EHR and practice management system selection for a private practice surgery practice. Methods include documentation of selection criteria and experience with vendor demonstrations.

The results point to the importance of identifying physician and staff system needs prior to contacting vendors. Identifying needs can inform development of checklists for system functionality during vendor demonstrations. Items to include on the checklist include integration of administrative and clinical workflows, and integration with other systems. Functionality specific to plastic surgery practices include ease of uploading and annotating pictures, management of inventory, documentation of skincare needs and purchase history, and integration with practice management software for insurance and private billing. Other functionality needs include patient engagement and provision of relevant patient education materials.

This paper will report on system selection experience from identifying EHR vendors through implementation and outline lessons learned and best practices. Plastic surgeons, practice managers and other end-users will benefit from a more thorough understanding of their requirements for an EHR and practice management system, and identification and prioritization of criteria and consistent checklists and questions to guide vendor demonstration. Then selection can be made based on functionality and price.
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INTRODUCTION: Patient satisfaction surveys are an increasingly important part of healthcare, influencing the practice of physicians. Given the changing landscape of health insurance and reimbursement, providers seek to satisfy patients in order to maintain and grow patient loyalty and market share. Press Ganey has developed tools to assess physician and department performance that are in use by 50% of hospitals in the US and over 10,000 healthcare organizations. The authors sought to evaluate the factors that influence patient satisfaction, specifically in plastic surgery patients, both locally and nationally.

METHODS: A 26 item Press Ganey survey was distributed to patients of 686 participating plastic surgeons nationwide, including those at the authors’ home institution. The responses from January to December 2016 were retrospectively analyzed with Pearson correlation coefficients. A common surrogate for overall patient satisfaction and loyalty is response to the Press Ganey survey item “Likelihood to recommend provider to others.” This “Likelihood to recommend” was used as the primary outcome measure and correlated with the other 25 items.

RESULTS: There were 411 survey responses from patients seen by plastic surgeons in the Northwell health system and 36,836 responses from patients seen nationally. Items that were not well correlated (r<0.5) with “Likelihood to recommend” were ease of getting speaking on telephone, wait time, and courtesy of registration staff. The items that were best correlated (r>0.8) with “Likelihood to recommend” were confidence in care provider, how inclusive the care provider was in decision making, and the provider’s concern for questions. The confidence in the care provider and overall perception of the care provider were the most correlated with a patient’s likelihood to recommend the provider to prospective patients.

CONCLUSION: In an evolving patient centric culture, patients’ confidence and trust of the provider are more important than perception of the office environment to maintaining patient loyalty and market share.
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**INTRODUCTION:** Online review sites have become a modern version of the word-of-mouth recommendation, and prospective patients are increasingly consulting them before making decisions about their medical care. The impact of online reviews will only intensify in the coming years as they continue to affect both aesthetic and reconstructive plastic surgeons. Our purpose was twofold: 1) to identify common reasons for patient satisfaction and dissatisfaction with plastic surgeons cited in online reviews; and 2) to evaluate the usefulness and reliability of these reviews as a methodology for understanding the patient experience. We selected breast augmentation as the primary procedure of interest.

**METHODS:** Data applicable to breast augmentation was obtained from RealSelf and Yelp via a “web crawling” computer program. Data from Google Reviews was obtained manually. The top 10–20 plastic surgeons in each of five large metro areas were evaluated. Duplicate or blank reviews were excluded. Positive and negative aspects of each review, including satisfaction, were recorded. Computerized and manual content analysis was used to qualitatively evaluate each review.

**RESULTS:** 3833 Google, 5618 Yelp, and 437 RealSelf reviews were assessed, with 387, 426, and 234 reviews meeting inclusion criteria, respectively. The utilization of each rating website varied significantly according to metropolitan area. 86.2% of reviews were positive and 12.2% were negative. “Good aesthetic outcome” (71%), “good bedside manner” (63.3%), “office staff friendly and/or helpful” (57.4%) were the top three most commonly mentioned reasons for patient satisfaction. “Reasonable cost” was only mentioned in 4.1% of positive reviews. “Poor aesthetic outcome” (49.3%), “does not listen to patient” (40.1%), and “not competent” (35.2%) were the top three most commonly mentioned reasons for dissatisfied reviews. Asymmetry (58.7%) and implant malposition (41.3%) were the two most commonly reported reasons for “Poor aesthetic result”. Negative reviews were generally longer (207.7 ± 175.3 words) than positive ones (112.7 ± 102.1 words).

**CONCLUSION:** Aesthetic outcome appears to be the largest driver of patient reviews, but surgeon personal factors such as listening skills and bedside manner also play a significant role in determining whether patients leave a positive or negative online review. As online platforms continue to become more popular, surgeons should be cognizant of these factors to improve their online reputation.

---

### #PlasticSurgery: Is the Message Reaching the Audience?

**Presenter: Austin D. Chen, BS**

**Co-Authors:** Qing Zhao Ruan, MD; Alexandra Bucknor, MBBS, MRCS, MSc; Patrick P. Bletsis, BSc; Anmol S. Chattha, BA; Bernard T. Lee, MD, MBA, MPH, FACS; Samuel J. Lin, MD, MBA, FACS

**Affiliation:** Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center / Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

**INTRODUCTION:** Twitter is one form of social networking that has been recognized as a suitable platform for plastic surgeons to engage in and share information. A public poll using Twitter found that respondents wanted more links to peer-reviewed articles (79%), patient education (67%) and safety information (47%). The aim of this study is to assess the readability of these articles and analyze differences between non-open full,