International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

# The Role of Patient Satisfaction Surveys in Healthcare Quality Improvement: A Review

[1]*Salim Hasan Al Arrayed
[1]Arrayed Eye Centre Manama, Kingdom of Bahrain.

**Abstract**

Patient satisfaction is a critical indicator of healthcare quality, reflecting patients' perceptions of care and the effectiveness of healthcare delivery. Despite its recognized importance, inconsistencies in survey design, application, and integration across diverse healthcare systems present challenges for standardization and actionable use. High-income countries often employ validated, culturally adapted instruments, whereas middle- and low-income nations face infrastructural, methodological, and cultural barriers, limiting comparability and the effectiveness of quality improvement initiatives. Although patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) and patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) have gained attention for capturing comprehensive patient-centered perspectives, there remains a gap regarding their systematic application for measurable healthcare improvements. This review aimed to summarize current research on the role of patient satisfaction surveys in quality improvement, identify methodological and contextual gaps, and highlight strategies for maximizing survey utility in patient-centered care. A systematic search of peer-reviewed studies published between 2015 and 2025 was conducted across PubMed, Google Scholar, Science Direct, and Springer Link, applying thematic analysis to 15 selected studies. Findings indicate that determinants of satisfaction include communication quality, waiting times, environmental factors, professional competence, and socio-demographic influences. Integrating patient feedback into continuous quality improvement frameworks, digital platforms, and specialty-specific instruments enhances care responsiveness, engagement, and outcomes. However, disparities in methodology, cultural adaptation, and digital integration persist. Strengthening survey validity, embracing technology, and standardizing cross-national measures are essential for translating patient experiences into sustainable healthcare quality improvements worldwide.

**Keywords:** Patient Satisfaction; Quality of Health Care; Patient Reported Outcome Measures; Surveys and Questionnaires; Health Care Surveys; Digital Health; Delivery of Health Care; Patient-Centered Care.

## 1. Introduction

The level of patient satisfaction is an important indicator of the quality of healthcare since it reflects the views of the patients on care delivered to them. The model by Donabedian is based on the idea that the quality of healthcare may be systematic and broken down into three interconnected factors, i.e., structure, process, and outcome (Ameh et al., 2017). The structure includes physical and organizational characteristics of healthcare facilities, including infrastructure, personnel credentials, and resources; the process refers to the contact between healthcare givers and patients, including diagnosis, treatment and communication; and the outcome relates to care, especially patient satisfaction, health improvements, and adherence to treatment. Lack in structural features such as inappropriate facilities and constraints, like doctor and nurse services, greatly affect the level of satisfaction among patients (Fatima et al., 2018). This understanding provides a clear insight into the fact that the structural and process elements can be directly enhanced to increase patient satisfaction and, thus, the overall quality of healthcare (Setyaningrum et al., 2024).

Patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) and patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) collectively provide a multifaceted view of healthcare quality because they measure different yet complementary healthcare dimensions of patient-centered care (Kingsley & Patel, 2017). PREMs mostly assess the perception of patients with the process of care and levels of satisfaction as well as organizational responsiveness especially in micro-level quality improvement and organizational benchmarking. Conversely, PROMs measure the clinical and functional

**Salim Hasan Al Arrayed**
Arrayed Eye Centre Manama, Kingdom of Bahrain
Email: ssarrayed@gmail.com

Received: 22-Oct-2025 Revised: 19-Nov-2025 Accepted: 2-Dec-2025

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

outcomes as perceived by the patient as per their quality of life and health status, which is crucial longitudinal data that measures the overall effectiveness of care in the long term (Weinfurt & Reeve, 2022).

Combined with the conventional clinical and operational outcomes, these patient-reported measures can help evaluate the quality of healthcare in a more comprehensive manner, once clinical outcomes are compared with patient experiences and can be used to develop truly patient-centered systems (Gleeson et al., 2016). The role of inclusion of patient satisfaction and experience in quality evaluation systems has been emphasized by institutions like the World Health Organization (WHO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Institute of Medication (IOM) internationally. They support the organized involvement of PREMs and PROMs in increasing accountability, driving policy, and advancing forward to provide care that actually puts patient needs and preferences first (De Rosis et al., 2022).

It was established in the prior study by Bleustein et al., (2014) that the increase in waiting time adversely affected patient perceptions of care, including such issues as access, perceived staff competence, and trust in services (Bleustein et al., 2014). Additionally, it was found that effective communication is one of the essential factors, as effective communication could have been identified in order to mitigate dissatisfaction related to waiting. With the evolution of the field, these findings formed the basis of the creation of developed and tested survey tools that are better structured to measure the satisfaction of the patients (Xie & Or, 2017). Such tools have been improved with psychometric validation so that they can be relied on, and applied in various healthcare environments. The development of the qualitative observations and unstructured feedback system to the validated survey-based systems has helped improve our comprehension of the complex relationship between communication and waiting times and patient satisfaction and eases the means to have specific interventions in improving patient experiences (Xie & Or, 2017).

Surveys, personal interviews, as well as active feedback of national agencies is also a prerequisite of patient satisfaction in high-income countries, where the Euro Health Consumer Index (EHCI) is one of the most popular strategies used to measure and examine the satisfaction of patients in the novel and innovative context of e-health (Cylus et al., 2016). These frameworks are more prone to using standardized metrics and include the cultural consideration by converting questionnaires to the local context to help to more accurately reflect perception of patients. In contrast, middle- and low-income nations can have the following problems namely, the lack of adequate data collection infrastructure, cultural disparity between expressing satisfaction, and different expectations hence, it makes it difficult to incorporate patient satisfaction into the process of quality measurement (Devi et al., 2020). As an example, a country may rely on fewer indicators or the indirect measures, owing to the lack of resources, which initiates the discrepancy in approaches and complicates the cross-country comparison (Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016).

Furthermore, the attitude towards healthcare providers and systemic transparency based on the culture affects the response of patients thereby affecting the validity and interpretation of the data of patient satisfaction (Govere & Govere, 2016). This variety of approaches explains the relevance of situational approach, where socio-economic and cultural factors should be taken into account to implement patient satisfaction in the scope of the national health quality model, which is why it becomes crucial to continue refinement of approaches to ensure validity, comparability, and cultural-sensitivity in various care settings (Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016).

Although the world has accepted patient satisfaction as an important measure of healthcare quality, it has been supported with much diversity in design, applied and used in the different healthcare systems. The high-income nations tend to use standardized and validated measures, but middle and low-income countries are challenged with the problem of poor infrastructure, cultural difference and inconsistency of methods of measurement and analysis used in practice, which restricts the cross-country comparison and the use of these results in practice. Additionally, but more importantly, though patient-reported experience measures (PREMs), as well as outcome measures (PROMs), are becoming more and more in focus, there is still a gap on their systematic application to initiate quality improvement that is measurable. This review aimed to summarize the existing research on the importance of patient satisfaction surveys in healthcare quality improvement, uncover possible methodological and contextual gaps, and emphasize the ways to maximize the usefulness of survey-based feedback to achieve the global promotion of patient-centered, equitable, and evidence-based healthcare quality improvement.

## 2. Methodology

### *2.1. Search Strategy*

Studies of past 10 years were used that had been published in peer-reviewed journals. Searching of data was done on well-known databases like PubMed, Google Scholar, Science Direct and Springer Link. To carry out this review, the data were gathered with a certain attention to publications that were published between 2015 and 2025 and studied the role of patient satisfaction surveys in the healthcare quality improvement. The author adopted specific search strategies as shown in Table 1 below.

### *2.2. Selection Criteria*

Table 2 demonstrates the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

*Table 1: Search Strategies (Source: Author)*

| S. No. | Search Strategy |
|---|---|
| 1. | (“patient satisfaction” OR “patient experience” OR “patient perception” OR “patient-reported experience measures” OR “PREMs” OR “patient-reported outcome measures” OR “PROMs”) |
| 2. | (“healthcare quality” OR “quality of care” OR “healthcare improvement” OR “service quality” OR “continuous quality improvement” OR “CQI” OR “performance improvement”) |
| 3. | (“assessment tool” OR “feedback system” OR “measurement instrument” OR “evaluation method” OR “psychometric validation”) |
| 4. | (“global” OR “international” OR “cross-national” OR “multicountry” OR “comparative study” OR “worldwide” OR “OECD” OR “WHO”) AND (“hospital” OR “primary care” OR “specialty clinic” OR “ophthalmology” OR “outpatient care” OR “inpatient care”) |

*Table 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria (Source: Author)*

| Inclusion Criteria | Exclusion Criteria |
|---|---|
| Studies that were published in journals with peer-reviewing policies provided by the publishers were included. | Studies that were published in journals with peer-reviewing policies not provided by the publishers were excluded. |
| The studies included in the review were selected based on having the keywords patient satisfaction, healthcare quality improvement and surveys. | The studies not having the specific keyword patient satisfaction, healthcare quality improvement and surveys were excluded from the review. |
| The studies published in the last 10 years from 2015 to 2025 were included in this review. | The studies performed or papers published prior to 2015 were excluded to include the most recent data. |
| Only studies that were accessible in full-text format for the public view were included. | Studies not accessible in open access format in any authorized database were excluded. |

### *2.3. Data Analysis*

The selection of 15 studies was made according to their titles, publishers and the primary purpose of the review corresponded with the rationale of the current study. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data obtained from the 15 articles as demonstrated in the discussion. The information was collected through the use of repetitive keywords in the article including patient satisfaction, healthcare quality improvement and surveys.

### *2.4. Quality Assessment*

The quality of the research involves the criteria upon which the selected publications were the most applicable to the objective of the review and were published in 2015-2025. Another consideration that was significant pertained to availability of full-text studies. These criteria add to the credibility and validity of the synthesized information.

## 3. Result

Table 3 summarizes the studies incorporated and provides information on the importance of patient satisfaction surveys in healthcare quality improvement .

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

*Table 3: Included Studies*

| S. No | Author | Journal | Title | Objective | Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | (Ferreira et al., 2023) | Healthcare | Patient Satisfaction with Healthcare Services and the Techniques Used for its Assessment: A Systematic Literature Review and a Bibliometric Analysis | To identify global determinants of patient satisfaction and commonly used measurement techniques. | Communication, provider competence, and waiting times were the strongest predictors of satisfaction globally. |
| 2. | (Batbaatar et al., 2017) | Perspectives in Public Health | Determinants of patient satisfaction: a systematic review | To synthesize determinants of satisfaction across healthcare systems. | Found that interpersonal care, responsiveness, and accessibility drive satisfaction more than clinical outcomes. |
| 3. | (Lee et al., 2020) | Patient Education and Counseling | Waiting time, communication quality, and patient satisfaction | To analyze how perceived waiting time influences satisfaction in inpatient settings. | Clear communication significantly reduced dissatisfaction due to long waiting times. |
| 4. | (Allenbaugh et al., 2019) | MedEdPORTAL | Health literacy and clear bedside communication | To improve communication between providers and low-literacy patients. | Health literacy-sensitive communication enhanced satisfaction and comprehension. |
| 5. | (Busari & Henry, 2025) | Unpublished/ Working Paper | Impact of Hospital Environment on Patient Satisfaction | To assess environmental and infrastructural factors shaping satisfaction. | Cleanliness, comfort, and privacy were key drivers of positive perceptions. |
| 6. | (Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016) | BMC Health Services Research | Patient satisfaction with the healthcare system: socio-economic and provision factors | To evaluate how demographic and socioeconomic variables influence satisfaction. | Older and female patients reported higher satisfaction; education inversely correlated with satisfaction. |
| 7. | (Abah Vivien, 2020) | IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences | Patient Centered Benchmarking for Satisfaction with Quality of Care among NHIS Enrollees | To examine benchmarking and CQI applications in Nigeria's NHIS system. | CQI frameworks using survey data improved patient-centered service delivery. |

*Cont. Table 3*

| S. No | Author | Journal | Title | Objective | Results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. | (Bastemeijer et al., 2019) | Patient Related Outcome Measures | Patient experiences: a systematic review of quality improvement interventions | To review how PREMs drive hospital QI. | PREMs data informed interventions like PDSA cycles and staff communication training. |
| 9. | (Kringos et al., 2015) | BMC Health Services Research | The influence of context on effectiveness of hospital QI strategies | To explore contextual factors in QI interventions. | Survey-based interventions were more effective when contextualized to hospital culture. |
| 10. | (De Rosis et al., 2020) | BMC Health Services Research | Using patient-reported measures to drive change in healthcare | To evaluate Italy's digital PREMs Observatory. | Continuous web-based surveys improved real-time QI and patient-centeredness. |
| 11. | (Price et al., 2022) | Medical Care | Strategies to enhance response rates in patient experience surveys | To review methods for improving survey representativeness. | Mixed-mode (mail + phone) surveys and small incentives significantly improved response rates. |
| 12. | (Friedel et al., 2023) | Healthcare | Measuring patient experience and satisfaction: European vs US approaches | To compare generic vs specialty satisfaction instruments. | Specialty tools improved validity but lacked cross-setting comparability. |
| 13. | (Sakti et al., 2022) | Patient Preference and Adherence | Patients' satisfaction with ophthalmology clinic services | To identify determinants of satisfaction in ophthalmology clinics. | Waiting time, clinician time, and clarity of explanations were top predictors of dissatisfaction. |
| 14. | (Chen et al., 2020) | Int. J. Health Care Quality Assurance | Improving hospital reimbursement via HCAHPS satisfaction data | To assess links between satisfaction and hospital readmissions. | Higher HCAHPS scores correlated with reduced readmissions and better outcomes. |
| 15. | (Oyeniyi, 2024) | World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews | The role of AI and mobile apps in patient-centric healthcare delivery | To evaluate digital feedback systems in enhancing satisfaction. | AI-driven platforms improved responsiveness, engagement, and service personalization. |

## 4. Discussion

### *4.1. Determinants of Patient Satisfaction: Interplay Between Communication, Accessibility, Environment, Competence, and Sociocultural Factors*

Patient satisfaction determinants are complex and the perceived waiting times and accessibility play important role in determining the overall ratings of care. Extensive literature suggests that an increased wait time is always linked to lower patient satisfaction in different healthcare environments and therefore the efficiency of booking

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

appointments and accessibility to healthcare services (Lee et al., 2019; Xie & Or, 2017). More importantly, the essential role of the clinician-patient communication and interpersonal care quality in moderating the adverse effects of waiting time was identified; positive communication, defined by clear explanations, health literacy-accessible dialogue, empathetic involvement, etc., may reduce the level of dissatisfaction even in the context of long waiting time (Allenbaugh et al., 2019).

Communications can build trust, help patients to better understand their health status, and help them have a more positive view of the quality of care. Specifically, communication that is sensitive to health literacy does not only promote better comprehension but it also seems to counteract the negative impact of extended waiting times on patient satisfaction especially in people with excessive information needs, including those with cancer. In general, the accessibility within better scheduling procedures, as well as the better interaction between clinicians and patients and the sense of empathy, is a key to improving the patient experience and outcomes (Lee et al., 2020).

Hospital physical environment and infrastructure have a critical role to play in determining patient satisfaction and healthcare outcome. Properly configured facility layouts taking into consideration privacy, access, natural lighting and ergonomic comfort play a major role in increasing patient perceptions of care and facilitate faster recovery (Busari & Henry, 2025). Cleanliness turns out to be a major factor contributing to trust, safety, and an overall level of satisfaction, and hygienic environments are directly associated with the perception of quality of care (Busari & Henry, 2025). Also, mechanisms that increase patient comfort, including temperature regulation, personalization of rooms, and ergonomic furniture help to increase well-being and positive hospital experiences (Busari & Henry, 2025).

In addition to environmental conditions, high-quality care is achieved also by the professionalism of healthcare professionals and the ability to coordinate the activities of the team members. The perception of technical abilities and the smooth cooperation between the team members largely determine the level of trust and satisfaction of patients and indicate that well-skilled and well-coordinated teams in the healthcare setting contribute to high patient outcomes. All of these points highlight how much physical infrastructure, hygienic standards are interconnected with the organizational competence of healthcare teams in improving patient experiences in hospital environments (Busari & Henry, 2025).

Sociocultural and demographical factors have a great role in how patients are satisfied with healthcare systems. According to the literature, the age, gender, education level, cultural expectations, and others can have an impact on patients in how they perceive and judge the quality of care. As an example, it was established that older patients were more likely to report higher levels of satisfaction, which could have been explained by various expectations and more value of the work of the healthcare providers (Ghose & Adhish, 2011; Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016). It also depends on differences between sexes, as some studies can indicate that women can be more satisfied or may have other priorities than men (Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016).

Education level also contributes to the level of satisfaction since a more educated person may have more expectations thus may make a critical assessment to the care provided. Moreover, cultural beliefs and social attitudes define the expectations, level of tolerence of patients, which eventually has some effect on the satisfaction levels reported. These sociocultural and demographic factors are important in planning specific interventions aimed at enhancing healthcare experience and in understanding patient satisfaction indicators correctly in a wide range of populations (Xesfingi & Vozikis, 2016).

In another systematic review and bibliometric analysis by Ferreira et al., (2023), the information about what makes patients satisfied in different healthcare contexts around the globe is synthesized (Almeida et al., 2015; Batbaatar et al., 2017; Farzianpour et al., 2015; Ferreira et al., 2023; Miao et al., 2020). The research acknowledges several factors that are determined to affect total satisfaction but most significant are the quality of medical care, interactions between medical practitioners and patients, waiting time, and the socio-demographic status of patients such as age and educational attainment. Among them, the medical care and communication are always the most influential ones and are closely linked with the increased global satisfaction ratings. Another important finding that is pointed out in the analysis is that the perception of quality of care and the communicative competency of the provider are important factors in the overall patient satisfaction, which subsequently influence patient loyalty and healthcare outcomes (Ferreira et al., 2023).

### *4.2. Utilizing Patient Satisfaction Data for Continuous Healthcare Quality Improvement*

Patient feedback based on standardized surveys

like HCAHPS, is a critical quality indicator which informs various aspects of healthcare provision. The inclusion of quality assurance measures (satisfaction) in the healthcare organizations enables them to know the areas that require improvement, whether in clinical care or in communication between the patient and provider. These survey outcomes play a key role in informing the policy and staff training programs at the administrative levels, as well as, resource allocation decisions; thus, a patient-focused policy, which increases the healthcare services, to match client expectations and experiences in healthcare services. In addition, the use of satisfaction information aids in the ongoing quality improvement because it allows organizations to monitor the performance levels over time, initiate specific interventions, and assess its effect on patient outcomes (Cowen et al., 2016). Altogether, the use of patient satisfaction data can not only increase the level of transparency and accountability but also introduce systemic changes that could improve the quality of provided care (Karakolias, 2024).

According to the findings of the study by Abah Vivien, (2020), the application of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) and benchmarking plays a critical role in improving service delivery in the healthcare field under the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS). It emphasizes that the use of survey data concerning patient satisfaction and service gaps may be viewed as a useful patient-centered measure of service performance monitoring and benchmarking. The results indicate that feedback, especially in terms of perceived quality gaps, the importance of particular elements of services can be used to implement specific interventions to improve the quality of healthcare. It is crucial to ensure the successful maintenance of changes by implementing a systematic CQI framework founded on the data-driven insights to be able to make sure that health services meet the expectations of patients. The paper supports the evolution of continuous monitoring systems, which would use the satisfaction surveys to determine the gaps, progress, and the culture of constant improvement in the quality of healthcare in the NHIS system (Abah Vivien, 2020; Berhane & Enquselassie, 2016; Gbadamosi & Famutimi, 2017; Koce et al., 2019; Mustapha Kurfi & Hussaini Aliero, 2017; Osungbade et al., 2014; Sathish et al., 2019).

According to the systematic review of Bastemeijer et al., (2019), patient experience (PRES) surveys can be considered important in informing Quality Improvement (QI) efforts in the hospital environment. These surveys deliver the necessary information on numerous aspects of patient experience, including communication, decision-making, and patient satisfaction. As discussed in the review, PREM-based insights tend to provide effective QI interventions like staff training, Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles and workflow redesign (Bastemeijer et al., 2019; Kringos et al., 2015). As an example, organizational training and education to enhance communication skills have shown significant improvements in how patients rate care, and some studies have found significant increases in patient satisfaction ratings with specific interventions (Bastemeijer et al., 2019; Kringos et al., 2015).

Similarly, the survey-driven workflow changes, such as the introduction of organizational changes, have contributed to improved continuity of care and patient outcomes (Kringos et al., 2015). It is important to note that iterative PDSA cycles can enable healthcare teams to experiment, revise, and maintain changes to the extent to which changes favorably transform the patient experience (Kringos et al., 2015). A systematic measurement through PREMs contributes to specific QI measures that can adequately respond to the identified gaps, resulting in the practical improvement of patient-centred care measures and building a culture of continuous quality improvement (Bastemeijer et al., 2019).

### *4.3. Digital Transformation, Patient Engagement, and Outcome-Driven Quality Improvement*

Advanced digital tools, mobile applications, and AI-based feedback systems, which are transforming the nature of patient engagement and care delivery, have greatly facilitated the digital transformation in the healthcare sector. The innovations can be used to gather and analyze real-time data that will enable healthcare providers to receive immediate information about patient health status, behavior, and treatment effects (Marley & Farooq, 2015). Mobile applications are the key solutions to serve as a remote monitoring platform, educating patients, and managing their appointments, as well as facilitating constant communication and empowerment (Marley & Farooq, 2015). AI-driven feedback mechanisms complement this by processing data generated by the patient to provide personalised advice, identify early signs of health problems and intervention in a timely way (Marley & Farooq, 2015). All these technologies, cumulatively create a more active, patient-centered role-playing, enhancing the health outcome due to immediate responsiveness and feedback delivery and redesigning

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

typical forms of traditional healthcare into a more responsive, adaptive, and personalized system (Oyeniyi, 2024).

In a study conducted by De Rosis et al., in (2020), the Italian PREMs Observatory showed how real-time reporting mechanisms and continuous, web-based implementation of satisfaction surveys could greatly enhance quality improvement responses (immediate responses) both at the ward and system levels. Combination of patient feedback with electronic health records (EHRs) and narrative sections in surveys did not only enhance the quantitative data but also identified the existence of compassionate behaviors and organizational performance disparities. Particularly, the integration of online reporting platforms also allowed the multi-level benchmarking, both at an individual ward level and a regional level, which positively influenced patient-centeredness and responsiveness of the staff. Another element noted in the research was an increasing role of voluntary feedback in social media and institutional websites as an additional type of Data in Patient Reported Experience Measure (PREM), but there are still conditions limiting representativeness and comparability in benchmarking terms (De Rosis et al., 2020).

It is indicated that telemedicine enhances convenience, access, and continuity of care, increases the satisfaction score, decreases readmission, and enforces better adherence in chronic disease patients (Chen et al., 2020). It has also been reinforced through electronic surveys, real-time feedback kiosk, and patient portal that has helped providers respond to patient concerns in a timely manner. Adding the digital data about patient satisfaction to performance management systems has been associated with better reputation and financial performance associated with the increased retention rates and favorable online feedback. Nevertheless, regardless of these advantages, it is still complicated to prove that various types of clinical rates improve due to the inclusion of satisfaction-directed quality strategies, since the results are conditioned by the complex of multifactorial characteristics, such as care delivery models and patient demographics. Therefore, as much as digital modalities contribute to satisfaction measure and responsiveness, careful interpretation is necessary in the effects of such modalities on physical health outcomes (Chen et al., 2020).

### *4.4. Integrating Measurement Validity, Methodological Rigor, and Specialty Contexts in Patient Satisfaction Assessment*

Standardized metrics can be offered using generic scores like the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS) and the Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ) to compare and benchmark institutions on a policy level. Nevertheless, their general orientation does not consider the details of clinical specialties and cultural orientation. Conversely, specialty-specific measures (i.e., instruments specific to oncology, maternity, or outpatient surgical care) are better content valid, given their focus on the expectations and treatment complexities and emotional aspects specific to their particular specialties (Friedel et al., 2023). However, these tools are frequently limited in the generalizability or cross-context comparison. The research also underlines that effective psychometric validation using tests of internal consistency, construct validity, and reliability is also necessary to guarantee the relevance of generic and specialty tools to patients and determine the direction of improvement (Friedel et al., 2023).

The methodological factors in survey designing underscore the fact that, the administration mode, timing and other assistive strategies can be chosen very well to enhance the response rates and representativeness. There are reasons to believe that sequential mixed-mode administration is most frequently, followed by a mail questionnaire and telephone follow-up, the highest response rate, and web elements provide the insignificant benefits corresponding to the reduced cost (Price et al., 2022). Small unconditional cash payments are always followed by significant changes in the level of participation, and even prenotification letters and certified mailing also contribute to a better response (Price et al., 2022). Face-to-face administration, particularly in hospital discharge with the use of electronic tablets, has demonstrated effectiveness in terms of response and representativeness across greater populations that lack accessibility, but there is a risk of bias with the adoption of survey-delivery by clinical personnel. Altogether, the discrepancy in response among subgroups could be further reduced by individualizing survey techniques, including the use of simplified guideline, the availability of bilingual methods, and reminders (Price et al., 2022).

The evidence associated with specialty clinics especially ophthalmology highlights the repeated issues of concern among patients, which include waiting time, and the perception of technical quality as well as time spent with clinicians. As an example, the surveys at the ophthalmology clinic repeatedly found waiting time as one of the main factors behind dissatisfaction, as well as

the perception of a hurriedly conducted consultation and insufficient explanation of the process (Sakti et al., 2022). The outcomes have strongly informed the micro-level quality improvement efforts, including the redesign of the triage process, more effective scheduling of appointments, and the resettlement of staff roles in order to minimize bottlenecks (Sakti et al., 2022). This type of focused use of surveys shows how the specialty-specific feedback may be turned into applicable workflow and patient-experience changes (Sakti et al., 2022).

## 5. Conclusion

Patient satisfaction surveys have evolved into indispensable tools for assessing and enhancing healthcare quality worldwide. By integrating patient-reported experience and outcome measures (PREMs and PROMs) with traditional clinical indicators, healthcare systems can achieve a more comprehensive and patient-centered evaluation of care. Evidence demonstrates that well-designed, culturally adaptable, and psychometrically validated instruments drive meaningful quality improvement initiatives across diverse contexts. However, disparities in methodology, response rates, and data integration persist globally. Strengthening survey validity, embracing digital feedback systems, and promoting equitable participation remain essential for translating patient voices into sustained healthcare quality improvement.

## 6. Limitations and Future Implications

This review is limited by variations in study design, measurement instruments, and cultural contexts that hinder cross-country comparability. Additionally, publication bias and reliance on English-language sources may have excluded relevant regional evidence. Heterogeneity in survey methodologies also restricts the ability to generalize findings across diverse healthcare systems. Future research should focus on developing standardized, culturally adaptable, and technology-integrated patient satisfaction tools that ensure inclusivity and real-time feedback. Incorporating artificial intelligence and digital analytics can enhance data interpretation and responsiveness in quality improvement initiatives. Comparative cross-national studies are also needed to evaluate how satisfaction metrics influence policy, healthcare equity, and long-term patient outcomes across varying economic and cultural healthcare systems.

## Statement and Declarations

***Funding:*** None

***Conflict of Interest:*** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest to disclose.

***Acknowledgement:*** None

***Author Contribitions:*** The author conceived the idea, conducted the literature review, analyzed and interpreted the findings, and drafted and finalized the manuscript.

***Data Availability:*** All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this article.

## References

Abah Vivien, O. (2020). Patient Centered Benchmarking for Satisfaction with Quality of Care among NHIS Enrollees in Primary Care: The Impact of Past Experience on Satisfaction and Rated Importance of Service Components. IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS).

Allenbaugh, J., Spagnoletti, C. L., Rack, L., Rubio, D., & Corbelli, J. (2019). Health literacy and clear bedside communication: a curricular intervention for internal medicine physicians and medicine nurses. MedEdPORTAL, 15, 10795.

Almeida, R. S. d., Bourliataux-Lajoinie, S., & Martins, M. (2015). Satisfaction measurement instruments for healthcare service users: a systematic review. Cadernos de saude publica, 31(1), 11-25.

Ameh, S., Gómez-Olivé, F. X., Kahn, K., Tollman, S. M., & Klipstein-Grobusch, K. (2017). Relationships between structure, process and outcome to assess quality of integrated chronic disease management in a rural South African setting: applying a structural equation model. BMC health services research, 17(1), 229.

Bastemeijer, C. M., Boosman, H., van Ewijk, H., Verweij, L. M., Voogt, L., & Hazelzet, J. A. (2019). Patient experiences: a systematic review of quality improvement interventions in a hospital setting. Patient related outcome measures, 157-169.

Batbaatar, E., Dorjdagva, J., Luvsannyam, A.,

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

Savino, M. M., & Amenta, P. (2017). Determinants of patient satisfaction: a systematic review. Perspectives in public health, 137(2), 89-101.

Berhane, A., & Enquselassie, F. (2016). Patient expectations and their satisfaction in the context of public hospitals. Patient preference and adherence, 1919-1928.

Bleustein, C., Rothschild, D. B., Valen, A., Valatis, E., Schweitzer, L., & Jones, R. (2014). Wait times, patient satisfaction scores, and the perception of care. The American journal of managed care, 20(5), 393-400.

Busari, M., & Henry, G. (2025). Impact of Hospital Environment on Patient Satisfaction–Studying facility design, cleanliness, noise reduction, and comfort measures.

Chen, H.-c., Cates, T., Taylor, M., & Cates, C. (2020). Improving the US hospital reimbursement: how patient satisfaction in HCAHPS reflects lower readmission. International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance, 33(4-5), 333-344. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijhcqa-03-2019-0066

Cowen, M. E., Czerwinski, J., Kabara, J., Blumenthal, D. U., Kheder, S., & Simmons, S. (2016). The risk-outcome-experience triad: mortality risk and the hospital consumer assessment of healthcare providers and systems survey. Journal of Hospital Medicine, 11(9), 628-635.

Cylus, J., Nolte, E., Figueras, J., & McKee, M. (2016). What, if anything, does the EuroHealth Consumer Index actually tell us? BMJ Blogs.

De Rosis, S., Cerasuolo, D., & Nuti, S. (2020). Using patient-reported measures to drive change in healthcare: the experience of the digital, continuous and systematic PREMs observatory in Italy. BMC health services research, 20(1), 315.

De Rosis, S., Ferrè, F., & Pennucci, F. (2022). Including patient-reported measures in performance evaluation systems: patient contribution in assessing and improving the healthcare systems. The International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 37, 144-165.

Devi, R., Kanitkar, K., Narendhar, R., Sehmi, K., & Subramaniam, K. (2020). A narrative review of the patient journey through the lens of non-communicable diseases in low-and middle-income countries. Advances in Therapy, 37(12), 4808-4830.

Farzianpour, F., Byravan, R., & Amirian, S. (2015). Evaluation of patient satisfaction and factors affecting it: a review of the literature. Health, 7(11), 1460-1465.

Fatima, T., Malik, S. A., & Shabbir, A. (2018). Hospital healthcare service quality, patient satisfaction and loyalty: An investigation in context of private healthcare systems. International journal of quality & Reliability Management, 35(6), 1195-1214.

Ferreira, D. C., Vieira, I., Pedro, M. I., Caldas, P., & Varela, M. (2023). Patient Satisfaction with Healthcare Services and the Techniques Used for its Assessment: A Systematic Literature Review and a Bibliometric Analysis. Healthcare (Basel), 11(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11050639

Friedel, A. L., Siegel, S., Kirstein, C. F., Gerigk, M., Bingel, U., Diehl, A., Steidle, O., Haupeltshofer, S., Andermahr, B., & Chmielewski, W. (2023). Measuring patient experience and patient satisfaction—how are we doing it and why does it matter? A comparison of European and US American approaches. Healthcare,

Gbadamosi, I. A., & Famutimi, E. O. (2017). Perception and satisfaction of employees with national health insurance scheme services: A descriptive study at university college hospital, Ibadan, Nigeria. International Journal of Tropical Disease & Health, 22(1), 1-12.

Ghose, S., & Adhish, S. V. (2011). Patient satisfaction with medical services: a hospital-based study. Health Popul, 34(4), 232-242.

Gleeson, H., Calderon, A., Swami, V., Deighton, J., Wolpert, M., & Edbrooke-Childs, J. (2016). Systematic review of approaches to using patient experience data for quality improvement in healthcare settings. BMJ open, 6(8), e011907.

Govere, L., & Govere, E. M. (2016). How effective is cultural competence training of healthcare providers

on improving patient satisfaction of minority groups? A systematic review of literature. Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing, 13(6), 402-410.

Karakolias, S. (2024). Mapping data-driven strategies in improving health care and patient satisfaction. World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences.

Kingsley, C., & Patel, S. (2017). Patient-reported outcome measures and patient-reported experience measures. BJA education, 17(4), 137-144.

Koce, F., Randhawa, G., & Ochieng, B. (2019). Understanding healthcare self-referral in Nigeria from the service users' perspective: a qualitative study of Niger state. BMC health services research, 19(1), 209.

Kringos, D. S., Sunol, R., Wagner, C., Mannion, R., Michel, P., Klazinga, N. S., Groene, O., & Consortium, D. (2015). The influence of context on the effectiveness of hospital quality improvement strategies: a review of systematic reviews. BMC health services research, 15(1), 277.

Lee, S., Groß, S. E., Pfaff, H., & Dresen, A. (2020). Waiting time, communication quality, and patient satisfaction: An analysis of moderating influences on the relationship between perceived waiting time and the satisfaction of breast cancer patients during their inpatient stay. Patient education and counseling, 103(4), 819-825.

Lee, S., Gross, S. E., Pfaff, H., & Dresen, A. (2019). Differences in perceived waiting time by health insurance type in the inpatient sector: an analysis of patients with breast cancer in Germany. INQUIRY: The Journal of Health Care Organization, Provision, and Financing, 56, 0046958019875897.

Marley, J., & Farooq, S. (2015). Mobile telephone apps in mental health practice: uses, opportunities and challenges. BJPsych bulletin, 39(6), 288-290.

Miao, R., Zhang, H., Wu, Q., Zhang, J., & Jiang, Z. (2020). Using structural equation modeling to analyze patient value, satisfaction, and loyalty: a case study of healthcare in China. International Journal of Production Research, 58(2), 577-596.

Mustapha Kurfi, M., & Hussaini Aliero, I. (2017). C. A study on clients' satisfaction on the national health insurance scheme among staff of Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto. IOSR J Econ Financ, 8, 44-52.

Osungbade, K. O., Obembe, T. A., & Oludoyi, A. (2014). Users' satisfaction with services provided under National Health Insurance Scheme in south western Nigeria. Int J Trop Dis Health, 4(5), 595-607.

Oyeniyi, J. (2024). The role of AI and mobile apps in patient-centric healthcare delivery. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22(1), 1897-1907.

Price, R. A., Quigley, D. D., Hargraves, J. L., Sorra, J., Becerra-Ornelas, A. U., Hays, R. D., Cleary, P. D., Brown, J., & Elliott, M. N. (2022). A systematic review of strategies to enhance response rates and representativeness of patient experience surveys. Medical Care, 60(12), 910-918.

Sakti, D. H., Firdaus, A. T., Utami, T. P., Jati, K. D. P., Mahayana, I. T., Wardhana, F. S., & Handayani, N. (2022). Patients' satisfaction with ophthalmology clinic services in a public teaching hospital. Patient preference and adherence, 723-735.

Sathish, A., Indradevi, R., & Gangineni, S. (2019). Service Quality and its influence on Customer Satisfaction in a Multi-speciality Hospital. Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development, 10(5).

Setyaningrum, D., Sriatmi, A., & Arso, S. P. (2024). Patient Satisfaction on Hospital Outpatient Service Quality Based on the Donabedian Model. Journal of Public Health for Tropical and Coastal Region, 7(3), 229-234.

Weinfurt, K. P., & Reeve, B. B. (2022). Patient-reported outcome measures in clinical research. Jama, 328(5), 472-473.

Xesfingi, S., & Vozikis, A. (2016). Patient satisfaction with the healthcare system: Assessing the impact of socio-economic and healthcare provision factors. BMC health services research, 16(1), 94.

Xie, Z., & Or, C. (2017). Associations between waiting times, service times, and patient satisfaction in

International Journal of Medical Discoveries
Volume 2, Issue 1
ISSN: 3067-7912

an endocrinology outpatient department: a time study and questionnaire survey. INQUIRY: The Journal of Health Care Organization, Provision, and Financing, 54, 0046958017739527.