OBJECTIVES: Patient-reported outcome (PRO) measures provide patients and clinicians with a comprehensive understanding of the treatment from different perspectives. The current study compared with the conventional physical examination and laboratory test result, PROs may be a better way to assess the overall disease status and treatment outcome. This study aims to compare the differences of PROs and conventional physical examination and laboratory test result.

METHODS: A total of 100 patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease were recruited and divided into two groups: the PRO group and the conventional group. The PRO group included patients who completed PRO questionnaires, while the conventional group only had physical examination and laboratory test results. The PROs were measured using the St George’s Respiratory Questionnaire (SGRQ) and the quality of life section of the Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire (CRDQ). The conventional physical examination included pulmonary function tests, chest X-rays, and blood tests. The results were compared using independent sample t-tests and correlation analysis.

RESULTS: The PRO group had significantly lower SGRQ and CRDQ scores than the conventional group, indicating better quality of life for patients who completed PROs. The correlations between PROs and conventional results were positive, meaning that better PROs were associated with better physical examination and laboratory test results. No significant differences were found between the two groups in terms of age, sex, and smoking status.

CONCLUSIONS: PROs provide additional information on the overall disease status and treatment outcome for patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Further studies are needed to explore the impact of PROs on clinical decision-making and patient management.