



This is a repository copy of *Editorial: Health-related quality of life in health care*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/196600/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Kharroubi, S.A. and Elbarazi, I. (2023) Editorial: Health-related quality of life in health care. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11. 1123180.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1123180>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY

Hai Fang,
Peking University, China

*CORRESPONDENCE

Samer A. Kharroubi
✉ sk157@aub.edu.lb

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to
Health Economics,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Public Health

RECEIVED 13 December 2022

ACCEPTED 24 January 2023

PUBLISHED 02 February 2023

CITATION

Kharroubi SA and Elbarazi I (2023) Editorial:
Health-related quality of life in health care.
Front. Public Health 11:1123180.
doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1123180

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Kharroubi and Elbarazi. This is an
open-access article distributed under the terms
of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#)
(CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction
in other forums is permitted, provided the
original author(s) and the copyright owner(s)
are credited and that the original publication in
this journal is cited, in accordance with
accepted academic practice. No use,
distribution or reproduction is permitted which
does not comply with these terms.

Editorial: Health-related quality of life in health care

Samer A. Kharroubi^{1,2*} and Iffat Elbarazi³¹Department of Nutrition and Food Sciences, Faculty of Agricultural and Food Sciences, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon, ²School of Health and Related Research, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom, ³College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Institute of Public Health, United Arab Emirates University, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates

KEYWORDS

Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL), health and patients outcomes, cost-effectiveness analyses (CEAs), patient-oriented research (POR), healthcare management, health policy, quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), decision making

Editorial on the Research Topic Health-related quality of life in health care

Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) is a cornerstone in the evaluation of modern medicines, healthcare practice and other medical interventions (1). It is of increasing importance in healthcare in the context of the rapidly growing power, variety and expense of modern medicines. Whether generic or condition specific, many instruments have been developed to ensure that clinical studies consider the needs of patients (2–7). These can be used to demonstrate the efficacy of a new technology, to document the burden associated to a given disease and either to support or to inform health policy, pricing and reimbursement decision making (8).

In health economics, it is useful to perform cost-effectiveness and cost-utility studies by considering the preferences of patients (8, 9). The World Health Organization (WHO), for instance, undertakes cost-effectiveness and cost-utility assessments of interventions across national boundaries. In the UK, for example, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) determines which treatments and/or procedures should be used in the National Health Service (NHS) on the basis of their cost-effectiveness, and there are similar advisory or regulatory bodies in several other countries, including US, Canada, Australia and the Netherlands.

To date, plenty of research is conducted in this field and relates, for example, to the choice of the instrument, methodological development, ability to capture specific health dimensions, and lots more. Our Research Topic was open to the subject area of health-related quality of life in healthcare and in clinical practice. Articles included instrument development, new technologies, application, evaluations and outcomes. For example, [Li et al.](#) have evaluated the global, sex, age, region, and country-specific cardiovascular disease (CVD) burden, along with the trends, risk factors, and implications for the prevention of CVD. This study would help explain the characteristics of the global CVD burden in order to set up more effective and targeted prevention strategies. [Lobo et al.](#) have studied the need to address potential caregiver-affecting issues at many stages of health planning, recovery, and policymaking in order to generate the evidence to enable stroke caring engagement. In addition, a thorough understanding of the processes involved in stroke care, available services and individual needs and experiences to develop a more realistic approach toward engagement with whom. [Cheng and Jin](#) have investigated the association between smoking and HRQoL among Chinese individuals aged 40 years and older using an instrumental variable probit model. Their findings showed that smoking leads to a smaller probability of having a better quality of life, thereby anti-smoking

campaigns are then needed to highlight the negative effect of tobacco use on HRQoL. In a multinational study, Ghazy et al. have also assessed the quality of life and its determinants among healthcare workers living and working in the Arab world. The findings of this study indicate that more attention should be administered to this key group in order to ensure their productivity and service provision. Besides, AlKuwaiti et al. have also explored the physical, social, psychological, spiritual, and lifestyle impact of a positive COVID-19 diagnosis on a sample of the UAE population. The study shows that patients with COVID-19 have perceived very good support in terms of their physical health from the government and health authorities, but need social, psychological, and educational support during the infection period and after immediate recovery and post-recovery.

With regards to cost-effectiveness analyses, Shi et al. have assessed the cost-effectiveness of the same-day discharge (SDD) in comparison to that of regular care for primary total hip arthroplasty patients. This is achieved by analyzing the effect using the Oxford hip score (OHS), medical costs (both out-of-pocket and reimbursed), mean incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER), and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) at 6-month follow up. By a standard cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), this study would help physicians, government and health authorities to look at SDD in a more precise and efficient approach. Additionally, Shao et al. have also evaluated the cost-effectiveness of camrelizumab plus chemotherapy to treat sq-NSCLC from the Chinese healthcare system perspective. The findings of this economic evaluation approach would provide evidence for clinicians, government and health authorities in making optimal decisions in general clinical practice.

To this end, our Research Topic was sealed with a methodological paper where Kharroubi and Kelleher have developed a novel Bayesian non-parametric model for estimating the utility values of health states defined by a generic descriptive system, to generate quality-adjusted life years and hence to conduct cost utility analysis of healthcare interventions. The new Bayesian statistical model also permits the utilization of evidence from one country as potential prior information for a study in another. The results of this study suggest that existing countries' valuations could be used as informative priors to generate better utility estimates than modeling the data from each country separately. This sort of analysis (borrowing strength from existing countries) could be particularly promising in terms of reducing the need for conducting large surveys in every country,

which would in turn reduce the cost of cross-country valuation. This will be hugely important for countries where large-scale evaluation exercises are expensive and hard to conduct, particularly for countries with small population size or low- and middle-income countries.

So as a final word, Health Related Quality of Life in Healthcare has become the focus of health related research and practice especially after the COVID-19 crisis which have unveiled systems weaknesses and the need for future preparedness with more evidence based oriented actions and policies which this topic has aimed for.

Author contributions

SK participated in the conceptualization of the idea, the design of the Research Topic, editorial drafting, and the final review of the editorial. IB reviewed and finalized the editorial and participated in the conceptualization of the study. All authors have read and approved the final editorial.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all authors who have contributed to this Research Topic. We are also grateful to the associate editors and the referees for their many helpful comments.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

1. Brazier JE, Ratcliffe J, Tsuchiya A, Solomon J. *Measuring and Valuing Health for Economic Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2007).
2. Brooks R. EuroQol: the current state of play. *Health Policy*. (1996) 37:53–72. doi: 10.1016/0168-8510(96)00822-6
3. Kharroubi, SA McCabe, C. Modelling HUI 2 health state preference data using a nonparametric Bayesian method. *Medical Decision Making*. (2008) 28:875–887. doi: 10.1177/0272989X08318460
4. Feeny DH, Furlong WJ, Torrance GW, Goldsmith CH, Zenglong Z, Depauw S, et al. Multi-attribute and single-attribute utility function for the Health Utility Index Mark 3 system. *Med Care*. (2002) 40:113–28. doi: 10.1097/00005650-200202000-00006
5. Brazier JE, Roberts J, Deverill M. The estimation of a preference-based measure of health from the SF-36. *J Health Econ*. (2002) 21:271–92. doi: 10.1016/S0167-6296(01)00130-8
6. Revicki DA, Leidy NK, Brennan-Diemer F, Sorenson S, Togias A. Integrating patients' preferences into health outcomes assessment: the multiattribute asthma symptom utility index. *Chest*. (1998) 114:998–1007. doi: 10.1378/chest.114.4.998
7. Brazier JE, Czoski-Murray C, Roberts J, Brown M, Symonds T, Kelleher C. Estimation of a preference-based index from a condition specific measure: the King's Health Questionnaire. *Med Decis Maki*. (2008) 28:113–26. doi: 10.1177/0272989X07301820
8. Drummond MF, Sculpher M, O'Brien B, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. Oxford: Oxford Medical Publications (2005).
9. Gold MR, Siegel JE, Russell LB, Weinstein, MC. *Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press (1996).