

Review of: "[Commentary] “Form Follows Function (FFF)” – Applying this rule of designers and architects can reduce misinterpretations and methodical shortcomings in healthcare."

Mohammad Mahdi Ershadi¹

¹ Amirkabir University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper explores the application of the “Form Follows Function” rule from Ulm's Academy of Design in healthcare. The author highlights the discrepancies between experimental controlled trials and real-world medical practice, emphasizing the need for structured and pragmatic approaches in healthcare evaluation. The paper emphasizes the importance of establishing thresholds for clinical relevance and efficiency to prevent overtreatment and advocates for aligning measurement strategies with actual functions to enhance healthcare evaluation accuracy. The study also discusses two conflicts in healthcare:

The misinterpretation of results from randomized controlled trials (RCTs)

Methodical shortcomings in evaluating the need for healthcare provision and its efficiency.

The paper suggests applying the principles of the FFF rule to healthcare services to address these conflicts and improve healthcare outcomes. There are some improvement points that could be addressed in this study:

The paper could benefit from a clearer statement of the research objective or research question. This would help readers understand the specific problem the study aims to address and the expected outcomes.

2. While the paper briefly mentions the application of the "Form Follows Function" (FFF) rule from Ulm's Academy of Design in healthcare, it would be valuable to provide additional context on the FFF rule itself. Explaining its principles and how they relate to healthcare evaluation would enhance the reader's understanding.

3. The study would benefit from a detailed description of the methodology used to identify conflicts in healthcare evaluation and to highlight discrepancies between experimental controlled trials and real-world medical practice. Providing information on data collection, analysis methods, and any specific tools or frameworks employed would strengthen the study's validity.

4. While the paper discusses the need for structured, pragmatic approaches in healthcare evaluation, it would be beneficial to include examples or case studies that illustrate the challenges faced in real-world healthcare settings. Adding supporting evidence would enhance the credibility and applicability of the proposed solutions.

5. It is important to acknowledge and discuss any limitations of the study. This could include limitations related to the methodology, data sources, or generalizability of the findings. Addressing potential limitations would help readers assess the reliability and validity of the study's conclusions.
6. The paper briefly mentions the implications of aligning measurement strategies with actual functions in healthcare evaluation, but it would be valuable to expand on the potential impact and significance of this approach. Discussing how it can improve patient outcomes, resource allocation, and decision-making processes would strengthen the paper's conclusions.
7. The paper lacks a structured section. For example, a dedicated conclusion section summarizing the main findings and their implications. Adding a conclusion section would provide a concise overview of the study's contributions and help readers grasp the key takeaways.
8. This study needs to have a better literature review section and review more similar studies to have better context and structure.

By addressing these improvement points, the study can become more comprehensive, robust, and impactful in its analysis and recommendations.