Careyva BA[1,2*]**, Singh J**[3]**, Goldberg A**[1,2]**, Johnson M**[1] **and Stello B**[1]

[1]*Department of Family Medicine, Allentown, PA, USA*

[2]*Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, USA*

[3]*Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, USA*

[*]**Corresponding author:** Beth A Careyva, MD, Department of Family Medicine, Lehigh Valley Health Network, 707 Hamilton St., 8th Floor, P.O. Box 1806, Allentown, PA 18105-1806, USA, Tel: +484-862-3059, Fax: +484-862-3059, E-mail: beth_a.careyva@lvhn.org

Received date: Apr 27, 2016, **Accepted date:** Apr 28, 2016, **Published date:** Apr 30, 2016

T e FDA de f nes pati M ‘ ϒĬγe╫

tools mailed directly to the patient or transmitted through a patient portal for those with the electronic medical record capacity to do so. On the date of the visit, PROs may be assessed in the waiting room via paper surveys, tablet computers, or computer kiosks. The tools may also be incorporated during the rooming process, administered by medical assistants or nurses, as an additional "vital sign" [6]. Once in the exam room, clinicians may administer PROs as paper or web-based tools or may enter them directly into the EMR. Immediately after the visit, patients may be given a survey to return at the next visit.

Additionally, PRO assessments may be measured longitudinally, to

9. Gwaltney CJ, Shields AL, Shi f man S (2008) Equivalence of electronic and paper-and-pencil administration of patient-reported outcome measures: a meta-analytic review. Value Health. 11: 322-333.

10. Dawson J, Doll H, Fitzpatrick R, Jenkinson C, Carr AJ (2010) T e routine use of patient reported outcome measures in healthcare settings. BMJ 340: c186.