# **RESEARCH ARTICLE**



**OPEN ACCESS** 

# Client Satisfaction: Understanding its Predictors to improve HIV treatment and care in a tertiary facility southwestern state, Nigeria

Imhonopi GB<sup>1D</sup>, Soyannwo T<sup>1D</sup>, Ojo OY<sup>1D</sup>, Fasiku MM<sup>1D</sup>, Ahmed KA<sup>1D</sup>, Temitayo-Oboh AO<sup>1</sup>, Abdulsalam AR<sup>1</sup>, Osindeinde IA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine and Primary Care, Federal Medical Center, Abeokuta <u>ID</u>: Orcid ID

Submitted: 1<sup>st</sup> July 2021 Accepted: 19<sup>th</sup> August 2021 Published: 30<sup>th</sup> December 2021

#### Abstract

**Objective:** Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection is a major public health concern. Frequent hospital visits are needed on the part of the patient to achieve decreased prevalence, the efficacy of antiretroviral therapy (ART), and viral suppression. Patient satisfaction is needed to achieve the aforementioned outcomes of care. This study, therefore, was conducted to assess clients' satisfaction and perception of the quality of HIV/AIDs services and to elicit factors associated with dissatisfaction.

**Method**: A cross-sectional survey was done using a systematic sampling method to select the study population. Data were analyzed by descriptive statistics, chi-square test, and logistic regression at a p-value set at < 0.05.

**Results**: Most of the respondents (34.4%) were within the age range of 36- 44years. The mean age was  $42.1\pm$  11.5years. The overall satisfaction was 85.6%. The majority of respondents (95.2%) affirmed that the quality of care received was good. Unavailability of HIV educational materials was shown to predict clients' satisfaction more than other factors with 3.545; 95% CI: 1.519 - 8.275; p = 0.003. Likewise, clients who perceived health workers to be non-accepting and judgmental are 3.6 times more likely to be unsatisfied with HIV services provided compared to those who do not (3. 580; 95% CI: 1.264- 10.141; p = 0.016).

**Conclusion:** The study demonstrated impressive overall clients' satisfaction with services provided at the health facility and the quality of care. Attention must be paid to the availability of HIV materials and training and retraining of staff to reduce stigmatization and discrimination against patients.

Keywords: Client satisfaction, Quality of care, HIV, Determinants, Patients

#### **Plain English summary**

The study was carried out to assess clients' satisfaction and understand the predictors of factors affecting satisfaction among patients attending the ART clinic at the Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta, Ogun State. The study found that the majority (85.6%) of the clients were satisfied with the care given. However, waiting time was found to be a major factor among clients who were dissatisfied with the services provided. We recommended that there should be continuous training and retraining of staff to ensure quality service delivery.

## Background

Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection is a major public health concern. Reports from the

Correspondence: Ahmed, Kayode A Department of Community Medicine and Primary Care, Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta, Ogun State Nigeria +2348035756623, abdulmuminahmed070@gmail.com Joint United Nations Program on HIV/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (UNAIDS) described the global burden of HIV/AIDS as one

© BUMJ. 2020 Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</a>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

of the most destructive epidemics the world has ever witnessed. Sub-Saharan Africa is the worst hit by the infection with nearly 23 million of the 33.2 million people with infection living there. Global AIDS death in adults and children were estimated at 2.1million of whom1.6 million was again from sub-Saharan Africa (1).

HIV and AIDS care requires frequent visits to the hospital. As a result, patient satisfaction with care services during hospital visits is important in considering the quality and outcome of care (2). To maintain a decline in the prevalence of HIV and efficacy of antiretroviral therapy (ART), it is better to keep the patients on treatment satisfied with ART services. Poor patients satisfaction is poor virological associated with and immunological response (3). It is also responsible for the development of resistant strains (3). Patients' satisfaction rating is both a measure of care and the person providing the care (4).

Patients' satisfaction ratings can measure the different aspects of the medical services received or different specific dimensions of the satisfaction or the overall level of satisfaction of total package often referred to as global satisfaction (4). Studies on patients' satisfaction with a healthcare need to be carried out intermittently so that factors responsible for their dissatisfaction can be promptly addressed before clinic default sets in. Provision of services for the management of HIV infection has become a concern to the team at Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta, Nigeria. In the same vein, the satisfaction and perception of the quality of care by clients are of utmost importance. This study was conducted to assess clients' satisfaction, and perception of the quality of HIV/AIDs services to enhance the efficiency and quality of services.

# Methods

## Study Area

The study was conducted at the Anti-Retroviral Treatment Clinic (AIDS Prevention Initiative in Nigeria Clinic) of the Federal Medical Centre Abeokuta (FMCA). FMCA is a 500-bedded regional specialist hospital that came into existence on 21st April 1993 with a philosophy of excellence in the provision of medical services to the Gateway State of Ogun and other neighboring states. Ogun State has an HIV prevalence of 1.6% and has 327 centers for the management of HIV (5). There are 19,189 HIV-positive patients on treatment in Ogun State. Antiretroviral (ARV) services in Ogun State are currently being supported by APIN Public Health Initiatives and Prime health response initiatives (6).

## Study Design

This was a descriptive cross-sectional study of clients' satisfaction with services at the antiretroviral treatment center and its Federal Medical determinants in Centre. Abeokuta.

## Study population

The respondents in this study were adult HIV clients aged 18 years and above on treatment receiving ART services at the Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta.

## Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Patients who were aware of their diagnosis admitted into care for at least six months and with sufficient cognitive ability to answer questions were recruited for the study.

HIV patients who were on admission in the facility and clients who objected to being part of the study.

## Sample Size Determination

The number of clients sampled was determined using Fischer's formula. A prevalence (p) of 90.0%, which was the proportion of clients satisfied with HIV services in a previous study conducted in Anambra (7). After a 10% adjustment for non-response, a minimum sample size of 142 was determined. A total of 270 clients were surveyed from the clinic.

## Sampling Technique

A systematic sampling technique was used for the selection of respondents. The sampling frame was obtained from the clinic record. The first respondent was chosen by simple random sampling technique by balloting and subsequent respondents were selected using a predetermined calculated sampling interval until the required sample size was reached.

# Study instruments/Data collection/Data analysis

The study instrument was a semi-structured interviewer-administered questionnaire. It was pretested among clients in a Primary Health Care facility offering comprehensive HIV services. The questionnaire had three sections. Section A assessed the socio-demographic characteristics. Section B measured patients' satisfaction under the following themes; Accessibility, User Friendliness/Information, Level of stigmatization/discrimination, confidentiality, and Comprehensiveness of HIV/AIDs privacy, services, and overall client satisfaction (8).

Section C assessed the perception of the quality of services.

Four resident doctors were trained for three days on the use of the study instrument, obtaining informed consent, and maintaining confidentiality. Data collected were entered into a computer and analyzed using SPSS version 21. Summary statistics were generated and presented using frequency tables. Appropriate tests of significance (chi-square test and regression analysis) were used to test statistics. Logistic regression analysis of independent variables was performed to determine predictors of clients' satisfaction. Statistical significance was set at a p-value.

# Results

The population characteristics of the respondents are presented in table-1 where about 93 (34.4%) of the respondents were within the age range 36-44years. The mean age was  $42.1\pm 11.5$ years. More than two-thirds 194 (71.9%) were females. A higher percentage 220 (81.5%) were of the Yoruba ethnic group. Christian respondents constituted the majority of 164 (60.7%) while 111 (41.1%) had secondary education. About 164 (60.7%) were married. Most of the respondents fall within the income range  $\leq$  N10, 000 which is approximately \$29 as seen in table-1 below.

Demographic	Characteristics	Frequency (n=270)	Percentage (%)
Age Group	16-25 Years	17	6.3
	26-35 Years	69	25.6
	36-45 Years	93	34.4
	>46 Years	91	33.7
Mean age	42.1± 11.5 Years		
Gender	Male	76	28.1
	Female	194	71.9
Ethnicity	Yoruba	220	81.5
	lgbo	24	8.9
	Hausa	7	2.6
	Others	19	7.0
Religion	Christian	164	60.7
	Islam	100	37.0
	Traditional	6	2.2
Educational Level	Primary	61	22.6
	Secondary	111	41.1
	Tertiary	86	31.9
	None	12	4.4
Marital Status	Single	34	12.6
	Married	164	60.7
	Divorced/Separated	27	10.0
	Widowed	45	16.7

Considering access to the HIV service point, most of the respondents 184 (68.1%) get to the facility within one hour. When asked if there were problems in getting transport to the hospital, the majority 238 (88.1%) reported an absence of transportation problems. A larger percentage 215 (79.6%) reported cost of transportation to the health facility was affordable. Also, a larger percentage of the respondents 230 (85.2%) reported cost of consultation was affordable. Almost all clients 266 (98.5%) waited more than one hour before been attended to. Likewise, the majority 243 (90.0%) reported the drugs were adequate. (Table 2a)

Table 2a: Assessment of factors affecting clients' satisfaction					
Variables Frequency(n=270) Percentage (					
Time to the Facility					
= 1 hour</td <td>184</td> <td>68.1</td>	184	68.1			
>1hour	86	31.9			

Transportation problems		
Yes	32	11.9
No	238	88.1
Cost of Transportation		
Yes	55	20.4
No	215	79.6
Waiting time		
< 30 Minute	4	1.5
>1 Hour	266	98.5
Cost of Consultation		
Yes	40	14.8
No	230	85.2
Drugs		
Adequate	243	90.0
Inadequate	27	10.0

This study found an overall clients' satisfaction of 231 (85.6%). Interestingly, 231 (85.6%) of respondents never had reasons to complain about the attitude of caregivers at the HIV clinic. The majority 229 (84.8%) said they never had an interruption of consultation, while 210 (77.8%) always had an adequate explanation about test results though, 155 (57.4%) of the respondents said they never had more time as they could have during a consultation. A majority, 218 (80.7%) reported never been uncomfortable discussing personal or intimate issues while with the caregiver. In the same vein, 175 (64.8%) of respondents never had any problem being involved in decision-making about their HIV treatment and care. Also, 230 (85.2%) said they never had problems with asking the providers questions about HIV care. Almost all respondents 252 (93.3%) never had their complaints ignored. It's good to know that, almost all the respondents 263 (97.4%) had their consultation in a language they could understand and 88.5% never have a hard time understanding questions. Similarly, 208 (77.0%) of the respondents never had a delay of appointment. Conversely, 64 (23.7%) never had a delay in getting an appointment for urgent care and 63 (23.3%) reported never had a delay in getting an appointment for non-urgent care. However, only 62 (23.0%) of respondents reported always having access to available HIVspecific educational materials. (See Table-2b).

Variable	Never (%)	Sometimes (%)	Usually (%)	Always (%)
Availability of HIV Specific educational materials	142 (52.6)	54 (20.0)	12 (4.4)	62 (23.0)
Delay of appointment	208 (77.0)	40 (14.8)	9 (3.3)	13 (4.8)
Delay in getting appointment for urgent care	64 (23.7)	30 (11.1)	27 (10.0)	149 (55.2)
Delay in getting appointment for non- urgent care	63 (23.3)	32 (11.9)	17 (6.3)	158 (58.5)
Delay in getting answers to questions when facility is contacted	40 (14.8)	10 (3.7)	16 (5.9)	204 (75.6)
Perception on interruption of consultation	229 (84.8)	24 (8.9)	4 (1.5)	13 (4.8)
Perception on providing adequate explanation on test results	28 (10.4)	14 (5.2)	18 (6.7)	210 (77.8)
Perception on providing more time during consultation	155 (57.4)	44 (15.6)	25 (9.3)	48 (17.8)
Perception on being uncomfortable discussing personal or intimate issues	218 (80.7)	15 (5.6)	14 (5.2)	23 (8.5)
Involvement in Decision making	175 (64.8)	50 (18.5)	17 (6.3)	28 (10.4)
Perception on unable to ask provider questions about HIV.	230 (85.2)	21 (7.8)	7 (2.6)	12 (4.4)
Perception on complaints ignored	252 (85.2)	5 (1.9)	6 (2.2)	7 (2.6)

# Table 2b: Clients Satisfaction and Perception of services provided at the HIV clinic.

Perception on inability to understand 239 (88.5) 12 (4.4) 4 (1.5) 15 (5.6) their answer.

Furthermore, table-3 is about the factors with clients' satisfaction associated and perception of quality of care. The majority of respondents, 257 (95.2%), affirmed that the quality of care received was good though 239 (88.5%) complaint of lack of adequate equipment. About half, 139 (51.5%), of respondents, reported that health personnel accepted them and there were no judgmental feelings about their condition. Similarly, 264 (97.8%) believed their HIV status was kept confidential. Waiting time was a major determinant of satisfaction, in this study 229 (86.1%) of clients waited for >30minutes before being consulted. About 58.9% reported the staff to be up-to-date with recent developments in HIV. Most of the respondents, 70.7%, acknowledged the staff to be respectful and 63.3% reported that the staff was understanding. Some of the associated factors to clients' satisfaction in this study were availability of HIV educational material ( $\chi$ 2-15.928, P-value=<0.001), not ignoring complaint of respondents ( $\chi$ 2-5.568, P-value= 0.018), accepting and non-judgmental of clients ( $\chi$ 2-11.162, P-value=0.001), availability of equipment ( $\chi$ 2-6.031, P-value=0.014) were all found to be statistically significant.

Poor       13       4.8         Equipment       Adequate       31       11.5         Adequate       239       88.5         Level of Stigma and Discrimination       Accepting and Non-judgmental       No         Never       99       36.7         Sometimes       22       8.1         Usually       10       3.7         Always       139       51.5         Confidentiality and Privacy       Environmental Non-judgmental         HIV Status kept confidential       Yes       264         Yes       264       97.8         No       6       2.2         Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value         30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153       0.042*         Vascrifiendliness/Information       Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001         No       133(93.7)       9(6.3)       15.928       <0.0018*         No       219(86.9)       33(13.1)       Perception of respondents       Yes       21(75.6)       10(24.4)       3.869       0.049*         No       200(87.3)       29(12.7)	Variables	Frequency(n=270)	Percentage (%)	Chi-value	P-value
Poor       13       4.8         Equipment       Adequate       31       11.5         Adequate       239       88.5         Level of Stigma and Discrimination       Accepting and Non-judgmental       No         Never       99       36.7         Sometimes       22       8.1         Usually       10       3.7         Always       139       51.5         Confidentiality and Privacy       Environmental Non-judgmental         HIV Status kept confidential       Yes       264         Yes       264       97.8         No       6       2.2         Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value         30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153       0.042*         >30minutes       229(86.1)       37(13.9)       User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	Perception on quality of care				
Equipment         No         No           Adequate         31         11.5           Inadequate         239         88.5           Level of Stigma and Discrimination         Accepting and Non-judgmental         Never         99         36.7           Sometimes         22         8.1         Usually         10         3.7           Always         139         51.5         Confidentiality and Privacy         HIV Status kept confidential           Yes         264         97.8         No         6         2.2           Waiting time         Satisfied         Not Satisfied $x^2$ p-value           30 minutes         229(86.1)         37(13.9)         User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials           Yes         98(76.6)         30(23.4)         15.928         <0.0001	Good	257	95.2		
Adequate       31       11.5         Inadequate       239       88.5         Level of Stigma and Discrimination       Accepting and Non-judgmental         Never       99       36.7         Sometimes       22       8.1         Usually       10       3.7         Always       139       51.5         Confidentiality and Privacy       HIV Status kept confidential         Yes       264       97.8         No       6       2.2         Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied         30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153         Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	Poor	13	4.8		
Adequate       31       11.5         Inadequate       239       88.5         Level of Stigma and Discrimination       Accepting and Non-judgmental         Never       99       36.7         Sometimes       22       8.1         Usually       10       3.7         Always       139       51.5         Confidentiality and Privacy       HIV Status kept confidential         Yes       264       97.8         No       6       2.2         Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied         30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153         Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	Equipment				
Inaciequate         239         88.5           Level of Stigma and Discrimination         Accepting and Non-judgmental         Never         99         36.7           Never         99         36.7         Sometimes         22         8.1           Usually         10         3.7         Always         139         51.5           Confidentiality and Privacy         HIV Status kept confidential         Yes         264         97.8           No         6         2.2         Waiting time         Satisfied         Not Satisfied         x²           30 minutes and less         2(50.0)         2(50.0)         4.153         0.042*           >30minutes         229(86.1)         37(13.9)         User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials           Yes         98(76.6)         30(23.4)         15.928         <0.0001	Adequate	31	11.5		
Level of Stigma and Discrimination           Accepting and Non-judgmental           Never         99 $36.7$ Sometimes         22 $8.1$ Usually         10 $3.7$ Always         139 $51.5$ Confidentiality and Privacy         HIV Status kept confidential         Yes           Yes $264$ $97.8$ No $6$ $2.2$ Waiting time         Satisfied         Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ 30 minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ >30minutes $229(86.1)$ $37(13.9)$ User-friendliness/Information         Ves $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $133(93.7)$ $9(6.3)$ Ignoring complaints of respondents         Yes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $219(86.9)$ $33(13.1)$ Perception of respondents on         interruption of consultation         Yes $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ Level of Stigma and Discrimination         Accepting and non-judgmental health provider         Yes <td></td> <td>239</td> <td>88.5</td> <td></td> <td></td>		239	88.5		
Accepting and Non-judgmental         Never       99 $36.7$ Sometimes       22 $8.1$ Usually       10 $3.7$ Always       139 $51.5$ Confidentiality and Privacy       51.5         HIV Status kept confidential $264$ $97.8$ No       6 $2.2$ Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ 30 minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ >30minutes $229(86.1)$ $37(13.9)$ User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No       133(93.7) $9(6.3)$ Ignoring complaints of respondents       Yes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $219(86.9)$ $33(13.1)$ Perception of respondents on       Interruption of consultation         Yes $21(75.6)$ $10(24.4)$ $3.869$ $0.049^*$ No $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ Level of Stigma and Discrimination         Yes $137(80.1)$		nation			
Sometimes         22         8.1           Usually         10         3.7           Always         139         51.5           Confidentiality and Privacy         HIV Status kept confidential           HIV Status kept confidential         Yes         264         97.8           No         6         2.2         Waiting time         Satisfied         Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value           30 minutes and less         2(50.0)         2(50.0)         4.153         0.042*           >30minutes         229(86.1)         37(13.9)         User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials           Yes         98(76.6)         30(23.4)         15.928         <0.0001					
Usually       10 $3.7$ Always       139 $51.5$ Confidentiality and Privacy       HIV Status kept confidential         Yes $264$ $97.8$ No       6 $2.2$ Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ 30 minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ >30minutes       229(86.1) $37(13.9)$ User-friendliness/Information $Availability$ of HIV educational materials         Yes       98(76.6) $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $0.0001$ No       133(93.7) $9(6.3)$ $15.928$ $0.0001$ Ignoring complaints of respondents       Yes $12(66.7)$ $6(33.3)$ $5.568$ $0.018^*$ No       219(86.9) $33(13.1)$ Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation       Yes $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ Level of Stigma and Discrimination $Accepting and non-judgmental health provider       Yes       137(80.1) 34(19.9) 11.162 0.001^*         No       94(94.9)       5(5.1)       Confidentiality and Privacy       5(5.1)$	Never	99	36.7		
Always13951.5Confidentiality and PrivacyHIV Status kept confidentialYes26497.8No62.2Waiting timeSatisfiedNot Satisfied $\chi^2$ $30$ minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ $>30$ minutes $229(86.1)$ $37(13.9)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $0.002^*$ User-friendliness/InformationAvailability of HIV educational materialsYes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $133(93.7)$ $9(6.3)$ Ignoring complaints of respondentsYes $12(66.7)$ $6(33.3)$ $5.568$ $0.018^*$ No $211(75.6)$ $10(24.4)$ $3.869$ $0.049^*$ No $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ Level of Stigma and DiscriminationAccepting and non-judgmental health providerYes $137(80.1)$ $34(19.9)$ $11.162$ $0.001^*$ No $94(94.9)$ $5(5.1)$ Confidentiality and Privacy	Sometimes	22	8.1		
Always13951.5Confidentiality and PrivacyHIV Status kept confidentialYes26497.8No62.2Waiting timeSatisfiedNot Satisfied $\chi^2$ s0 minutes and less2(50.0)2(50.0)4.1530.042*>30 minutes229(86.1)37(13.9)37(13.9)0.042*User-friendliness/InformationAvailability of HIV educational materialsYes98(76.6)30(23.4)15.928<0.0001	Usually	10	3.7		
Confidentiality and Privacy HIV Status kept confidentialYes $264$ $97.8$ No $6$ $2.2$ Waiting timeSatisfiedNot Satisfied $\chi^2$ $30$ minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ $>30minutes$ $229(86.1)$ $37(13.9)$ $37(13.9)$ User-friendliness/InformationAvailability of HIV educational materialsYes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $133(93.7)$ $9(6.3)$ $9(6.3)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ Ignoring complaints of respondentsYes $219(86.9)$ $33(13.1)$ $33(13.1)$ Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ $200(49^*)$ Ves $217(5.6)$ $10(24.4)$ $3.869$ $0.049^*$ No $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ $29(12.7)$ $200(87.3)$ $29(12.7)$ Level of Stigma and Discrimination $Accepting and non-judgmental health providerYes137(80.1)34(19.9)11.1620.001^*No94(94.9)5(5.1)5(5.1)Confidentiality and PrivacyS(5.1)S(5.1)$		139	51.5		
HIV Status kept confidential         Yes       264       97.8         No       6       2.2         Waiting time       Satisfied       Not Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value         30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153       0.042*         >30 minutes       229(86.1)       37(13.9)       0.042*         User-friendliness/Information       Availability of HIV educational materials       Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001					
Yes26497.8No62.2Waiting timeSatisfiedNot Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value30 minutes and less2(50.0)2(50.0)4.1530.042*>30minutes229(86.1)37(13.9)37(13.9)37(13.9)User-friendliness/InformationAvailability of HIV educational materialsYes98(76.6)30(23.4)15.928<0.0001					
No62.2Waiting timeSatisfiedNot Satisfied $\chi^2$ p-value30 minutes and less2(50.0)2(50.0)4.1530.042*>30minutes229(86.1)37(13.9)37(13.9)37(13.9)User-friendliness/InformationAvailability of HIV educational materialsYes98(76.6)30(23.4)15.928<0.0001	Yes	264	97.8		
30 minutes and less $2(50.0)$ $2(50.0)$ $4.153$ $0.042^*$ >30minutes $229(86.1)$ $37(13.9)$ $37(13.9)$ User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials         Yes $98(76.6)$ $30(23.4)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ No $133(93.7)$ $9(6.3)$ $15.928$ $<0.0001$ Ignoring complaints of respondents $219(86.9)$ $33(13.1)$ $8000000000000000000000000000000000000$	No				
30 minutes and less       2(50.0)       2(50.0)       4.153       0.042*         >30minutes       229(86.1)       37(13.9)       37(13.9)         User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials         Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	Waiting time	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	<b>x</b> <sup>2</sup>	p-value
>30minutes       229(86.1)       37(13.9)         User-friendliness/Information       Availability of HIV educational materials         Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	-				
User-friendliness/Information         Availability of HIV educational materials           Yes         98(76.6)         30(23.4)         15.928         <0.0001					
Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001					
Yes       98(76.6)       30(23.4)       15.928       <0.0001	Availability of HIV educationa	al materials			
No         133(93.7)         9(6.3)           Ignoring complaints of respondents         Yes         12(66.7)         6(33.3)         5.568         0.018*           No         219(86.9)         33(13.1)         Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation         3.869         0.049*           Yes         21(75.6)         10(24.4)         3.869         0.049*           No         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         29(12.7)           Level of Stigma and Discrimination         Accepting and non-judgmental health provider         Yes         137(80.1)         34(19.9)         11.162         0.001*           No         94(94.9)         5(5.1)         Confidentiality and Privacy         5(5.1)         5(5.1)	Yes		30(23.4)	15.928	<0.0001
Ignoring complaints of respondents         12(66.7)         6(33.3)         5.568         0.018*           No         219(86.9)         33(13.1)         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9         9	No				
Yes       12(66.7)       6(33.3)       5.568       0.018*         No       219(86.9)       33(13.1)       9         Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation       33(13.1)       9       9         Yes       21(75.6)       10(24.4)       3.869       0.049*         No       200(87.3)       29(12.7)       11.162       0.001*         Level of Stigma and Discrimination       42(19.9)       11.162       0.001*         No       94(94.9)       5(5.1)       0.019	Ignoring complaints of respo				
No         219(86.9)         33(13.1)           Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation         33(13.1)           Yes         21(75.6)         10(24.4)         3.869         0.049*           No         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)           Level of Stigma and Discrimination         4200(87.1)         34(19.9)         11.162         0.001*           No         94(94.9)         5(5.1)         5(5.1)         5(5.1)	Yes		6(33.3)	5.568	0.018*
Perception of respondents on interruption of consultation Yes21(75.6)10(24.4)3.8690.049*No200(87.3)29(12.7)Level of Stigma and Discrimination Accepting and non-judgmental health provider Yes137(80.1)34(19.9)11.1620.001*No94(94.9)5(5.1)Confidentiality and Privacy	No				
Interruption of consultation         21(75.6)         10(24.4)         3.869         0.049*           No         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)         20(12.7)	Perception of respondents of				
Yes         21(75.6)         10(24.4)         3.869         0.049*           No         200(87.3)         29(12.7)         29(12.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200(10.7)         200	interruption of consultation				
No200(87.3)29(12.7)Level of Stigma and DiscriminationAccepting and non-judgmental health providerYes137(80.1)34(19.9)11.1620.001*No94(94.9)5(5.1)Confidentiality and Privacy	Yes	21(75.6)	10(24.4)	3.869	0.049*
Level of Stigma and DiscriminationAccepting and non-judgmental health providerYes137(80.1)No94(94.9)State5(5.1)Confidentiality and Privacy	No				-
Accepting and non-judgmental health providerYes137(80.1)34(19.9)11.1620.001*No94(94.9)5(5.1)Confidentiality and Privacy	Level of Stigma and Discrimi		× /		
Yes 137(80.1) 34(19.9) 11.162 0.001* No 94(94.9) 5(5.1) Confidentiality and Privacy					
No 94(94.9)´ 5(5.1)´ Confidentiality and Privacy	Yes	•	34(19.9)	11.162	0.001*
Confidentiality and Privacy	No		, , ,		
	Confidentiality and Privacy	- ( /	- \ - /		
	Yes	5(83.3)	1(16.7)	0.025	0.875

### Imhonopi et. al. BUMJ 2021 4(2):97-106

No Equipment	226(85.6)	38(14.4)		
Equipment Adequate	209(87.4)	30(12.6)	6.031	0.014*
Inadequate	22(71.0)	9(29.0)	0.001	0.014
Respectful Staff				
Yes	74(93.7)	5(6.3)	5.951	0.015*
No	157(82.2)	34(17.8)		
Understanding Staff				
Yes	90(90.9)	9(9.1)	3.625	0.057
No	141(82.5)	30(17.5)		

Table 4 shows the logistic regression of predictive factors for clients' satisfaction. Respondents who reported unavailability of HIV educational materials were 3.5 times more likely to be unsatisfied with HIV services compared to those who do not (3.545; 95% Cl: 1.519 - 8.275; p =

0.003). Likewise, clients who perceived health workers to be non-accepting and judgmental are 3.6 times more likely to be unsatisfied with HIV services provided compared to those who do not (3. 580; 95% CI: 1.264- 10.141; p = 0.016).

Variable	Odds Ratio	95%	95% CI	
		Lower	Upper	
Waiting time				
1hour (ref)</td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
>1 hour	3.613	0.346	37.751	0.283
Availability of HIV educational				
materials				
Yes (ref)				
No	3.545	1.519	8.275	0.003
Ignoring complaints of respondents				
Yes (ref)				
No	2.230	0.651	7.636	0.202
Accepting and non-judgmental				
health provider				
Yes (ref)				
No	3.580	1.264	10.141	0.016
Interruption of consultation				
Yes (ref)				
No	2.022	0.761	5.377	0.158
Equipment				
Adequate	2.604	0.953	7.117	0.084
Inadequate (ref)				
Respectful staff				
Yes (ref)				
Νο	0.291	0.072	1.181	0.084
Understanding Staff				
Yes (ref)				
No	1.546	0.511	4.680	0.441

## Discussion

The socio-demographic pattern of respondents in this study was similar to that found in another study by Opara et al (9) in Uyo, where the majority of People Living with HIV and AIDS attending HIV clinic at the University of Uyo Teaching Hospital, Uyo were aged 31-43 years (51.4%), this study found a mean age of  $42.1\pm11.5$  years. There was a significant relationship in the mean age of participants in this study with another similar research by Helena Getenet et al (10) in Ethiopia which was 30.5 years for females and 35.2 years for the males. The findings in the two studies corroborate well with what we found in our study which showed that in most situations, HIV infections were acquired at a younger age with the manifestation of infection very early in life.

In the same vein, the study found the majority of our respondents were females and married. Similar findings were reported in Nnewi (11), Uyo (9), and Ethiopia (10) this might indicate that females were either exposed to HIV infection early in life. Our study also found that most of the respondents had secondary education, followed closely by the tertiary level of education, this was similar to what Anthony Iwu et al (12) found in Orlu, south-east, Nigeria. In the same study, Anthony al (12)found et more widowed/separated, Opara et al (9) found a majority of their respondents were divorced/separated, while the majority of our respondents were married, these findings capture the significance of heterosexual intercourse in the transmission of HIV in Nigeria and Africa in general.

Patient satisfaction can be used as an indicator of health care quality because the more satisfied patient is the more likely patient cooperate with the healthcare provider and have a higher level of continuity with the provider which in turn improves the clinical outcome (2, 11). Access to care was an important domain by which satisfaction was measured (13). This study found most clients stayed more than one hour before the consultation. Findings from our study were similar to a study conducted in Kano. North-west Nigeria which showed a median time spent waiting to see a doctor as 40minutes (13). Studies carried out in Uganda (14), Iran (15) and South Africa (16) also reported the significance of access to a health facility. They emphasized that clients' satisfaction is also determined through access to healthcare services which encompasses the availability of health workers and drugs especially in public health facilities, distance to health facilities, and a longer waiting time to access healthcare services. In the area of general satisfaction with service provision, it was observed that there was a good level of overall satisfaction similar to the level of perception among the majority of the respondents, and as such, there could be a relationship between perception and satisfaction of the respondents which is not unusual as both satisfaction and perception depend on past preconceived ideas, expectations, experiences and achieved service performance (12, 17, 18). This general school of thought regarding perception and expectation was displayed in this study where there was a high satisfaction overall clients' among the respondents. Although a small fraction of the

respondents lamented the lack of availability of HIV-specific educational materials, most were satisfied with the lack of delay in appointment even for urgent and non-urgent care and getting answers to question when the facility is contacted.

This study found perception on quality of care to be good, the majority of our respondents believed the quality of services was adequate though they perceived that equipment was lacking and the waiting time was equally perceived to be lengthy. An average respondent spent more than 30minutes before consultation in this study. Although, this study was not a comparison between public and private facilities studies in Nigeria had shown that the quality was better in public compared with private facilities. Olowookere et al (19) and Osungbade et al (20) in Nigeria both reported that generally, a high level of satisfaction with services was observed among the participants from public hospitals. In sharp contrast to the findings in this study, Nwabueze et al (11) reported more satisfaction among private facility attendants in their study. Umeokonkwo Chukwuma et al (2) in Anambra, South-east, Nigeria argued that the differences observed among the public and private facilities were largely due to reasons of subsidies where services are largely subsidized by the government, users generally report a high level of satisfaction due to their little expectation.

Furthermore, Awatta Walter Ochan and colleagues observed that patients in public health facilities usually have higher perceptions and they should have had a bigger average gap but due to their higher expectations as well, which is difficult to meet. This is in line with the disconfirmation theory, which states that 'the higher the expectations, the lower the perception' leading to less satisfaction or negative disconfirmation (14). This observation was similar to what we discovered in this study where perception was high in most of the thematic areas considered except in the area of waiting time which most patients believed was too long and could greatly affect clients' satisfaction. A high proportion of clients" in this study reported that the attitude of health staff was never poor to them: never had any interruption of consultation, always had an adequate explanation about test results; although majority complaint of never had more time during the consultation. Chukwuma et al (2) report contrast sharply our observation, in their study the proportions that were satisfied were less than 50% in both public and private hospitals in technical quality and time spent with the doctor

domains. This could mean the patients' perception of the technical competency of their clinicians was suboptimal. The findings in our study were most likely due to the doctor-client ratio with most of the time spent on ensuring that more clients are seen at every clinic. The findings on not getting more time to consultation in this study were contrary to a South African study where clients interviewed agreed that their healthcare provider listened to their problems long enough. In this same study majority of the patients had an opportunity to ask their healthcare provider questions and were satisfied with the explanations provided (21). Similarly, this study showed that the majority of our were never respondents uncomfortable discussing personal or intimate issues; were involved in decision making on their care and treatment, and were never ignored when the complaint was made. A related study in the United States of America supported this assertion that patient involvement in decisions on treatment modalities had a strong correlation with the interpersonal quality of care satisfaction and with overall quality-of-care satisfaction (22).

These findings are guite similar to a study that was done by the National Agency for the Control of AIDS (NACA). Nigeria to assess the quality of care where the majority of clients were completely satisfied with confidentiality and respect of patients' privacy, the competence of HCWs, consultation, explanation and guidance of HCWs, the responsiveness of the HCWs to patients" questions and requests (21). The medical staff needs to pay more attention to privacy and the adequacy of the doctors' explanations of medical terms is more than important in clients' satisfaction which was also demonstrated by this present study. This observation further emphasizes the importance of health care provider's behavior such as the conduct and attention to the patient in improving patients' satisfaction. This has been noted by Dansereau et al (23), which showed that patients' ratings of health care provider behavior were an especially strong predictor of satisfaction. A similar study among clients in Bangladesh showed that health workers' attitudes and behavior were much more important than the technical competence of the provider (24).

Other factors that could influence patients' experiences are responsiveness and empathy. It was indicated that health workers' interpersonal skills and patients' trust influence the satisfaction with the provider stronger than the actual quality of medical care (24). The Bangladeshi study (24)

corroborated the finding in this study which demonstrated clients' confidentiality and privacy; accepting and non-judgmental attitude by a healthcare provider; not ignoring complaints of respondents and availability of HIV educational materials were found to be statistically significant predictors of client satisfaction. This goes to support Beller's (25) views that, "No matter how sophisticated and reputable a medical facility may be and no matter how brilliant and knowledgeable the physicians practicing there, patients will not perceive their care as being excellent unless they are satisfied concerning many of the behaviors cited above and that results in high patients' satisfaction is having physicians and other caregivers who are truly concerned about their patients" (25).

The predictors of clients' satisfaction of care received at the facility include unavailability of HIV educational materials and non-accepting and judgmental attitude of the staff. However, Jitta et al (26) in Uganda found total time spent in the facility and Joshua Amo-Adjei et al (27) in Ghana reported that regular drug supply is a factor influencing clients' satisfaction in their studies (2). The observation in this study is a clear and unique opportunity to increase information sharing between caregivers and clients to increase clients' satisfaction with the services provided.

# Limitations of the study

We did not explore the waiting time at different service points such as pharmacy, laboratory, adherence counseling, and HIV testing units to have an idea where the patient usually waits more but the study makes it clear there is an issue with waiting time.

# Conclusion and recommendations

This study showed that clients attending HIV/AIDS clinic were satisfied with the services provided at Federal Medical Centre, Abeokuta. However, certain areas of concern have been elucidated which include reducing the waiting time before patients are seen, inadequate availability of educational materials, and the need to be non-judgmental and accepting on the part of the health workers. Improvement in these areas will further enhance the overall patients' experience and satisfaction thereby increasing the certainty of better treatment adherence and retention in medical care.

From the foregoing and observation arising from this present study, the following recommendation would improve clients' satisfaction and increase treatment adherence and retention in care at the HIV clinic.

- 1. Reducing waiting time before medical consultation through training and retraining of healthcare workers.
- 2. Making adequate availability of Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials to all clients both new and old.
- 3. Unacceptable and judgmental attitudes by some staff were also found to strongly determine satisfaction. There should be training and retraining on behavioral change for all cadres involved in care and treatment to minimize stigmatization.
- 4. Despite the pressure of ensuring all clients who present at the clinic are seen, adequate time must be given to each client to hear their view of care they receive and make input in the decision on their care and treatment.

# Declarations

# Ethics consideration

Ethical approval for this study (FMCA/470/HREC/01/2019/10) was obtained from the Federal Medical Centre Ethical Review Committee. Clients were provided with informed consent forms explaining the study objectives and aims and the voluntary nature of the study. The interviews were conducted in privacy and anonymously. Respondents were informed about the objectives of the study and that the data collected would be treated with confidentiality. Written informed consent was obtained from all respondents signed or thumb printed before the start of the interview.

# Consent for publication

The authors hereby give consent for the publication of this work under the Creative Commons CC Attribution. Non-commercial 4.0 license.

# Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed in this study are included in this article and are available at any request.

# Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

*Funding* None

Contributions of authors

Conception and design: IG, ST, OOY, and FMM Acquisition of data: OOY and OIA Analysis and interpretation of data: FMM Drafting of the manuscript: AKA and AAR Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: ST and AKA Statistical analysis: ST AND OOY Administrative, technical, or material support: TAO

Supervision: ST AND OOY

# Acknowledgments

We would like to appreciate the residents' doctors that were involved with data collection

# References

- United Nations. General Assembly. Special session, United Nations. General Assembly. Special Session on HIV/AIDS, United Nations. Department of Public Information, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS: United Nations General Assembly, Special Session on HIV/AIDS, 25-27 June 2001. UN; 2001.
- Umeokonkwo CD, Aniebue PN, Onoka CA, Agu AP, Sufiyan MB, Ogbonnaya L. Patients' satisfaction with HIV and AIDS care in Anambra State, Nigeria. PloS one. 2018 Oct 26;13(10):e0206499.
- World Health Organization. AIDS epidemic update: December 2009. WHO Regional Office Europe; 2010 Mar 24.
- Ware Jr JE, Snyder MK, Wright WR, Davies AR. Defining and measuring patient satisfaction with medical care. Evaluation and program planning. 1983 Jan 1;6(3-4):247-63. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189(83)90005-8</u>
- 5. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. New survey results indicate that Nigeria has an HIV prevalence of 1.4%. Available at https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/res ources/20190314 PR Nigeria en.pdf
- 6. APIN Public Health Initiatives. https://apin.org.ng/
- Anosike A, Olakunde BO, Adeyinka DA, Ezeokafor C, Amanze O, Mathews O, Alau K, Ogungbemi K. Clients' satisfaction with HIV treatment and care services in Nigeria. Public health. 2019 Feb 1;167:50-4.
- 8. Hailemeskal MB, Sereda Y, Latypov A, Kiriazova T, Avaliani N. Perceived quality of HIV care and client satisfaction across different service providers in Ukraine.

European journal of public health. 2020 Feb 1;30(1):23-30.

- Opara DC, Umoh IB, John M. Sociodemographic and anthropometric variables of persons living with HIV and AIDS in Uyo, South Eastern Nigeria. Pakistan Journal of Nutrition. 2007;6(6):547-57.
- 10.Getenet H, Haileamlak A, Tegegn A. Clients'satisfaction with antiretroviral therapy services at Jimma University Specialized Hospital. Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences. 2008;18(2):17-24
- 11.Nwabueze SA, Adogu PO, Ilika AL, Asuzu MC. Comparative analysis of patient satisfaction levels in HIV/AIDS care in secondary and tertiary health care facilities in Nigeria. Afrimedic Journal. 2010;1(2):1-9.
- 12. Iwu AC, Duru CB, Uwakwe KA, Diwe KC, Merenu IA, Chineke HN, Madubueze UC, Abejegah C, Ndukwu EU, Ohale I. Patients' perception and satisfaction with the quality of HIV care services and its associated sociodemographic determinants in a tertiary care hospital. Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. 2017 Mar 11:1-4.
- 13. Iliyasu Z, Abubakar IS, Abubakar S, Lawan UM, Gajida AU. Patients' satisfaction with services obtained from Aminu Kano Teaching Hospital, Kano, Northern Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice. 2010;13(4).
- 14.Ochan AW, Aaron K, Aliyu S, Mohiuddin M, Bamaiyi P. Patients' satisfaction with Healthcare Services Received in Health Facilities in Bushenyi District of Uganda. International Journal of Science and Healthcare Research. 2018;3(1):76-87.
- 15.Rafii F, Hajinezhad ME, Haghani H. Nurse caring in Iran and its relationship with patient satisfaction. Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, The. 2008 Dec;26(2):75-84.
- 16.Orner P, Cooper D, Myer L, Zweigenthal V, Bekker LG, Moodley J. Clients' perspectives on HIV/AIDS care and treatment and reproductive health services in South Africa. AIDS Care. 2008 Nov 1;20(10):1217-23.
- 17.Yakob B, Ncama BP. Perceived quality of HIV treatment and care services in Wolaita zone of southern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2015 Dec 1;5(12):e010026.

- Vinagre MH, Neves J. The influence of service quality and patients' emotions on satisfaction. Int J Health Care Qual Assur. 2008; 21:87– 103.
- 19.Olowookere SA, Fatiregun AA, Ladipo MM-A, Akenova YA. Reducing waiting time at a Nigerian HIV treatment clinic: opinions from and the satisfaction of people living with HIV/AIDS. J Int Assoc Physicians AIDS Care. 2002; 11: 188–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1545109711402214
- 20.Osungbade KO, Shaahu VN, Owoaje EE, Adedokun BO. Patients' Satisfaction with Quality of Anti-Retroviral Services in Central Nigeria: Implications for Strengthening Private Health Services. J Prev Med. 2013; 1: 11–18. https://doi.org/10.12691/jpm-1-3-1
- 21.NACA. Quality of Care. Technical Report. National Agency for the Control. Abuja Nigeria. June 2015. <u>https://naca.gov.ng/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/FINAL-</u> <u>TECHNICAL-REPORT-OF-QUALITY-OF-</u> <u>CARE-STUDIES.-1.pdf</u>
- 22.Jha AK, Oray JE, Zheng J, Epstein AM. Patients' Perception of Hospital Care in the United States. N Engl J Med. 2008 October 30; 359 (18): 1921-1931.
- 23.Dansereau E, Masiye F, Gakidou E, Masters SH, Burstein R, Kumar S. Patient satisfaction and perceived quality of care: evidence from a cross-sectional national exit survey of HIV and non-HIV service users in Zambia. BMJ Open. 2015 Dec 1;5(12):e009700.
- 24.Harutyunyan, T., Demirchyan, A., Thompson, M.E., Petrosyan, V. Patient satisfaction with primary care in Armenia: good rating of bad services? Health Services Management Research, February 1, 2010, 23(1): 12-17.
- 25.Beller GA. President's page. Patient satisfaction: a personal perspective. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol., Feb, 2001; 37 (2): 687-688.
- 26.Jitta J, Arube-Wani J, Muyiinda H. Study of client satisfaction with health services in Uganda. Int J Equity Health. 2008;9:109-15.
- 27.Joshua Amo-Adjei, Prince Justin Anku, Hannah Fosuah Amo, Mavis Osei Effah. Perception of quality of health delivery and health insurance subscription in Ghana. BMC Health Services Research. 2016;16:317.