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Introduction

• Great emphasis has been placed on patient satisfaction and using it as a proxy for quality of care. However, the use of patient satisfaction as proxy for quality of care remains controversial. Provider initiated patient satisfaction reporting (PIPSR) has been shown to be a more reliable measure compared to commercial physician rating websites in the orthopedic literature. This study queried 210 neurosurgeons with publicly available PIPSR and compared the ratings between the PIPSR and commercial physician rating websites.
Methods

• 24 programs were identified as having publicly available PIPSР. Three commercial physician rating websites were chosen for the corresponding physicians. A “negative review” was defined as any rating of 1 or 2 out of 5 stars that was accompanied by a comment determined to be “negative” by the authors.
Results

• There was a higher number of responses and a statistically significant lower percentage of negative comments in PIPSR. Linear regression analysis showed that academic institutions had a lower physician rating score compared to private institutions and programs in the Northeast had a lower score with reference to the Midwest. The only demographic factor associated with lower physician rating was years in practice.
Discussion

• It is important to assess the validity of physician rating platforms as greater emphasis is placed on patient satisfaction and its association with quality of care. PIPSР appears to be a more reliable platform for physician rating compared to commercial physician rating websites. Further studies will be required to determine the association between PIPSР and quality of care in neurosurgery.
Summary Points

• Physician rating websites are becoming integral resource for patients, physicians and policy makers.

• Higher overall rating and lower negative comments were seen in PIPSR compared to commercial physician rating websites.

• Study is limited by limited availability of publicly available PIPSR information and lack of individual rating information for each comment.