

TITLE PAGE

**Owner-reported outcome measures in veterinary care for companion animal
orthopedic patients: An international online survey of veterinarians' expectations
and practices**

Heidi Radke,¹ MA, DrMedVet, DipIECVS, FRCVS; Tracy Y Zhu,² PhD; Christian
Knoll,² Dipl. Stat.; Matthew J. Allen,¹ MA, VetMB, PhD, MRCVS; Alexander Joeris,²
MD, MSc HEMP

¹ Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United
Kingdom

² Clinical Science, AO Innovation Translation Center, AO Foundation, Davos,
Switzerland

Corresponding author

Heidi Radke
Girton College, University of Cambridge
Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3 0JG, United Kingdom
Email: hr264@cam.ac.uk

Disclosures

A Joeris, C Knoll, and TY Zhu are employees of AO Foundation who provided funding
for this study. Parts of the study results have been published in a short abstract form in
the proceedings of the European Society of Veterinary Orthopaedics and Traumatology
(ESVOT) Congress, 5-8 May 2021.

24

25 **Acknowledgement**

26 H Radke, C Knoll, MJ Allen, and A Joeris designed the study; H Radke collected the
27 data; H Radke and C Knoll analyzed the data; H Radke, TY Zhu, and C Knoll interpreted
28 the data; H Radke, TY Zhu, and A Joeris drafted the manuscript; all authors revised and
29 approved the final article. The authors would like to thank Ms Cordula Blohm for her
30 contributions in data collection and analyses. This work was funded by AO Foundation
31 via AO VET.

32 **ABSTRACT**

33 **Objective**

34 To report veterinarians' familiarity with and perceptions of owner/observer-reported
35 outcome measures (OROMs) and their applications in routine clinical practice.

36 **Study design**

37 Cross-sectional online survey.

38 **Animals or Sample Population**

39 441 veterinarians with a caseload of companion animal orthopedic patients.

40 **Methods**

41 Respondents answered questions regarding their familiarity with and application of
42 OROMs. Respondents provided opinions on statements related to reasons for using or not
43 using OROMs in routine clinical practice, prerequisites to implement OROMs in routine
44 clinical practice, and whether they would implement OROMs in routine clinical practice
45 if adequate tools/technologies were available.

46 **Results**

47 Most (293/441, 66.4%) respondents felt familiarity with at least one OROM. Only 17.5%
48 (77 out of the 440 answering the question about the application of OROMs) applied
49 OROMs in routine clinical practice. The two main reasons for not using OROMs in
50 routine clinical practice were the lack of opportunity/feasibility and the lack sufficient
51 information/knowledge/experiences. User-friendliness, time efficiency, and
52 interpretability were considered the most important prerequisites for implementing
53 OROMs in routine clinical practice. If adequate tools/technologies were available,

266/439 (60.6%) respondents indicated that they would definitely implement OROMs in routine clinical practice.

Conclusion

Although most respondents were familiar with at least one OROM, fewer than one-fifth applied them in routine clinical practice. Most respondents were willing to implement OROMs in routine clinical practice if adequate tools/technologies were available.

Clinical Significance

Our results justify further investigations to improve the application of OROMs in routine clinical practice in veterinary care of companion animal orthopedic patients.

KEYWORDS

Canine, owner-reported outcome measures, observer-reported outcome measures, OROM, Surveys and Questionnaires

INTRODUCTION

Clinical outcomes are measurable changes in health, function, and/or quality of life that result from the care given to the patients.¹ Improving patient outcomes should be the ultimate goal for patient care, both in humans and animals.² Owner (observer)-reported outcome measures (OROMs) are validated questionnaires that provide semiquantitative scores based on the subjective evaluation of companion animals' health, function, and/or quality of life by their owners/carers.⁵ Outcomes from the perspective of the animal's owner/carer are increasingly incorporated in evidence-based veterinary studies through the use OROMs.

There are several ways in which OROMs can add value to veterinary care.^{2,3} Implementing OROMs in routine veterinary clinical practice can enhance the understanding of the treatment effects on clinical outcomes and quality of life (QoL) of companion animal patients from the owner's perspective.² The use of OROMs can facilitate the communication with owners⁴ and enhance the effectiveness of consultations without increasing consultation time.⁵ Applying OROMs may also be an effective way of increasing owner engagement and satisfaction.³

It is important to understand the attitudes of veterinarians regarding the application of OROMs in routine clinical practice and the barriers that may have limited their use to design strategies that facilitate the adoption of OROMs. The objectives of this cross-sectional online survey of veterinarians with a caseload of companion animal orthopedic patients were to report 1) veterinarians' familiarity with and the current application of

90 OROMs in routine clinical practice, 2) veterinarians' perceptions of the advantages and
91 disadvantages of implementing OROMs in routine clinical practice, and 3) obstacles to a
92 successful implementation of OROMs in routine clinical practice.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Survey

This cross-sectional online survey was conducted from February to March 2020. An invitation e-mail was distributed to 7,000 individuals registered under 1) a mailing list of AO VET, 2) members of the European College of Veterinary Surgeons, 3) members of the European Society of Veterinary Orthopaedics and Traumatology, 4) members of the European College of Veterinary Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation, and 5) members with interest in dogs and cats of the International Veterinary Information Service (IVIS). AO VET is a global network of surgeons, scientists, and other professionals highly specialized in the field of veterinary surgery of the musculoskeletal system. The questionnaire was also advertised 1) via AO VET online media (Facebook and Veterinary Insights), 2) in the e-mail discussion forums of the British Veterinary Orthopaedic Association, 3) in the e-mail discussion of Ortholistserv, a forum for American College of Veterinary Surgeons and European College of Veterinary Surgeons Diplomates, 4) in the news blog (NEWStat) of the American Animal Hospital Association, and 5) on the IVIS webpage as a banner.

The invitation e-mail explained the purpose of the survey, provided contact details, and contained a secure web link to the questionnaire. Two reminders were sent. This study was conducted in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study protocol of this survey was approved by the Ethics & Welfare Committee in the Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge (Reference Number: CR409). At the beginning of the survey, participants were informed that their participation was voluntary

and anonymous and that by completing the survey they would allow their responses to be processed and analyzed. The participants indicated their consent to participate in the survey by clicking the web link to the questionnaire. No medical information was collected. Data were collected and analyzed anonymously. No written consent was obtained. No remuneration or reward was offered for participation.

Participants

Eligible participants were those who indicated that they were veterinarians with a clinical caseload of companion animal orthopedic patients.

Questionnaire

Development

The self-administered questionnaire was developed by a multidisciplinary team of veterinarians, clinical research scientists, and statisticians by taking references from similar surveys conducted in the field of human medicine.⁶ A pilot survey was conducted with ten veterinarians. Written feedback was obtained. There were no major changes to the questionnaire after the pilot survey apart from appropriate rewording and rephrasing.

Structure

The questionnaire is attached as Supplement I. The questionnaire had eleven questions on demographics, region of residence according to the AO regions, clinical experience, professional qualifications, current workplace, specialty, and caseload of companion animals.

139

140 Three questions were related to the participant's familiarity with and current application
141 of OROMs. Two types of applications of OROMs were distinguished in this survey: the
142 application of OROMs for research purposes referred to applying OROMs as part of
143 veterinary clinical studies (including any interventional or observational studies); the
144 application in routine clinical practice referred to applying OROMs not for any research
145 purposes but as part of everyday veterinary work or standard veterinary care offered to
146 patients who were not subjects in any kind of veterinary clinical studies. Ten disease-
147 specific or generic OROMs that have been featured in current literature in companion
148 animal orthopedics⁷⁻⁹ were listed in the questionnaire. Disease-specific OROMs included
149 Liverpool Osteoarthritis in Dogs (LOAD),¹⁰ Canine Brief Pain Inventory (CBPI),¹¹
150 Helsinki Chronic Pain Index (HCPI),¹² Canine Orthopedic Index (COI),¹³ Finnish Canine
151 Stifle Index (FCSI),¹⁴ and Bologna Healing Stifle Injury Index (BHSII).¹⁵ Generic
152 OROMs included VetMetrica Health-Related Quality of Life Instrument (HRQL),¹⁶
153 Glasgow University Veterinary School Questionnaire (GUVQuest),¹⁷ Texas A&M Client
154 Questionnaire,¹⁸ and Short Form Composite Measure Pain Score (CMPS-SF).¹⁹
155

156 Participants provided their opinions on ten statements regarding reasons for applying
157 OROMs, if they answered that they applied OROMs in routine clinical practice
158 (including those applying OROMs both in routine clinical practice and for research
159 purposes). Participants provided their opinions on six statements regarding reasons for
160 not applying OROMs in routine clinical practice if they answered that they did not apply
161 OROMs at all or applied only for research purposes.

Furthermore, participants provided their opinions on 1) five statements regarding what would be the most important aspects to apply OROMs in routine clinical practice, and 2) six statements regarding reasons why OROMs were not applied more often in routine clinical practice. Participants were asked whether they would apply OROMs in routine clinical practice if tools or technologies were available to overcome the barriers.

Statistical analyses

The response rate (including completed and partially completed questionnaires) and the margin of error at 95% confidence level (expressing the amount of random sampling error, calculated using the overall proportion of users of OROMs as the outcome of interest) were computed. Percentages for all categorical variables (excluding missing responses) were calculated. Multivariable logistic regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the influences of the region, specialty, current position, clinical experience, and workplace on a) the familiarity with disease-specific OROMs, b) the familiarity with generic OROMs, and c) the application of OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research. Because the experience of having applied OROMs, even for research purposes only, might influence the veterinarians' opinions, Chi-square tests were performed to compare the following data between those who did not apply OROMs at all and those who applied OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research: 1) the proportions of opinions on statements regarding why OROMs were not applied more often in routine clinical practice, and 2) the proportions of respondents who indicated that they would

184 definitely implement OROMs in routine clinical practice if tools or technologies were
185 available to overcome barriers. The significance level was set at $P<0.05$.

RESULTS

Participants

Four hundred sixty-four respondents completed the survey. One respondent was not a graduate of veterinary school, and 16 did not have a clinical caseload of companion animal orthopedic patients. The remaining 441 (95.0%) respondents were considered eligible for the final analyses. The overall response rate was 6.3% (441/7,000). The maximum margin of error for the results of the survey was 4%.

Over half of the respondents (232/441, 52.7%) were from Europe (Table 1). Respondents worked predominantly in the fields of orthopedics, traumatology, spine surgery, and soft tissue surgery (176/435, 40.5%). Numbers (percentages) of respondents having clinical experience of 1–10 years, 11–20 years, and ≥ 21 years were 116/441 (26.3%), 159/441 (36.1%), and 166/441 (37.6%), respectively. Most respondents (288/441, 65.3%) were veterinarians without surgical specialist training; 124 (28.1%) were surgical specialists in training; 29 (6.6%) were registered surgical specialists.

Familiarity of respondents with OROMs

Most (293/441, 66.4%) respondents felt a familiarity with at least one OROM. Disease-specific OROMs were more well-known (261/441, 59.2%) than generic OROMs (141/441, 32.0%). LOAD (180/441, 40.8%) and CBPI (164/441, 37.2%) were the two most well-known disease-specific OROMs, followed by HCPI (107/441, 24.3%), COI (66/441, 15%), FCSI (12/441, 2.7%), and BHSII (4/441, 0.9%). The most well-known generic OROM was GUVQuest (100/441, 22.7%), followed by CMPS-SF (58/441,

13.2%). Texas AM Client Questionnaire (28/441, 6.3%) and VetMetrica HRQL (5/441, 1.1%) were less well-known.

The proportion of respondents who were familiar with OROMs was highest in North America (67/81, 82.7%), in respondents working in the fields of orthopedics, traumatology, and spinal surgery (47/56, 83.9%), among surgical specialists in training (25/29, 86.2%), among respondents with 11–20 years of clinical experience (114/159, 71.7%), and among respondents working at university referral hospitals (54/66, 81.8%; Supplement II, Table S1). Multivariable analyses confirmed the influences of the region, specialty, current position, clinical experience, and workplace on the familiarity with disease-specific or generic OROMs (Table 2).

Application of OROMs

Four hundred forty respondents answered the question about the application of OROMs. Seventy-seven (17.5%) respondents applied OROMs in routine clinical practice: 58 applied them in routine clinical practice only (18 regularly and 40 irregularly), and 19 applied them in routine clinical practice and for research purposes. Sixty-five (14.8%) respondents applied OROMs for research purposes only. The overall proportion of respondents applying OROMs was 32.3% (142/440). The four most widely applied OROMs were LOAD (81/142, 57.0%), CBPI (61/142, 43%), HCPI (22/142, 15.5%), and COI (14/142, 9.9%). Proportions of respondents applying OROMs varied across regions, specialties, and workplaces but not across current positions and clinical experiences (Table 2 and Supplement II, Table S1).

The two statements related to facilitating communication between veterinarians and owners and to monitoring treatment responses attracted more than a 90% agreement rate (95.1% [73/76] and 93.4% [71/76], respectively, either strongly agreed or agreed) as the reasons for applying OROMs in routine clinical practice (Table 3). Only 18.4% (14/76) of respondents agreed that they were required by regulatory authorities to document QoL data.

Lack of opportunity/feasibility (232/356, 65.2%) and lack of sufficient information/knowledge/experience (234/360, 65.0%) had the highest agreement rates as the reasons for not applying OROMs in routine clinical practice. Less than 10% (35/356, 9.8%) of respondents agreed that they did not believe in the usefulness of OROMs for companion animal orthopedic patients.

Prerequisites for and obstacles to implementing OROMs in routine clinical practice

User-friendliness (418/435, 96.1%), time efficiency (401/432, 92.8%), interpretation and clinical relevance of results (399/430, 92.8%) were considered very important or important by over 90% of respondents (Table 4). Costs and compatibility to existing software tools were also considered very important or important by 75.6% (327/432) and 80.7% (346/429) of respondents, respectively.

The statement related to the time-consuming and burdensome aspects of OROMs for owners got an agreement rate of 51.4% (223/434) among the six statements related to

reasons why OROMs were not applied more often in routine clinical practice (Table 5). Agreement rates for the other statements ranged from 28.1% to 42.4%. The experience of having applied OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or for research purposes was associated with a more definite opinion, either agree or disagree, as reflected by the lower rates of neutral opinion (neither agree nor disagree) in these respondents (Table 5).

Two hundred sixty-six respondents (60.6% out of the 439 respondents who answered this question) would definitely implement OROMs in routine clinical practice if tools or technologies were available to overcome barriers; 159 (36.2%) responded with "maybe", and 5 (1.1%) responded with "maybe not"; 9 (2.1%) could not decide. The proportion of respondents who would definitely implement OROMs in routine clinical practice was 59.5% (172/289) among those who did not apply OROMs at all and 66.7% (94/141) among those who applied OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research ($P=0.152$).

DISCUSSION

This is the first international survey to report veterinarians' familiarity with, current application of, and perceptions of applying OROMs in routine clinical practice for companion animal orthopedic patients. A few disease-specific OROMs were found to be more well-known and more frequently applied than others, possibly because they were the most featured OROMs in the current literature^{7,9,20} or there have been reports on their validity, reliability, and responsiveness.⁷

The low percentage of respondents applying OROMs in routine clinical practice supported the anecdotal observation that OROMs had not been routinely applied in the everyday practice of veterinary medicine.² In contrast, a routine collection of patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), the equivalent of OROMs in human medicine, has been implemented in several healthcare systems to improve the quality of care from the patients' perspective.^{21,22} For instance, PROMs are part of the Health Outcomes Survey in Medicare managed care in the US,²³ and the National Health Service PROMs program in England routinely collects generic and disease-specific PROMs since 2009 to track the outcomes of patients undergoing four elective surgeries.²⁴ Applying PROMs in routine clinical practice has been shown to help tailor treatment plans to meet the patients' preferences and needs, improve patient outcomes, and facilitate patient-clinician communication,^{21,22} with minimal or no clinical workflow delays.²⁵

Increasing the application of OROMs in routine clinical practice requires more than developing validated and time-efficient OROMs. Our results may help identify areas for

improvement in raising awareness of, and application of, OROMs in routine clinical practice. Over 90% of the respondents who applied OROMs in routine clinical practice felt that OROMs facilitate the communication with owners and help monitor the responses to treatments. Over 70% of respondents who did not apply OROMs in routine clinical practice disagreed with the statement that OROMs are not useful. These indicated that the usefulness of OROMs may not be a major concern. The two main reasons for not using OROMs were the lack of opportunity/feasibility and the lack of sufficient information/knowledge/experience. Over half of the respondents, even among those who had applied OROMs, agreed that filling out OROMs was time-consuming and burdensome for owners. Although most available OROMs have been designed to be completed in 5 to 10 minutes, respondents could still have concerns that owners might feel delayed in the regular consultations and burdened by being asked to complete an OROM. User-friendliness, time efficiency, and interpretability were considered the three most important prerequisites for implementing OROMs in routine clinical practice.

These barriers identified in the survey are mostly "soft" barriers that can be tackled with technical innovations and further education. These may include replacing paper-based forms with digitized OROMs; the development of user-friendly digital platforms (such as centralized databases and cloud applications) that can be integrated into the existing electronic medical record systems and facilitate the delivery, storage, processing, access, and visualization of OROMs; adequate training to the owners and veterinarians on understanding OROMs and their purpose; and better education of veterinarians on how to communicate the results to owners and how to use OROMs to engage owners in the

consultation.³ An example of educating veterinarians on how to use OROMs can be found in the study by Mwacalimba et al., where the veterinarians were provided with a one-page guidance document that explained the purpose of the QoL assessment and provided talking points for introducing and explaining the assessment results to owners.⁵ These improved the usability of the QoL assessment and resulted in favorable acceptance from the veterinarians.

It is encouraging that most respondents would definitely apply OROMs in routine clinical practice if technologies or tools were available to overcome barriers. A favorable environment may be created for broader use of OROMs in routine clinical practice as experience with OROMs expands and matures. First, it encourages developers to develop more valid, reliable, sensitive, and interpretable OROMs for more conditions and purposes. Second, it guides institutional changes of policies for using OROMs to improve healthcare quality. Finally, it promotes among veterinarians the concept of value-based care, in which the value of care lies in the outcomes that matter to patients.

The main limitation of this survey was the low response rate (6.3%). However, we may have underestimated the response rate because it was calculated using the total number of invitations sent rather than the number of eligible invitees.²⁶ Nonetheless, it was still unlikely that the response rate could have reached 60%, a frequently quoted measure of survey quality.²⁶ The low response rate may give rise to nonresponse bias. First, the invitations were sent to mailing lists of several organizations with a high number of specialists. Specialists might have been overrepresented in the final analyses. Second,

veterinarians interested in OROMs were more likely to have responded as the survey was voluntary. These two factors may have led to overestimation of the levels of familiarity with and application of OROMs. Nevertheless, the relatively small margin of error indicated confidence in the results being representative of the full population. Another study limitation is the small number of users of OROMs. In contrast to non-users, who may be over-optimistic, experienced users may be more cautious concerning the usefulness and burden of OROMs. The analyses of the experienced users might highlight the most important challenges in applying OROMs in routine clinical practice.

In conclusion, although most respondents were familiar with at least one OROM, fewer than one-fifth applied them in routine clinical practice. Most respondents were willing to implement OROMs in routine clinical practice if adequate tools and technologies were available to overcome the barriers. Our results justify further investigations to improve the application of OROMs in routine clinical practice of veterinary care of companion animal orthopedic patients.

REFERENCES

1. Porter ME. What is value in health care? *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363:2477-2481.
2. Pantaleon L. Why measuring outcomes is important in health care. *J Vet Intern Med*. 2019;33:356-362.
3. Yeates J, Main D. Assessment of companion animal quality of life in veterinary practice and research. *J Small Anim Pract*. 2009;50:274-281.
4. Yeates JW, Mullan S, Stone M, Main DC. Promoting discussions and decisions about dogs' quality-of-life. *J Small Anim Pract*. 2011;52:459-463.
5. Mwacalimba KK, Contadini FM, Spofford N, et al. Owner and Veterinarian Perceptions About Use of a Canine Quality of Life Survey in Primary Care Settings. *Front Vet Sci*. 2020;7:89.
6. Joeris A, Knoll C, Kalampoki V, Blumenthal A, Gaskell G. Patient-reported outcome measurements in clinical routine of trauma, spine and craniomaxillofacial surgeons: between expectations and reality: a survey among 1212 surgeons. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8:e020629.
7. Radke H, Joeris A, Chen M. Evidence-based evaluation of owner-reported outcome measures for canine orthopedic care - a COSMIN evaluation of 6 instruments. *Vet Surg*. 2021.
8. Cook JL. Canine Orthopedic Outcome Measures Program: where are we now? *Vet Surg*. 2014;43:229-231.
9. Belshaw Z, Asher L, Harvey ND, Dean RS. Quality of life assessment in domestic dogs: An evidence-based rapid review. *Vet J*. 2015;206:203-212.

10. Hercock CA, Pinchbeck G, Giejda A, Clegg PD, Innes JF. Validation of a client-based clinical metrology instrument for the evaluation of canine elbow osteoarthritis. *J Small Anim Pract.* 2009;50:266-271.
11. Brown DC, Bell M, Rhodes L. Power of treatment success definitions when the Canine Brief Pain Inventory is used to evaluate carprofen treatment for the control of pain and inflammation in dogs with osteoarthritis. *Am J Vet Res.* 2013;74:1467-1473.
12. Hielm-Bjorkman AK, Rita H, Tulamo RM. Psychometric testing of the Helsinki chronic pain index by completion of a questionnaire in Finnish by owners of dogs with chronic signs of pain caused by osteoarthritis. *Am J Vet Res.* 2009;70:727-734.
13. Brown DC. The Canine Orthopedic Index. Step 3: Responsiveness testing. *Vet Surg.* 2014;43:247-254.
14. Hyytiainen HK, Molsa SH, Junnila JJT, Laitinen-Vapaavuori OM, Hielm-Bjorkman AK. Developing a testing battery for measuring dogs' stifle functionality: the Finnish Canine Stifle Index (FCSI). *Vet Rec.* 2018;183:324.
15. Pinna S, Lambertini C, Grassato L, Romagnoli N. Evidence-Based Veterinary Medicine: A Tool for Evaluating the Healing Process After Surgical Treatment for Cranial Cruciate Ligament Rupture in Dogs. *Front Vet Sci.* 2019;6:65.
16. Scott EM, Davies V, Nolan AM, et al. Validity and Responsiveness of the Generic Health-Related Quality of Life Instrument (VetMetrica) in Cats With Osteoarthritis. Comparison of Vet and Owner Impressions of Quality of Life Impact. *Front Vet Sci.* 2021;8:733812.

17. Wiseman-Orr ML, Nolan AM, Reid J, Scott EM. Development of a questionnaire to measure the effects of chronic pain on health-related quality of life in dogs. *Am J Vet Res.* 2004;65:1077-1084.
18. Hudson JT, Slater MR, Taylor L, Scott HM, Kerwin SC. Assessing repeatability and validity of a visual analogue scale questionnaire for use in assessing pain and lameness in dogs. *Am J Vet Res.* 2004;65:1634-1643.
19. Reid J, Nolan AM, Hughes JML, Lascelles D, Pawson P, Scott EM. Development of the short-form Glasgow Composite Measure Pain Scale (CMPS-SF) and derivation of an analgesic intervention score. *Animal Welfare.* 2007;16:97-104.
20. Belshaw Z, Asher L, Dean RS. Systematic Review of Outcome Measures Reported in Clinical Canine Osteoarthritis Research. *Vet Surg.* 2016;45:480-487.
21. Nelson EC, Eftimovska E, Lind C, Hager A, Wasson JH, Lindblad S. Patient reported outcome measures in practice. *BMJ.* 2015;350:g7818.
22. Chen J, Ou L, Hollis SJ. A systematic review of the impact of routine collection of patient reported outcome measures on patients, providers and health organisations in an oncologic setting. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2013;13:211.
23. (CMS) CfMMS: Health Outcomes Survey (HOS). (<https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Research/HOS>).
24. Devlin N, Appleby JL: Getting the Most out of PROMs: Putting Health Outcomes at the Heart of NHS Decision-Making. London, UK, The King's Fund, 2010.
25. Rotenstein LS, Agarwal A, O'Neil K, et al. Implementing patient-reported outcome surveys as part of routine care: lessons from an academic radiation oncology department. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2017;24:964-968.

418 26. Johnson TP, Wislar JS. Response rates and nonresponse errors in surveys. *JAMA*.
419 2012;307:1805-1806.

420

421

422 Table 1 Demographics and characteristics of the respondents

Characteristics	N=441
Sex	441
Men	114 (25.9)
Women	325 (73.7)
Prefer not to say	2 (0.5)
Clinical experience	441
1–5 years	30 (6.8)
6–10 years	86 (19.5)
11–15 years	82 (18.6)
16–20 years	77 (17.5)
21–25 years	62 (14.1)
25–30 years	42 (9.5)
>30 years	62 (14.1)
Region	440
Africa	4 (0.9)
Asia Pacific	47 (10.7)
Europe	232 (52.7)
Latin America	67 (15.2)
Middle East	9 (2.0)
North America	81 (18.4)
Qualification(s) ^a	441
Veterinary surgeon	302 (68.5)
ECVS/ACVS resident	29 (6.6)
ECVS/ACVS specialist	112 (25.4)
Other type of registered surgical specialist	41 (9.3)
Other	41 (9.3)
Workplace	441
Private practice	197 (44.7)
Private referral hospital	142 (32.2)
University referral hospital	66 (15.0)
Both university and non-university referral hospital	27 (6.1)
Other	9 (2.0)
Surgical specialty	435
Orthopedics and traumatology	86 (19.8)
Orthopedics, traumatology, and spinal surgery	56 (12.9)
Orthopedics, traumatology, spinal surgery, and soft tissue surgery	176 (40.5)
Surgery and other areas of clinical veterinary medicine	101 (23.2)
Specialized in one or more subareas of orthopedics and traumatology	16 (3.7)
Percentage of case-load of companion animal orthopedic cases	441
Up to 20%	92 (20.9)
21–40%	67 (15.2)
41–60%	82 (18.6)
61–80%	65 (14.7)
81–100%	135 (30.6)

No. of new appointments of canine orthopedic patients per week	434
1–5	104 (24.0)
6–10	122 (28.1)
11–15	79 (18.2)
15–20	53 (12.2)
20–30	45 (10.4)
>30	31 (7.1)

Results are presented as number (%). Abbreviations: ACVS, American College of Veterinary Surgeons; ECVS, European College of Veterinary Surgeons.

^a Answer options are not mutually exclusive. Percentages do not add up to 100%.

426 Table 2 Influence of region, specialty, current position, clinical experience, and workplace on the familiarity with disease-specific owner-reported outcome
 427 measures (OROMs), the familiarity with generic OROMs, and the current application of OROMs

Variables	Familiarity with disease-specific OROMs		Familiarity with generic OROMs		Current application of OROMs in routine clinical practice/research	
	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i>
Region ^a						
Europe	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Asia Pacific	0.62 (0.30;1.29)	0.201	1.54 (0.77;3.11)	0.226	0.63 (0.29;1.36)	0.242
Latin America	0.15 (0.07;0.31)	<0.001	0.61 (0.29;1.25)	0.176	0.31 (0.14;0.71)	0.006
North America	1.26 (0.64;2.47)	0.507	3.95 (2.18;7.15)	<0.001	1.11 (0.62;1.99)	0.727
Surgical specialty						
Orthopedics and traumatology	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Orthopedics, traumatology, and spinal surgery	1.47 (0.61;3.53)	0.388	0.34 (0.15;0.76)	0.008	0.86 (0.42;1.76)	0.679
Orthopedics, traumatology, spinal surgery, and soft tissue surgery	0.7 (0.37;1.33)	0.279	0.77 (0.43;1.36)	0.366	0.41 (0.23;0.73)	0.003
Surgery and other areas of clinical veterinary medicine	0.29 (0.14;0.61)	0.001	0.67 (0.33;1.36)	0.263	0.32 (0.15;0.68)	0.003
Orthopedics and traumatology with further specialization	0.37 (0.10;1.35)	0.132	0.3 (0.07;1.25)	0.099	0.41 (0.11;1.52)	0.183
Current position						
Registered surgical specialist	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Veterinarian but not a registered surgical specialist	0.48 (0.26;0.86)	0.014	1.33 (0.77;2.29)	0.307	0.81 (0.48;1.37)	0.429
Surgical specialist in training	1.09 (0.31;3.80)	0.896	1.19 (0.45;3.17)	0.730	1.47 (0.57;3.75)	0.424
Clinical experience						
≥21 years	Reference		Reference		Reference	
1–10 years	3.03 (1.60;5.73)	<0.001	0.88 (0.48;1.60)	0.675	0.93 (0.51;1.70)	0.813
11–20 years	2.33 (1.36;4.00)	0.002	1.08 (0.65;1.80)	0.755	0.81 (0.49;1.36)	0.428
Workplace ^a						
Private practice	Reference		Reference		Reference	
Private referral hospital	0.93 (0.53;1.65)	0.815	1.78 (1.02;3.09)	0.041	1.11 (0.64;1.94)	0.703
University referral hospital	2.16 (0.97;4.80)	0.059	1.37 (0.68;2.74)	0.377	2.23 (1.13;4.40)	0.020

	Both university and non-university referral hospital	1.11 (0.37;3.31)	0.849	2.84 (1.04;7.76)	0.042	1.96 (0.70;5.51)	0.202
428	Abbreviation: OROMs, owner-reported outcome measures.						
429	^a Due to low frequencies, those classified as 'Afrika' and 'Middle East' in the region or 'Other' in the workplace, were excluded from the model.						

430 Table 3 Perceived advantages and limitations of applying owner-reported outcome measures (OROMs) in routine clinical practice for companion animal
431 orthopedic patients

Variable	n	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Reasons for applying OROMs in routine clinical practice ^a						
OROMs can help to prioritize clinical problems.	76	10 (13.2)	50 (65.8)	14 (18.4)	2 (2.6)	0 (0.0)
OROMs can help to facilitate communication between the veterinarian and the dog owner/carer.	76	29 (38.2)	44 (57.9)	3 (3.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
OROMs can screen for potential patient-related problems.	76	13 (17.1)	43 (56.6)	16 (21.1)	4 (5.3)	0 (0.0)
OROMs can identify dog carer and patient-related preferences.	76	11 (14.5)	34 (44.7)	30 (39.5)	1 (1.3)	0 (0.0)
OROMs monitor changes/responses to treatment.	76	35 (46.1)	36 (47.4)	5 (6.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
OROMs monitor and assess the general health care status of my patients and their health care status changes.	75	14 (18.7)	38 (50.7)	18 (24.0)	5 (6.7)	0 (0.0)
OROMs can be helpful but are not substitutes to measure the clinical outcomes of my patients.	76	22 (28.9)	35 (46.1)	11 (14.5)	7 (9.2)	1 (1.3)
OROMs help to monitor the quality of healthcare provision.	76	13 (17.1)	46 (60.5)	11 (14.5)	5 (6.6)	1 (1.3)
OROMs are useful for national/international comparison and benchmarking.	76	16 (21.1)	39 (51.3)	18 (23.7)	3 (3.9)	0 (0.0)
I am required to document the owner-reported quality of life data by the government, regulatory bodies, my workplace, or for insurance reasons.	76	6 (7.9)	8 (10.5)	12 (15.8)	26 (34.2)	24 (31.6)
Reasons for not applying OROMs in routine clinical practice ^b						
I do not believe in the usefulness of outcome and quality of life measurements in veterinary orthopedics.	356	12 (3.4)	23 (6.5)	67 (18.8)	158 (44.4)	96 (27.0)
I do not have sufficient information, knowledge, or experience to apply OROMs in daily routine clinical practice.	360	88 (24.4)	146 (40.6)	50 (13.9)	57 (15.8)	19 (5.3)
It is too time-consuming to implement OROMs in my daily clinical practice.	357	24 (6.7)	135 (37.8)	111 (31.1)	67 (18.8)	20 (5.6)
The resistance of owners to filling out owner-reported outcomes routinely is too high.	355	21 (5.9)	84 (23.7)	162 (45.6)	72 (20.3)	16 (4.5)
I am interested in using OROMs but I have not yet had the possibility to do so.	356	89 (25.0)	143 (40.2)	70 (19.7)	38 (10.7)	16 (4.5)
The resistance within my workplace to using OROMs is too high.	355	19 (5.4)	45 (12.7)	137 (38.6)	106 (29.9)	48 (13.5)

432 Results are presented as count (%). N is the available respondents for the analyses. Abbreviation: OROMs, owner-reported outcome measures.

433 ^a Only respondents who indicated that they applied OROMs in routine clinical practice or routine clinical practice and research provided opinions on these
434 statements (N=77).

435 ^b Only respondents who indicated that they did not apply OROMs in routine clinical practice (including those who applied OROMs for research purposes only)
436 provided opinions on these statements (N=363).

437 Table 4 Important aspects for implementing owner-reported outcome measures in routine clinical
 438 practice for companion animal orthopedic patients

Variables	N = 441
User-friendliness (for hospital staff and animal owners)	435
Very important	294 (67.6)
Important	124 (28.5)
Neither important nor unimportant	14 (3.2)
Unimportant	2 (0.5)
Very unimportant	1 (0.2)
Costs	432
Very important	146 (33.8)
Important	181 (41.9)
Neither important nor unimportant	89 (20.6)
Unimportant	13 (3.0)
Very unimportant	3 (0.7)
Time efficiency	432
Very important	226 (52.3)
Important	175 (40.5)
Neither important nor unimportant	27 (6.3)
Unimportant	3 (0.7)
Very unimportant	1 (0.2)
Compatibility to existing software tools	429
Very important	163 (38.0)
Important	183 (42.7)
Neither important nor unimportant	62 (14.5)
Unimportant	16 (3.7)
Very unimportant	5 (1.2)
Interpretation and clinical relevance of results	430
Very important	255 (59.3)
Important	144 (33.5)
Neither important nor unimportant	25 (5.8)
Unimportant	4 (0.9)
Very unimportant	2 (0.5)

439 Results are presented in count (%).

440
441

Table 5 Reasons why owner-reported outcome measures (OROMs) were not used more often in routine clinical practice for all respondents and by current application of OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research

Application of OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research													
Variables	Current application of OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or research								<i>P</i> ^a	All participants			
	No				Yes								
	N	Strongly agree /Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree /Strongly disagree	N	Strongly agree /Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree /Strongly disagree		N	Strongly agree /Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree /Strongly disagree
Data from OROMs are not objective and cannot adequately reflect our patient's situation.	293	79 (27.0)	130 (44.4)	84 (28.7)	141	43 (30.5)	43 (30.5)	55 (39.0)	0.017	434	122 (28.1)	173 (39.9)	139 (32)
Data from OROMs are prone to a placebo effect and therefore are not reliable or clinically relevant in veterinary orthopedic patients.	293	107 (36.5)	117 (39.9)	69 (23.5)	141	46 (32.6)	49 (34.8)	46 (32.6)	0.133	434	153 (35.3)	166 (38.2)	115 (26.5)
There is a lack of suitable and specific OROMs available for the assessment of routine patients in veterinary orthopedics.	293	112 (38.2)	128 (43.7)	53 (18.1)	141	49 (34.8)	36 (25.5)	56 (39.7)	<0.001	434	161 (37.1)	164 (37.8)	109 (25.1)
Veterinary surgeons lack the necessary skills to interpret and use the information given by these instruments.	294	121 (41.2)	95 (32.3)	78 (26.5)	142	52 (36.6)	34 (23.9)	56 (39.4)	0.019	436	173 (39.7)	129 (29.6)	134 (30.7)
To fill out OROMs is time-consuming and burdensome for the animal owner.	293	148 (50.5)	97 (33.1)	48 (16.4)	141	75 (53.2)	36 (25.5)	30 (21.3)	0.204	434	223 (51.4)	133 (30.6)	78 (18)
Implementing OROMs would require significant changes in the structure of the basic routine clinical practice of veterinary health	293	116 (39.6)	122 (41.6)	55 (18.8)	141	68 (48.2)	34 (24.1)	39 (27.7)	0.001	434	184 (42.4)	156 (35.9)	94 (21.7)

care providers as well as
being costly.

442 Results are presented as count (%). N is the available respondents for the analyses. Abbreviation: OROMs, owner-reported outcome measures.
443 ^a Comparisons by Chi-square test between respondents who did not apply OROMs at all and those who applied OROMs in routine clinical practice and/or
444 research.