean anesthesia-controlled time (ACT) and surgery-controlled time (SCT) values [6]. ACT is defined as the sum of the time starting when the patient enters the OR until the patient is ready for surgical positioning. added to the time starting when the incision is closed and ending when the patient leaves the OR [7]. SCT is defined as the time from when the patient is ready for positioning to when the surgical sites are closed. Studies examining SCT for TKA found that computer-based estimations of historical performance were a better predictor of actual SCT than the estimates provided by surgeons, while assessments of heterogeneity of ACT and SCT based on current procedural terminology (CPT) codes have also highlighted the need for more granular prediction models [8,9]. Moreover, ACT and SCT at academic institutions may be increased because of teaching responsibilities for anesthesia and surgery trainees and may not reflect mean ACT and SCT for the same procedures in other settings. Furthermore, a spectrum of clinical and nonclinical factors could contribute to significant variation in case duration between surgeons [10,11]. This study will compare the ACT and SCT of THA and TKA between an academic medical center (AMC) and a community hospital (CH) for 2 orthopedic surgeons.

We hypothesize that after adjusting for surgeon, the ACT and SCT between an AMC and a CH will have a statistically significant difference for both knee and hip procedures.

Methods
Design
This retrospective 2-center observational cohort study was conducted at an AMC—the University of Colorado Hospital—and a university-affiliated CH—UCHealth Broomfield Hospital. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, hip and knee replacement surgeries were primarily performed at the AMC. However, during the pandemic, these surgeries were relocated to the CH from March 2020 through August 2020 and again in November 2020. Both orthopedic surgeons work with the same team of orthopedic surgery physician assistants and trainees (residents and fellows) at both locations. The University of Colorado Department of Anesthesiology staffs both the AMC and CH with an anesthesia care-team model consisting of supervising attending physicians and anesthesia providers such as certified registered nurse anesthetists, anesthesiology assistants (AAs), or anesthesiology resident physicians-in-training. The academic center also has student AAs who often work alongside certified registered nurse anesthetists and AAs. The CH does not have anesthesiology residents or student AAs present for any procedure. The practice for anesthesia at both locations includes primarily performing neuraxial anesthesia on both TKA and THA if patients are appropriate and amenable to this type of anesthetic. For TKA, single-shot adductor canal blocks were performed in the preoperative area before the patient was brought to the OR. In the OR, the neuraxial anesthetic or a general anesthetic was performed.

Eligibility Criteria
Inclusion criteria for the study included participants undergoing primary THA and TKA. These cases were performed by 2 fellowship-trained adult reconstructive orthopedic joint surgeons who operated at both the AMC and CH. The time frame for cases performed was from January 1, 2019, to December 31, 2020. Inclusion criteria included being aged older than 18 years and the procedure type was determined based on CPT codes billed for the case. Only CPT codes 27130 (THA) and 27447 (TKA) were assessed in this study. Exclusion criteria included cases with missing data required to calculate ACT and SCT.

Data Collection and Storage
Demographic data and time stamps for each case were collected from electronic medical records and stored securely on the AMC’s cloud drive.
ACT and SCT Calculation
The time stamps for In Room Time, Ready for Positioning and Prep Time, Incision Time, Close Time, and Out of Room Time were collected for each case. Ready for Positioning is defined as the point when the anesthesia team has completed their activities, signifying that the patient was prepared for surgical positioning. Ready for Positioning and Prep Time indicated that all presurgical anesthesia-related activities were completed and the surgical team could begin positioning the patient and performing surgical preparation. ACT was calculated based on ([Ready for Positioning and Prep Time] – [In Room Time]) + ([Out of Room Time] – [Close Time]). SCT was calculated based on ([Close Time] – [Ready for Positioning and Prep Time]).

Statistical Analysis
Descriptive statistics were performed using means and SDs for continuous variables, whereas counts and percentages were used for categorical variables. The primary outcome was the duration of ACT and SCT. Several independent variables were investigated for association with ACT and SCT in TKA and THA procedures. These independent variables include the location (AMC vs CH), surgeon identity (1 of 2 surgeons), American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) classification (dichotomized into ASA class I/II, representing mild to moderate systemic disease, vs ASA class III/IV, representing severe systemic disease), and anesthesia type (general vs neuraxial). Several multiple regressions were fit to assess relevant associations. The first tested association describes 4 multivariable linear regressions; for each outcome (ACT or SCT), separate multivariable linear regressions were fit for each surgery type (TKA or THA). Location and surgeon identity were included as independent variables. The second tested association is of 4 separate multivariable regressions; however, the set of modeled independent variables changes including location, surgeon identity, and ASA classification as covariates. The third tested association is of 4 separate multivariable regressions using location, surgeon identity, and anesthetic type as covariates.

Associations were considered statistically significant if the P values were less than α at the .05 level. $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$ are reported for multivariable regressions. $R^2$ characterizes the proportion of variability in the outcome explained by model covariates, thus providing an estimate of the predictive utility of the model. Adjusted $R^2$ likewise estimates the model’s predictive usefulness, with a correction for the number of independent variables. R (version 4.0.4; R Core Team) was used for all analyses.

Ethical Considerations
The study was reviewed by the University of Colorado Denver Institutional Review Board and the study was approved for exempt status (Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board Protocol 20-2987), as it involved an observational retrospective analysis of existing medical records and therefore did not require additional interventions or the collection of new data from human research participants. Given the exempt status of the study, the written consent requirements of participants were waived for this Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board Protocol. The original informed consent for the primary data collection allowed for secondary analyses without additional consent, as approved by the institutional review board. This study was designed and executed following the STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) guidelines for cohort studies (Multimedia Appendix 1). To ensure the confidentiality and privacy of human research participant data, all patient records used in this study were deidentified prior to analysis. As there were no interactions or additional interventions with the participants, compensation was not applicable, and therefore not provided.

Results
There were 1256 observations for the 2 surgeons at the AMC and CH from January 1, 2019, to December 31, 2020. There were 619 THA observations and 637 TKA observations. A total of 10 (1.6%) out of 619 THA cases and 12 (1.8%) out of 637 TKA cases had missing values and were excluded from the analyses (Figure 1). One TKA case was missing ASA classifications and was omitted for regression controlling for this variable. The data set included 21 bilateral procedures at the AMC and 3 bilateral procedures at the CH. Secondary CPT codes were documented for a total of 5 cases including 1 cystoscopy, 1 tendon repair, 2 arteriograms, and 1 total hip liner exchange. All of the cases with secondary CPT codes documented occurred at the AMC.
There were no significant differences between the AMC and CH patient groups for age, sex, and ASA classification (all \( P > .05 \); Table 1). For THA, 29.2% (130/445) of the cases performed at the AMC used general anesthesia, while 7.3% (12/164) of the cases performed at the CH used general anesthesia, despite no statistically significant difference in ASA classification. Results were similar for TKA, as 23.8% (109/457) of the cases performed at the AMC used general anesthesia, while 4.2% (7/168) of the cases performed at the CH used general anesthesia, despite no statistically significant difference in ASA classification. The observed average SCT was 14.61 minutes longer for surgeon 1 and 9.31 minutes longer for surgeon 2 at the AMC in comparison to the CH for THA procedures. Furthermore, the observed average SCT was 18.01 minutes longer for surgeon 1 and 14.37 minutes longer for surgeon 2 at the AMC in comparison to the CH for TKA procedures (Table 2). The values for ACT also consistently showed increased time at the AMC for both THA and TKA cases for both surgeons (Table 2).
Table 1. Patient demographics and case characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Cases performed at AMC&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n=902)</th>
<th>Cases performed at CH&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n=332)</th>
<th>P value&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years), mean (SD)</td>
<td>63.1 (12.5)</td>
<td>63.5 (10.4)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex, n (%)</td>
<td>n (59.1)</td>
<td>n (60.5)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure and its ASA&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; classification, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (AMC: n=445; CH: n=164)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>266 (59.8)</td>
<td>110 (67.1)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td>179 (40.2)</td>
<td>54 (32.9)</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKA&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt; (AMC: n=457; CH: n=168)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>261 (57.1)</td>
<td>107 (63.7)</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td>195 (42.7)</td>
<td>61 (36.3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure and its anesthetic classification, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA (AMC: n=445; CH: n=164)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anesthesia</td>
<td>130 (29.2)</td>
<td>12 (7.3)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>315 (70.8)</td>
<td>152 (92.7)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKA (AMC: n=457; CH: n=168)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General anesthesia</td>
<td>109 (23.8)</td>
<td>7 (4.2)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>348 (76.2)</td>
<td>161 (95.8)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing documentation</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>AMC: academic medical center.

<sup>b</sup>CH: community hospital.

<sup>c</sup>P values correspond to a hypothesis test for the association of the study variable with surgical location. Continuous variables are assessed via 2-tailed t test and dichotomous variables via a difference of proportions test.

<sup>d</sup>ASA: American Society of Anesthesiologists.

<sup>e</sup>THA: total hip arthroplasty.

<sup>f</sup>N/A: not applicable.

<sup>g</sup>TKA: total knee arthroplasty.

Table 2. Comparison of the mean (SD) ACT<sup>a</sup> and SCT<sup>b</sup> for total hip arthroplasty and total knee arthroplasty between surgeons and between operative settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and variable</th>
<th>Total hip arthroplasty</th>
<th>Total knee arthroplasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMC&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;, mean (SD)</td>
<td>CH&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;, mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT (min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>27.03 (12.97)</td>
<td>24.07 (8.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 2</td>
<td>25.18 (10.69)</td>
<td>20.98 (8.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT (min)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>116.46 (27.03)</td>
<td>101.85 (25.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 2</td>
<td>111.96 (31.7)</td>
<td>102.61 (23.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>ACT: anesthesia-controlled time.

<sup>b</sup>SCT: surgery-controlled time.

<sup>c</sup>AMC: academic medical center.

<sup>d</sup>CH: community hospital.

Location and surgeon identity were included as independent variables. After adjusting for surgeon, the mean ACT for THA at the AMC was 3.77 (95% CI 1.83-5.71) minutes longer than for the CH and 3.58 (95% CI 1.91-5.26) minutes longer for TKA (both P<.001; Table 3). After adjusting for surgeon, the mean SCT at the AMC was 11.14 (95% CI 6.02-16.26) minutes longer than for the CH and 10.23 (95% CI 5.43-15.03) minutes longer for TKA.
longer for THA and 14.04 (95% CI 8.43-19.65) minutes longer for TKA (both \( P < .001 \); Table 3) in comparison to the CH. Having a moderate to severe systemic disease (ASA class III/IV) increased the ACT by 3.76 (95% CI 2.00-5.51; \( P < .001 \)) minutes and SCT by 6.33 (95% CI 1.66-10.99; \( P = .008 \)) minutes for THA after adjusting for location and surgeon (Table 4). Having an ASA classification of III/IV did not significantly increase the ACT time for TKA (\( P = .08 \); Table 4). There was no significant difference noted for ACT and SCT between neuraxial anesthesia and general anesthesia (all \( P > .05 \); Table 5). For all models, the adjusted \( R^2 \) was less than 10%, indicating that a significant amount of the variation in ACT and SCT is not explained by hospital, surgeon, ASA classification, or anesthetic used.

**Table 3.** Multivariable linear regression coefficients for the association of ACT\(^a\) and SCT\(^b\) with hospital and surgeon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and variable</th>
<th>Total hip arthroplasty(^c)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total knee arthroplasty(^d)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>( P ) value</td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>21.42 to 25.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC(^e)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.83 to 5.71</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>−2.18</td>
<td>−3.98 to −0.38</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>−1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>104.43</td>
<td>99.04 to 109.83</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>102.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC(^f)</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>6.02 to 16.26</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>−3.12</td>
<td>−7.87 to 1.63</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>−10.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \)ACT: anesthesia-controlled time.

\( ^b \)SCT: surgery-controlled time.

\( ^c \)ACT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.033/0.030; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.029.

\( ^d \)SCT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.032/0.029; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.055.

\( ^e \)AMC: academic medical center.

**Table 4.** Multivariable linear regression coefficients for the association of ACT\(^a\) and SCT\(^b\) with ASA\(^c\), hospital, and surgeon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and variable</th>
<th>Total hip arthroplasty(^d)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total knee arthroplasty(^e)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>( P ) value</td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>20.02 to 24.24</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>20.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA class III/IV</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.00 to 5.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC(^f)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.58 to 5.42</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>−2.03</td>
<td>−3.81 to −0.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>102.18</td>
<td>96.56 to 107.80</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>101.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA class III/IV</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.66 to 10.99</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC(^f)</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>5.58 to 15.79</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>−2.87</td>
<td>−7.60 to 1.86</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>−10.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \)ACT: anesthesia-controlled time.

\( ^b \)SCT: surgery-controlled time.

\( ^c \)ASA: American Society of Anesthesiologists.

\( ^d \)ACT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.061/0.056; and total knee arthroplasty had 624 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.037/0.003.

\( ^e \)SCT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.043/0.039; and total knee arthroplasty had 624 observations and an \( R^2/R^2 \) adjusted value of 0.060/0.055.

\( ^f \)AMC: academic medical center.
Table 5. Multivariable linear regression coefficients for the association of ACTa and SCTb with anesthesia, hospital, and surgeon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and variable</th>
<th>Total hip arthroplastyc</th>
<th>Total knee arthroplastyd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMCe</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>105.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aACT: anesthesia-controlled time.
bSCT: surgery-controlled time.
cACT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.036/0.031; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.037/0.033.
dSCT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.033/0.028; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.058/0.054.
eAMC: academic medical center.

Discussion

Overview

A paucity of literature exists for benchmarking operative times in different surgical settings, and our study therefore aimed to refine the prediction of surgical case duration for THA and TKA between an academic center and a CH for the same orthopedic surgeons. Our results showed that both SCT and ACT were statistically significantly longer for primary hip and knee arthroplasty at the AMC compared with the CH. The mean ACT was higher at the AMC by less than 4 minutes for THA and TKA for both surgeons, and this modest increase in ACT when trainees are present is consistent with previous reports [12,13]. Therefore, the participation of anesthesia trainees at the AMC may elongate the ACT, these results are not clinically meaningful in the context of OR efficiency—decreases in ACT when regional anesthesia was used [19–21].

Furthermore, it is pragmatic to identify other factors that could affect OR efficiency (ie, type of anesthesia, performing secondary procedures during the joint replacement, or performing bilateral procedures). In this study, we observed no significant differences between the ACT or SCT for both surgical centers when comparing general anesthesia versus neuraxial anesthesia. The current literature offers mixed results performed with surgical resident or surgical fellow participation [15,16]. The R² values in our results (<10%, Tables 3-5) also indicate the existence of other covariates that were not adjusted for in our multiple linear regression modeling such as the presence of scrub technician trainees, anesthesia trainees, surgical trainees, or traveling nursing staff who are not regularly participating in orthopedic surgery cases at the hospital.

Therefore, understanding this cost of training surgical residents, nursing, and scrub technician staff can help OR managers find a balance between achieving scheduling and financial targets while exploring strategies to provide adequate educational opportunities.

### Table 5. Multivariable linear regression coefficients for the association of ACT and SCT with anesthesia, hospital, and surgeon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome and variable</th>
<th>Total hip arthroplasty</th>
<th>Total knee arthroplasty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimates (min)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Coefficient intercept</td>
<td>105.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuraxial anesthesia</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon 1</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aACT: anesthesia-controlled time.
bSCT: surgery-controlled time.
cACT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.036/0.031; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.037/0.033.
dSCT for total hip arthroplasty had 609 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.033/0.028; and total knee arthroplasty had 625 observations and an R²/R² adjusted value of 0.058/0.054.
eAMC: academic medical center.
of hip fractures [22]. ASA classification is also a significant predictor of length of stay cost for patients undergoing TKA [23,24]. In our study, there was an increase in ACT and SCT by approximately 4 and 6 minutes respectively for both surgical centers when the patient had moderate to severe systemic disease (ASA class III or IV) compared with patients with mild or no systemic disease (ASA class I or II). With over 3700 primary joint arthroplasty cases performed across the AMC’s hospitals per year, a 10-minute decrease in ACT and SCT per case could result in 37,000 available OR minutes, equating to greater than 200 additional orthopedic cases (at an average of 155 minutes per case).

Limitations

Our study has several limitations. One of the limitations of this study is the sample size. Even with 1234 cases, there was still an underrepresentation of patients with ASA classifications of I and IV. While we feel this sample represents the patient population that normally receives primary joint replacement surgery, a larger cohort would allow for a more granular analysis of each ASA classification group. A second limitation is associated with the generalizability of this study. Our analysis was performed at 1 AMC and 1 CH. Only 2 surgeons were tracked for this study due to their unique movement between the 2 clinical sites. A larger cohort of surgeons with a similar multisite practice pattern could provide data that would be more generalizable. Furthermore, the perioperative environment and considerations at other academic and CHs could lead to different results. Therefore, the increased difference seen in SCT in our study could be a result of differences in OR culture between academic institutions and CHs, along with increased time required for on-the-job education for trainees in nursing and scrub technicians. Individual variation in the documentation of the surgery process could also be a confounding variable for the calculation of ACT and SCT. In addition, the decision-making process regarding the choice of surgical center involves a complex interplay of patient and surgical factors, some of which may not have been captured in our analysis. For example, the selection of cases for the academic center hospital may be influenced by factors such as case complexity, patient comorbidities, or surgeon preference. These potential biases could introduce uncontrolled variability into the ACT or SCT. Last, we define Ready for Positioning as the time point when anesthesia had completed its activities and when the patient was prepared for surgical positioning including completion of any additional intravenous lines or invasive monitoring if required for the procedure. However, other logistical factors may influence the actual commencement of surgery. Therefore, although our definition represents the point when anesthesia activities were complete, it does not imply the presence and readiness of the surgical team. Future directions of this study include assessing the effect of different levels of trainee and surgical nursing team involvement in our analysis, in addition to comparisons of cost and clinical outcomes between the 2 hospital locations and postoperative outcomes including complication rates.

Conclusions

OA is 1 of the 10 leading causes of disability in developed countries and the consequential growth in the volume of hip and knee replacement surgeries to manage end-stage OA will contribute to substantial and rising health expenditure [25,26]. Therefore, it is critical to optimize OR scheduling and management to maximize efficiency and decrease costs for both health systems and patients. As the demand for THA and TKA grows, it will be increasingly important to optimize OR efficiency for those surgeries. This study aims to validate and compare benchmarking times for ACT and SCT in a single patient population in both an academic center and a CH. One major application of these findings is that there is an efficiency benefit of performing primary joint replacements in our CH, as demonstrated by an average 16-minute reduction of SCT and a 4-minute reduction of ACT per case. This equates to a savings of approximately 80 minutes over the course of 4 surgical cases in a day, which could allow for the scheduling of another case. Such data can help to increase the reliability of surgical duration predictions and optimize scheduling to ultimately improve OR use, reduce cost, and improve patient experience.
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AA: anesthesiology assistant
ACT: anesthesia-controlled time
AMC: academic medical center
ASA: American Society of Anesthesiologists
CH: community hospital
CPT: current procedural terminology
OA: osteoarthritis
OR: operating room
SCT: surgery-controlled time
STROBE: Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology
THA: total hip arthroplasty
TKA: total knee arthroplasty
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