

Patient reported outcome of adult perioperative anaesthesia in the United Kingdom: a cross-sectional observational study[†]

E. M. K. Walker¹, M. Bell², T. M. Cook³, M. P. W. Grocott⁴ and S. R. Moonesinghe^{5*}, for the SNAP-1 investigator group

¹National Institute of Academic Anaesthesia Health Services Research Centre, Royal College of Anaesthetists, London, WC1R 4SG, UK, ²Royal College of Anaesthetists, London, WC1R 4SG, UK, ³Royal United Hospital NHS Foundation Trust Bath, BA1 3NG, UK, ⁴Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK and ⁵National Institute of Academic Anaesthesia Health Services Research Centre, Royal College of Anaesthetists, London, WC1R 4SG, UK, and UCL/UCLH Surgical Outcomes Research Centre, Department of Anaesthetics and UCL Centre for Anaesthesia, University College Hospital, London, NW1 2BU, UK

*Corresponding author. E-mail: rmoonesinghe@rcoa.ac.uk

Abstract

Background. Understanding the patient perspective on healthcare is central to the evaluation of quality. This study measured selected patient-reported outcomes after anaesthesia in order to identify targets for research and quality improvement.

Methods. This cross-sectional observational study in UK National Health Service hospitals, recruited adults undergoing non-obstetric surgery requiring anaesthesia care over a 48 h period. Within 24 h of surgery, patients completed the Bauer questionnaire (measuring postoperative discomfort and satisfaction with anaesthesia care), and a modified Brice questionnaire to elicit symptoms suggestive of accidental awareness during general anaesthesia (AAGA). Patient, procedural and pharmacological data were recorded to enable exploration of risk factors for these poor outcomes.

Results. 257 hospitals in 171 NHS Trusts participated (97% of eligible organisations). Baseline characteristics were collected on 16,222 patients; 15,040 (93%) completed postoperative questionnaires. Anxiety was most frequently cited as the worst aspect of the perioperative experience. Thirty-five per cent of patients reported severe discomfort in at least one domain: thirst (18.5%; 95% CI 17.8–19.1), surgical pain (11.0%; 10.5–11.5) and drowsiness (10.1%; 9.6–10.5) were most common. Despite this, only 5% reported dissatisfaction with any aspect of anaesthesia-related care. Regional anaesthesia was associated with a reduced burden of side-effects. The incidence of reported AAGA was one in 800 general anaesthetics (0.12%)

Conclusions. Anxiety and discomfort after surgery are common; despite this, satisfaction with anaesthesia care in the UK is high. The inconsistent relationship between patient-reported outcome, patient experience and patient satisfaction supports using all three of these domains to provide a comprehensive assessment of the quality of anaesthesia care.

Key words: anaesthesia; awareness; health care; outcome; patient satisfaction; quality indicators

[†]This Article is accompanied by Editorial Aew384.

Editor's key points

- Patient perspectives of anaesthesia care quality were assessed in a large-scale survey of adult patients receiving anaesthesia in the UK National Health Service.
- Questionnaires were completed by 15,040 patients from 257 hospitals over a 48 h period.
- Although 35% of patients reported severe discomfort, only 5% reported dissatisfaction.
- Despite high patient satisfaction with anaesthesia, there are opportunities for quality improvement in patient experience.

Safety, effectiveness and patient-centeredness have been defined as three key domains of healthcare quality,^{1,2} and performance metrics may assess any of these. Each year, more than 313 million operations take place globally (approximately 42 procedures per 1000 population),³ the majority of which are supported by anaesthesia providers. In high-income countries, deaths directly attributable to anaesthesia are rare, and intra-operative mortality in patients undergoing general anaesthesia (GA) is very low.⁴ However, anaesthesia is associated with other important adverse outcomes including postoperative complications^{5,6} and reduced long-term survival.^{7,8,9} Furthermore, many postoperative symptoms – for example, acute surgical pain – are distressing to patients,^{10,11} can delay hospital discharge,¹² and can lead to chronic health problems,¹³ thereby increasing health and social care costs. Thus, measurement of quality in anaesthesia care provides an opportunity to drive improvement that could affect millions of patients each year and promote healthcare efficiency and productivity.

Patient-reported metrics are increasingly viewed as core quality indicators.² Measures specific to anaesthesia encompass the three aforementioned domains of quality: effectiveness, by assessing procedural-related discomfort which anaesthesia providers aim to alleviate (e.g. pain, drowsiness, nausea); patient-centeredness, by measuring patient satisfaction with care delivered; and safety, through estimating the incidence of events that can lead to significant or long-term harm, such as accidental awareness during general anaesthesia (AAGA). Using measures encompassing all three of these domains, we conducted this study to determine the quality of anaesthesia care from the patient perspective in a UK multicentre sample, in order to identify risk factors for these adverse outcomes, characterise the relationship between patient reported outcome and patient satisfaction, identify targets for research and quality improvement, and improve the information given to future patients.

Methods

This study is reported in accordance with the “Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology” (STROBE) statement.¹⁴ We undertook a two-day multicentre observational cross-sectional study in the UK National Health Service (NHS). The protocol has been published.¹⁵ Ethics approval was granted by the UK National Research Ethics Service (West Midlands Committee, 14/WM/0043). Hospital and investigator engagement was facilitated through the Quality Audit and Research Coordinator (QuARC) network, which was established by the National Institute of Academic Anaesthesia Health Services Research Centre (NIAA-HSRC) to facilitate health

services research in anaesthesia and perioperative care across the UK. All NHS hospitals were invited to participate. The full investigator list can be found in Supplementary document 1. Patient recruitment took place between 00:00 on 13th May 2014 and 23:59 on 14th May 2014. These days of the week were chosen to maximise opportunities for recruitment of patients, outside weekend working hours and potentially busier workloads on Mondays and Fridays. All adults (≥ 18 yr) undergoing a non-obstetric surgical procedure requiring anaesthesia (local, regional or general) or sedation administered by an anaesthetist were eligible for inclusion; all were provided with information about the study before surgery (see Supplementary documents).

Dataset

The patient report form is presented in the Supplementary documents. The anaesthetist responsible for each patient's perioperative care completed patient, personnel and process details at the time of surgery. Operation names were entered using free-text by anaesthetists, and subsequently coded by members of the central study team, using a UK-based objective categorisation of surgical procedure type and magnitude.¹⁶ Patients subsequently completed the Bauer patient satisfaction questionnaire¹⁷ and a Modified Brice Questionnaire for AAGA. The Bauer questionnaire was previously identified¹⁸ as being a psychometrically developed and validated measure of patient satisfaction and discomfort. The modified Brice questionnaire uses closed-questions and was adapted from a previous study.¹⁹ Two further questions were asked: the NHS “Friends and Family Test” (would you recommend this anaesthetic service to friends and family?) and a question regarding whether the patient expected to be asleep during their procedure. Reasons for non-completion of patient questionnaires were noted. Obstetric and paediatric populations were excluded from this study as the Bauer questionnaire had not been validated in these settings.

Patient involvement

The Participant Information Sheet was reviewed and amended by a member of the Lay Committee of the Royal College of Anaesthetists; members of the lay committee were also invited to provide feedback on study design and conduct. The Bauer questionnaire was originally developed with patient involvement.

Analysis

Continuous variables are presented as mean (sd) when normally distributed and median (range) when not (normality was assessed using the Stata “sktest” for skewness and kurtosis in large sample sizes). Categorical variables are presented as n (%). Patients missing core variables (operation name, all patient characteristic data or any outcome data) were excluded from all analyses. Baseline characteristics between patients who declined or were unable to complete follow-up questionnaires were compared against those who did consent and complete questionnaires. Our co-primary endpoints were the 10 domains of discomfort in the Bauer patient satisfaction questionnaire.

We explored the relationship between patient and process-related factors and a poor outcome in each of the 15 domains of the Bauer questionnaire. For each of the ten markers of anaesthesia-related discomfort, a poor outcome was defined as a response of “severe” on a 3-point Likert scale (none, moderate, severe); for each of the five patient satisfaction questions, a poor outcome was defined by a response of either ‘Dissatisfied’ or ‘Very dissatisfied’ on a 4-point Likert scale. χ^2 tests were used to


determine the univariate relationship between candidate categorical variables deemed to have plausible associations with poor outcomes in any of these 15 domains; χ^2 test for trend was used with variable with multiple categories. Variables significant at $P < 0.1$ were then entered into separate multivariable logistic regression models for poor outcome, in each of the ten discomfort domains (backward-stepwise method), to calculate adjusted Odds Ratios (OR) with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI). Significance for multivariable models was set at $P < 0.05$. In multiple regression analyses, we used Bonferroni's correction to adjust for multiple comparisons for different outcomes: 10 comparisons for domains of anaesthesia-related discomfort, and five domains of patient-satisfaction; adjusted P values are denoted P' .

A potential case of AAGA was flagged if a patient responded that they remembered something between going to sleep and waking up, or they answered "Awareness" to the question asking them to report the worst thing about their operation. Additionally, all free text responses were screened for responses that could signify AAGA. The local principle investigators for each of these patients were contacted and asked to give their opinion of the likelihood of AAGA for their patients as "probable", "possible", "unlikely" or "un-assessable" according to previously defined criteria,²⁰ (supplementary Table 1) and using available local data. Two independent assessors (S.R.M. and T.M.C.) then reviewed each potential AAGA patient and classified them again into one of these four likelihood categories. All patients classed by any of the three reviewers as probable or possible AAGA were then discussed in detail by the two independent assessors and a final classification agreed by consensus.

Data were analysed using STATA/IC 12.1 for Mac (StataCorp LP, College Station TX, USA and Microsoft Excel for Mac 2011, Version 14.4.9 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington, USA).

Results

Patients were recruited from 257 hospitals within 171 English and Scottish NHS Trusts, Welsh Health Boards and



Northern Irish Health and Social Care Trusts – this represented 97% of NHS acute secondary care organisations providing adult services – 146 of 149 in England (98%),²¹ 13 of 14 (93%) in Scotland,²² six of seven (86%) in Wales²³ and five of five (100%) in Northern Ireland.²⁴ After exclusions, patient characteristics were recorded for 16,222 patients; 15,040 patients answered postoperative questionnaires, giving a response rate of 93% (Fig. 1). Baseline characteristics are shown in Table 1. The commonest reason for non-completion of postoperative questionnaires was that the patient had already been discharged from hospital (388 patients; 2.4%); consent was declined by 310 patients (1.9%) (Supplementary Table 2). Excluding discharged patients, those who did not complete follow-up questionnaires were older and were more likely to have comorbidities or be undergoing urgent or immediate surgery. The median number of patient respondents per hospital was 78 (range 6 – 388). 12,674 (84%) received general anaesthesia. The commonest operations were cystoscopy (782 patients; 5%), cataract surgery (619; 4%) and hernia repair (594; 4%); however, the cohort included 2449 different procedure codes. Data describing perioperative care are summarised in Supplementary Table 3.

Postoperative discomfort

5230 (34.8%; 95% CI 34.0-35.5%) patients reported severe discomfort in at least one domain. The three most prevalent types of severe discomfort were thirst (18.5%; 95% CI 17.8-19.1), pain at the surgical site (11.0%; 10.5-11.5), and drowsiness (10.1%; 9.6-10.5) (Table 2).

Univariate analyses of risk factors for each domain of severe discomfort are reported in Supplementary Table 4. Independent risk factors for severe discomfort across the ten domains of inquiry are presented in Table 3. Non-modifiable risk factors for severe discomfort included younger age, female sex, obesity, previous stroke or transient ischaemic attack, and long-term opioid or neuropathic pain therapy. Female sex was an independent risk factor for six of the ten adverse outcomes. Independent of other factors, there was a significantly lower prevalence of severe postoperative pain and drowsiness associated with using regional anaesthesia alone (that is, nerve block, spinal or epidural anaesthesia or a combination thereof, without general anaesthesia).

Patient experience and satisfaction

Patients most commonly reported anxiety to be the worst thing about their operation (33.3%), followed by pain (16.7%). Analysis of free-text responses identified a number of additional themes including the facilities, staff behaviours, communication, and non-clinical processes such as transport or discharge efficiency. (Table 4)

Patient satisfaction levels were high with only 5.7% of patients reporting being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with any aspect of their care (Table 5). 99% of the patients who responded to the NHS Friends and Family Test (FFT) stated they would recommend the anaesthesia service; 5% did not respond. Two patient or procedural risk factors independently predicted that a patient would not recommend the service to friends or family: long-term opioid use (11% of patients; odds ratio [OR] 1.98, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.24-3.15; $P < 0.004$), and a history of congestive cardiac failure (2% of patients; OR 2.80, 95% CI 1.29-6.05; $P < 0.009$). Multivariable analysis adjusting for these non-modifiable risk factors found that

Table 1 Baseline patient characteristics comparing respondents and non-respondents (n = 16,222) [P values corrected (P') for 20 comparisons between groups of surgical speciality]

Patient characteristics	Respondents (n = 15,040)	Non-respondents (n = 1,182)	P value
Sex (M/F) (% M)	6,696/8,344 (45)	551/631 (47)	0.163
Age, yr (range)	55 (18 – 100)	57 (18–98)	<0.001
ASA n (%)			<0.001
I	4,995 (33)	305 (26)	
II	7,208 (48)	450 (38)	
III	2,646 (18)	345 (29)	
IV	178 (1)	79 (7)	
V	3 (0.02)	3 (0.3)	
Surgical specialties, n (%)			P' value
Orthopaedics	4,000 (27)	251 (21)	<0.002
Gynaecology	1,946 (13)	122 (10)	0.12
Abdomen (gut)	1,818 (12)	144 (12)	0.96
Urology	1,802 (12)	143 (12)	0.94
Head and neck	1,251 (8)	102 (9)	0.75
Ophthalmology	984 (7)	105 (9)	0.04
Body surface (breast)	699 (5)	46 (4)	0.26
Abdomen (hepatobiliary)	496 (3)	41 (3)	0.99
Body surface (other)	438 (3)	28 (2)	0.8
Vascular	352 (2)	27 (2)	0.99
Dental	305 (2)	30 (3)	0.8
Neurosurgery	270 (2)	41 (3)	0.02
Cardiac	251 (2)	53 (4)	<0.002
Endoscopy	132 (0.9)	19 (2)	<0.004
Thoracic	131 (0.9)	17 (1)	0.18
Endocrine	55 (0.4)	1 (0.08)	0.36
Interventional radiology	43 (0.3)	24 (2)	<0.002
Abdomen (bariatric)	36 (0.2)	3 (0.3)	0.99
Transplant	22 (0.1)	3 (0.3)	0.89
Abdomen (endocrine)	9 (0.06)	1 (0.08)	0.74
Surgical urgency, n (%)			<0.001
Elective	12,008 (80)	809 (69)	
Expedited	1,436 (10)	129 (11)	
Urgent	1,532 (10)	222 (19)	
Immediate	64 (0.4)	22 (2)	
Surgical severity, n (%)			0.060
Minor	2,550 (17)	161 (14)	
Intermediate	5,709 (39)	458 (40)	
Major	4,476 (30)	356 (31)	
Complex	2,036 (14)	165 (14)	
Comorbidities, n (%)			
Congestive cardiac failure	320 (2)	54 (5)	<0.001
Previous stroke/TIA	572 (4)	84 (7)	<0.001
Cancer within past 5 yr	1,816 (12)	166 (14)	0.047
Obesity (BMI ≥ 30)	3,258 (22)	229 (19)	0.065
Long-term medications, n (%)			
Opiates/opioids	1,514 (10)	131 (11)	0.261
NSAIDs/COX inhibitors	1,331 (9)	81 (7)	0.019
Benzodiazepines	433 (3)	39 (3)	0.405
Neuropathic pain medications	883 (6)	71 (6)	0.845

the following types of severe discomfort predicted that the patient would not recommend the service to friends and family: pain (OR 2.73, 95% CI (1.81 – 4.13); P' < 0.0005) and PONV (OR 3.78, 95% CI 2.11–6.78; P' < 0.0005).

Accidental awareness during general anaesthesia (AAGA)

3.6% (95% CI 3.3–3.9%) of patients undergoing GA were not expecting to be asleep for surgery; conversely, 4.0% (3.7–4.3%) of patients expecting to be asleep were not administered a GA. There was no association between receiving a different type of anaesthetic to that expected, and reporting dissatisfaction with general care, waking or preoperative information sharing; after the review of 338 patients (2.7% of GAs; 95% CI 2.4–2.9%) identified as potential cases of AAGA, 15 patients (0.12% of GAs; 95% CI 0.1–0.2%) were classified as having had either probable (one patient) or possible (14 patients) AAGA, an event rate of approximately 1 in 800. AAGA was related to emergence from anaesthesia (removal of tracheal tube) in six of these patients. One patient reported dissatisfaction with their wake-up from anaesthesia: they experienced pain, being unable to move or breathe and hearing voices during surgery. Two patients reported feeling the surgery but without pain. Regression analysis did not identify any independent risk factors for probable or certain AAGA.

Discussion

This comprehensive national snapshot of patient-reported outcome shows high levels of satisfaction with anaesthesia care delivered by NHS hospitals. However, there is a striking disconnect between high levels of patient satisfaction and the substantial burden of perioperative symptoms. Severe discomfort in at least one domain was reported by 35% of respondents. The commonest symptom was severe thirst, but this did not predict patient dissatisfaction. Severe pain, drowsiness, sore throat and PONV predicted dissatisfaction with anaesthesia services; however, 99% of patients who responded indicated that they would recommend the service to friends and family. Anxiety and pain were both common and had impact on patient experience, and provide important targets for research and quality improvement. These data can also be used to improve the information provided to patients before surgery and anaesthesia, hence helping to meet and manage patient expectations of their perioperative outcomes and experience. AAGA was uncommon and when it did occur, in only one of 15 patients was it associated with short-term distress or dissatisfaction. Overall, these findings demonstrate the importance of measuring quality from several aspects (safety, experience, outcome) in order to contextualise findings and appropriately focus future efforts to improve care.

The inconsistent relationship we found between satisfaction, safety and effectiveness contradicts the findings of a recent systematic review.²⁵ There are several possible explanations for this. Our study focused on a particular aspect of hospital treatment – perioperative care evaluated within 24h of surgery – which has not previously been investigated in a comprehensive multicentre cohort.^{18,25} However, our findings are consistent with previous single centre studies in this setting.^{17,26} While symptoms such as severe postoperative thirst are common, they may simply be less distressing than those linked with patient dissatisfaction such as pain, nausea and vomiting, or sore throat; it may also be that patients are more prepared for some symptoms than others, through better preoperative communication with healthcare professionals.²⁷ The discrepancy between the prevalence of different domains of discomfort and their impact on patient satisfaction highlights the importance of measuring both symptoms and experience when

Table 2 Anaesthesia related discomfort [n(%)]

Anaesthesia-related discomfort	None	Moderate	Severe
Thirst			
Number	4,358	7,711	2,776
Percentage (95% CI)	30.0 (28.3-29.7)	51.3 (50.5-52.1)	18.5 (17.8-19.1)
Drowsiness			
Number	5,193	8,131	1,513
Percentage (95% CI)	34.5 (33.8 – 35.4)	54.1 (53.3-54.9)	10.1 (9.6-10.5)
Pain at surgical site			
Number	7,600	5,600	1,652
Percentage (95% CI)	50.5 (49.7-51.3)	37.2 (36.5-38.0)	11.0 (10.5-11.5)
Hoarseness			
Number	9,769	4,418	526
Percentage (95% CI)	65.0 (64.2-65.7)	29.4 (28.7-30.1)	3.5 (3.2-3.8)
Sore Throat			
Number	10,353	3,955	495
Percentage (95% CI)	68.83 (68.1-69.6)	26.3 (26.6-27.0)	3.29 (3.0-3.58)
Cold			
Number	11,333	2,859	666
Percentage (95% CI)	75.4 (74.7-76.0)	19.0 (18.4-19.6)	4.43 (4.1-4.8)
Nausea and vomiting			
Number	12,357	1,996	476
Percentage (95% CI)	82.2 (81.6-82.8)	13.3 (12.7-13.8)	3.2 (2.9-3.4)
Confusion			
Number	12,409	2,174	189
Percentage (95% CI)	82.5 (82.0-83.1)	14.5 (13.9-15.0)	1.3 (1.1-1.4)
Shivering			
Number	12,782	1,635	410
Percentage (95% CI)	85.0 (84.4-85.6)	10.9 (10.4-11.4)	2.7 (2.5-3.0)
Pain at injection site			
Number	12,856	1,734	194
Percentage (95% CI)	85.5 (84.9-86.0)	11.5 (11.0-12.0)	1.3 (1.1-1.5)

evaluating patient-centred outcomes for the purposes of quality improvement. It is notable that most patients who were categorised as potential AAGA patients did not report dissatisfaction with the care delivered. This may be because our estimate was inaccurate, because a low event rate meant that we missed a significant relationship between AAGA and other risk factors or outcomes, because the distressing consequences of AAGA may not become apparent until much later,²⁸ or because dissatisfaction after an episode of AAGA is more likely to be associated with the manner in which complaints or concerns are later handled than with the event of AAGA itself.²⁹

Analyses identifying risk factors for adverse outcomes should be interpreted with the same caution as in all observational studies. Our data are hypothesis-generating rather than explanatory, and confounding by indication could be responsible for some reported associations – for example between administration of morphine and severe postoperative pain.³⁰ Acknowledging these caveats, our findings nevertheless point towards opportunities for future research and improvement efforts. Low-risk interventions such as music therapy, which has been shown to reduce perioperative anxiety and pain,³¹ might improve experience for substantial numbers of patients without incurring major cost. The most common type of postoperative discomfort reported was thirst; this could be locally investigated through evaluation of preoperative starvation times, intraoperative fluid and drug regimens and possibly addressed through rapid re-establishment of oral fluids after

surgery where possible.³² More than half of patients reported severe or moderate surgical pain: this is a particularly important target for research and quality improvement, as improving acute pain management might also reduce the risk of chronic pain,¹³ which is both distressing for patients and carries significant societal burden.³³ Furthermore, this has recently been highlighted as a research priority by patients, public and health-care professionals in the UK.³⁴ Although the incidence of suspected AAGA in this cohort is consistent with studies using similar methods to elicit explicit recall of intraoperative events,³⁵ in nearly half of these patients, the episode of awareness occurred during removal of a tracheal tube. However, recent reports have highlighted late psychological harm as a result of awareness during emergence from anaesthesia,²⁸ hence we have included these patients in our estimate of AAGA incidence, where older studies have not.³⁶

The major strength of this study is the size and distribution of the sample. 97% of eligible NHS organisations contributed data, and the patient response rate was high. This comprehensive hospital participation is unusual compared with previous large-scale point-prevalence studies.^{37,38} Professional engagement was facilitated by establishing a network of investigators to support research and quality improvement; furthermore, and following the example set by surgical trainee research networks,³⁹ junior doctors and students were encouraged to become investigators for this study, hence supporting study delivery at a local level. This networked approach to health

Table 3 Factors independently (on multivariable analysis) associated with severe postoperative discomfort. Odds ratios (95% CI); P < 0.01 unless otherwise stated [P = P corrected for 10 comparisons using Bonferroni's correction]

Risk factor	Thirst	Pain at surgical site	Drowsiness	Hoarseness	Sore throat	Cold	PONV	Confusion	Shivering	Pain at injection site
NON-MODIFIABLE FACTORS										
Female sex	1.32 (1.22-1.45)	1.73 (1.55-1.96)	1.70 (1.51-1.91)		1.52 (1.25-1.84)	2.69 (2.24-3.23) 0.58 (0.47-0.72)	2.77 (2.22-3.45) 1.41 (1.15-1.72)		0.68 (0.52-0.88) P=0.04	
BMI>30							P=0.01		1.95 (1.53-2.49)	
Age 18-65	1.27 (1.12-1.43)	1.25 (1.10-1.41) P=0.01				1.40 (1.17-1.68)	1.57 (1.27-1.94)			
Age≥80	0.76 (0.63-0.90) P=0.02					1.69 (1.17-2.44) P=0.05			1.52 (1.14-2.04) P=0.04	
Previous TIA/CVA						1.48 (1.17-1.88) P=0.01				
Long-term opioids								3.49 (2.50-4.81)		
Long-term neuropathic agents	1.48 (1.25-1.74)									
ASA grade [Reference: ASA grade I]										
III	1.43 (1.25-1.63)									
IV or V	2.65 (1.89-3.71)									
Urgent/immediate surgery	1.22 (1.07-1.39) P=0.03	1.35 (1.16-1.59)	1.35 (1.15-1.58)							
Surgical type										
Neurosurgery	0.61 (0.45-0.83) P=0.01	0.69 (0.55-0.87)	0.66 (0.53-0.82)							
Urology	0.70 (0.59-0.81)									
Ophthalmology	0.47 (0.30-0.75) P=0.01									
Cardiac	0.45 (0.34-0.59)									
Head and Neck		2.01 (1.45-2.80)	2.14 (1.53-3.01)	1.85 (1.44-2.38) P=0.01	3.49 (2.80-4.36)					
Thoracic					3.38 (1.84-6.19)					
Magnitude of surgery [Reference variable: minor surgery]								2.75 (1.46-5.16) P=0.02		
Major								3.33 (1.69-6.55) P=0.01		
Complex									1.47 (1.20-1.81)	
Major or complex surgery	1	1	1.29 (1.12-1.48)	1.37 (1.12-1.66) P=0.02		1.32 (1.10-1.57) P=0.02	1.89 (1.48-2.43)			
Duration of surgery [Reference variable: <30min(m)]										
30-60m	1.26 (1.10-1.43) P=0.01	1.68 (1.40-2.00)	1.54 (1.30-1.84)			1.47 (1.17-1.68)				
60-120m	1.31 (1.13-1.52)	2.63 (2.18-3.15)	2.47 (2.07-2.94)			1.48 (1.20-1.82)	2.23 (1.54-3.24)			
>120m	1.66 (1.40-1.98)	3.18 (2.58-3.92)	3.06 (2.52-3.70)				3.17 (2.13-4.72)			
MODIFIABLE FACTORS										
Anaesthetic technique										
Inhalation GA	1.42 (1.25-1.61)		1.95 (1.40-2.71)	3.10 (2.00-4.79)						
Total i.v. GA			1.60 (1.16-2.22) P=0.05	1.89 (1.21-2.92) P=0.05		1.77 (1.30-2.41)				
Sole RA without GA	0.27 (0.19-0.37)		0.47 (0.31-0.73)							
Pharmacological agents administered during anaesthesia and surgery										
Neuromuscular block	1.85 (1.68-2.04)		1.46 (1.31-1.66)	3.38 (2.70-4.22)	2.96 (2.41-3.64)				0.71 (0.57-0.90) P=0.05	
Morphine	1.20 (1.09-1.32)	1.44 (1.28-1.63)				0.69 (0.57-0.83)			0.50 (0.31-0.80) P=0.04	
Alfentanil										
Cyclizine						1.49 (1.14-1.94) P=0.03				

Table 4 Responses to the question: "What was the worst thing about your operation?" (total responses: n = 13,985)

Response	Number of patients	Percentage	95% CI
Anxiety	4,653	33.3	32.3-34.1
Pain	2,333	16.7	16.1-17.3
Unable to carry out usual activities	1,785	12.8	12.2-13.3
Recovery process	920	6.6	6.2-7.0
Awareness	136	1.0	0.8-1.1
Nothing	2,034	14.5	14.0-15.1
Other (thematic analysis)	2,124	15.6	14.6-15.8
• Environment/facilities (waiting times/recovery)			
• Emotional wellbeing (anticipation/anxiety/circumstances of surgery)			
• Procedure specifics (cannulation/regional)			
• Symptoms (hunger, thirst, cold, pain)			
• Staff (professionalism/quality of care)			
• Communication (changes to planned surgery/pre-op discussion)			
• Process (transport, discharge)			

Table 5 Satisfaction with care

Domain	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
Pain therapy (n = 14,403)	8,879	4,986	414	108	16
Number	61.6	34.6	2.9	0.8	0.1
Percentage (95% CI)	(60.9-62.4)	(33.8-35.4)	(2.6-3.1)	(0.6-0.9)	
PONV therapy (n = 12,161)	8,652	3,271	117	33	88
Number	71.1	26.9	0.8	0.3	0.7
Percentage (95% CI)	(70.3-71.9)	(26.1 - 27.7)	(0.7-1.0)	(0.2-0.4)	
Preoperative information (n = 14,943)	12,458	2,373	58	52	2
Number	83.4	15.9	0.4	0.4	0.01
Percentage (95% CI)	(82.7-84.0)	(15.2-16.5)	(0.3-0.5)	(0.3-0.5)	
Waking up (n = 14,092)	9,416 (67)	4,360	194	78	44
Number	66.8	31.0	1.4	0.6	0.3
Percentage (95% CI)	(66.0-68.7)	(30.1-31.8)	(1.2-1.6)	(0.4-0.7)	
General care (n = 14,922)	12,773	2,065	31	51	2
Number	85.6	13.8	0.2	0.3	0.013
Percentage (95% CI)	(85.0-86.2)	(13.8-14.5)	(0.1-0.3)	(0.2-0.4)	

services research delivery provides a useful template that might be replicated in other settings. There are, however, some limitations. Although comparison with previous NHS activity data⁴ indicates that we have captured nearly all eligible patients during our recruitment window, a relatively small proportion of procedures (10%) were classified as either urgent or immediate, and non-respondents were also higher risk in terms of comorbidities and age: this is likely to reflect recruitment bias, and could have affected our findings. It is possible that we did not capture all patient or process-related risk factors for adverse outcomes: these are potential additional sources of confounding in our analyses. We did not include ethnicity in our dataset; other studies have found variation in patient satisfaction⁴⁰ or patient expectation⁴¹ according to ethnicity. This might also be an important issue when considering the international

generalizability of our findings. Finally, our methodology for determining whether patients experienced AAGA had limitations. It was clear from follow-up that for some patients, the term "awareness" carried a different meaning to that intended. This provides some explanation for the high false positive rate for the modified Brice questionnaire, and might indicate that its specificity is too poor to be used in routine clinical practice. We did not conduct three administrations of the Brice questionnaire as would normally be recommended; nor did we specify the method of follow-up of suspected AAGA patients by local investigators. These factors might have led to inaccuracy in our estimate of AAGA incidence.

In summary, we calculated a robust multicentre evaluation of patient perspectives on anaesthesia care in NHS hospitals. We found that while patient satisfaction was high, one in three

patients reported severe discomfort within 24h of surgery. Anxiety was most commonly reported as the worst aspect of the surgical episode: this finding supports wider implementation and evaluation of simple, cost-effective, evidence-based anxiolytic interventions. Routinely reported quality data should cover all three aspects of safety, experience and outcome, so as to provide a comprehensive assessment of care from the patient perspective. International replication of our methodology would provide data supporting improved performance and outcome in different healthcare settings, and enable comparisons that might further elucidate the role of organisational and cultural factors on patients' perspective of quality in anaesthesia care.

Authors' contributions

Study design/planning: S.R.M., E.M.K.W., M.B.

Study conduct: S.R.M., E.M.K.W., M.B.

Data analysis: S.R.M., E.M.K.W., M.P.W.G., T.M.C.

Writing paper: S.R.M., E.M.K.W.

Revising paper: all authors

Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available at *British Journal of Anaesthesia* online.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to our collaborators, the SNAP-1 investigators; the full list of contributors can be found in supplementary document 1.

Declaration of interest

All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure at <http://icmje.org/conflicts-of-interest/> and declare: financial support for the submitted work from the National Institute for Academic Anaesthesia (NIAA; Royal College of Anaesthetists), University College London Hospitals (UCLH) NHS Foundation Trust and UCLH National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre. In addition, S. R.M. has received other unrelated research grants from the NIAA, the UCLH NIHR Biomedical Research Centre and the Health Foundation. S.R.M. (since May 2016) is the Associate National Director for Elective Care for NHS England. E.M.K.W. received salary support from the London Clinic Intensive Care Unit while analysing this study. M.P.W.G. receives funding from the Southampton NIHR Biomedical Research Unit (Respiratory). There are no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Funding

National Institute for Academic Anaesthesia (Royal College of Anaesthetists), University College London Hospitals (UCLH) NHS Foundation Trust and NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and University College London. The funders have had no role in the conduct, analysis or reporting of the results.

References

1. Institute of Medicine. *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Washington D.C., U.S.: National Academy Press, 2001
2. Darzi A. *High Quality Care For All: NHS Next Stage Review final report*. London, UK: The Stationery Office, Department of Health, 2008b. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228836/7432.pdf (accessed 10 November 2015)
3. Weiser TG, Haynes AB, Molina G, et al. Estimate of the global volume of surgery in 2012: an assessment supporting improved health outcomes. *Lancet* 2015; **385**: S11
4. Sury MRJ, Palmer Jhmg Cook TM, Pandit JJ. The State of UK anaesthesia: a survey of National Health Service activity in 2013. *Br J Anaesth* 2014; **113**: 575–84
5. Pearse RM, Harrison DA, MacDonald N, et al. Effect of a perioperative, cardiac output-guided hemodynamic therapy algorithm on outcomes following major gastrointestinal surgery: a randomized clinical trial and systematic review. *JAMA* 2014; **311**: 2181–90
6. Rigg JR, Jamrozik K, Myles PS, et al. Epidural anaesthesia and analgesia and outcome of major surgery: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2002; **359**: 1276–82
7. Moonesinghe SR, Harris S, Mythen MG, et al. Survival after postoperative morbidity: a longitudinal observational cohort study. *Br J Anaesth* 2014; **113**: 977–84
8. Rhodes A, Cecconi M, Hamilton M, et al. Goal-directed therapy in high-risk surgical patients: a 15-year follow-up study. *Intensive Care Med* 2010; **36**: 1327–32
9. Wigmore TJ, Mohammed K, Jhanji S. Long-term survival for patients undergoing volatile versus IV anaesthesia for cancer surgery: a retrospective analysis. *Anesthesiology* 2016; **124**: 69–79
10. Macario A, Weinger M, Truong P, Lee M. Which clinical anaesthesia outcomes are both common and important to avoid? The perspective of a panel of expert anesthesiologists. *Anesth Analg* 1999; **88**: 1085–91
11. Macario A, Weinger M, Carney S, Kim A. Which clinical anaesthesia outcomes are important to avoid? The perspective of patients. *Anesth Analg* 1999; **89**: 652–8
12. Grocott MP, Browne JP, Van der Meulen J, et al. The Postoperative Morbidity Survey was validated and used to describe morbidity after major surgery. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2007; **60**: 919–28
13. Kehlet H, Jensen TS, Woolf CJ. Persistent post surgical pain: risk factors and prevention. *Lancet* 2006; **367**: 1618–25
14. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gotsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; **61**: 344–9
15. Moonesinghe SR, Walker EM, Bell M. Design and methodology of SNAP-1: a Sprint National Anaesthesia Project to measure patient reported outcome after anaesthesia. *Perioper Med (Lond)* 2015; **4**: 4 doi: 10.1186/s13741-015-0011-2. eCollection 2015
16. AXA-PPP Healthcare. Schedule of Procedures and Fees for Fee Approved Specialists. 2015. Available from <https://online.axapphealthcare.co.uk/SpecialistForms/SpecialistCode.mvc?source=contracted> (accessed 10 November 2015)
17. Bauer M, Bohrer H, Aichele G, Bach A, Martin E. Measuring patient satisfaction with anaesthesia: perioperative

- questionnaire versus standardised face-to-face interview. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica* 2001; **45**: 65–72
18. Barnett SF, Alagar RK, Grocott MP, Giannaris S, Dick JR, Moonesinghe SR. Patient-satisfaction measures in anaesthesia: qualitative systematic review. *Anesthesiology* 2013; **119**: 452–78
 19. Avidan MS, Jacobsohn E, Glick D, et al. Prevention of intraoperative awareness in a high-risk surgical population. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **365**: 591–600
 20. Pandit JJ, Andrade J, Bogod DG, et al. 5th National Audit Project (NAP5) on accidental awareness during general anaesthesia: protocol, methods, and analysis of data. *Br J Anaesth* 2014; **113**: 540–8
 21. NHS Confederation. Key statistics on the NHS. 2016. Available from <http://www.nhsconfed.org/resources/key-statistics-on-the-nhs> (accessed 1 July 2016)
 22. The Scottish Government. Structure of NHS Scotland. 2016. Available from <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Health/About/NHS-Scotland> (accessed 1 July 2016)
 23. NHS Wales. Health in Wales. 2016. Available from <http://www.wales.nhs.uk/nhswalesaboutus/structure> (accessed 1 July 2016)
 24. Health and Social Care Online, Health and Social Care Trusts. 2015. Available from <http://online.hscni.net/hospitals/health-and-social-care-trusts/> (accessed 1 July 2016)
 25. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. *Br Med J Open* 2013; **3**: e001570. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001570
 26. Myles PS, Williams DL, Hendrata M, Anderson H, Weeks AM. Patient satisfaction after anaesthesia and surgery: results of a prospective survey of 10,811 patients. *Br J Anaesth* 2000; **84**: 6–10
 27. Hamilton DF, Lane JV, Gaston P, et al. What determines patient satisfaction with surgery? A prospective cohort study of 4709 patients following total joint replacement. *Br Med J Open* 2013; **3**: e001570 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001570.
 28. Pandit JJ, Andrade J, Bogod DG, et al. 5th National Audit Project (NAP5) on accidental awareness during general anaesthesia: summary of main findings and risk factors. *Br J Anaesth* 2014; **113**: 549–59
 29. Kent CD, Posner KL, Mashour GA, et al. Patient perspectives on intraoperative awareness with explicit recall: report from a North American anaesthesia awareness registry. *Br J Anaesth* 2015; **115**: i114–21
 30. Signorello LB, McLaughlin JK, Lipworth L, Friis S, Sorensen HT, Blot WJ. Confounding by indication in epidemiologic studies of commonly used analgesics. *Am J Ther* 2002; **9**: 199–205
 31. Hole J, Hirsch M, Ball E, Meads C. Music as an aid for postoperative recovery in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2015; **386**: 1659–71
 32. Levy N, Mills P, Mythen M. Is the pursuit of DREAMing (drinking, eating and mobilising) the ultimate goal of anaesthesia? *Anaesthesia* 2016; **71**: 1008–12
 33. Breivik H, Eisenberg E, O'Brien T. The individual and societal burden of chronic pain in Europe: the case for strategic prioritisation and action to improve knowledge and availability of appropriate care. *BMC Public Health* 2013; **13**: 1229
 34. Boney O, Bell M, Bell N, et al. Identifying research priorities in anaesthesia and perioperative care: final report of the joint National Institute of Academic Anaesthesia/James Lind Alliance Research Priority Setting Partnership. *Br Med J Open* 2015; **5**: e010006 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010006.
 35. Sandin RH, Enlund G, Samuelsson P, Lennmarken C. Awareness during anaesthesia: a prospective case study. *Lancet* 2000; **355**: 707–11
 36. Myles PS, Leslie K, McNeil J, Forbes A, Chan MT. Bispectral index monitoring to prevent awareness during anaesthesia: the B-Aware randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004; **363**: 1757–63
 37. Magill SS, Edwards JR, Bamberg W, et al. Multistate point-prevalence survey of health care-associated infections. *N Engl J Med* 2014; **370**: 1198–208
 38. Pearse RM, Moreno RP, Bauer P, et al. Mortality after surgery in Europe: a 7 day cohort study. *Lancet* 2012; **380**: 1059–65
 39. Pinkney TD, Calvert M, Bartlett DC, et al. Impact of wound edge protection devices on surgical site infection after laparotomy: multicentre randomised controlled trial (ROSSINI Trial). *Br Med J* 2013; **347**: f4305
 40. Woods SE, Bivins R, Oteng K, Engel A. The influence of ethnicity on patient satisfaction. *Ethn Health* 2005; **10**: 235–42
 41. Mead N, Roland M. Understanding why some ethnic minority patients evaluate medical care more negatively than white patients: a cross sectional analysis of a routine patient survey in English general practices. *Br Med J* 2009; **339**: b3450

†This Article is accompanied by Editorial Aew384.