

1 **Title**

2 **Patient perspectives and hospital pay-for-performance: A qualitative study from Lebanon**

3

4 Jade Khalife¹, Björn Ekman¹, Walid Ammar², Fadi El-Jardali^{3,4}, Abeer Al Halabi⁴, Elise Barakat⁴, Maria
5 Emmelin¹

6

7

8 ¹ Social Medicine and Global Health, Department of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Lund
9 University, Malmö, Sweden.

10 ² Higher Institute of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Saint Joseph University of Beirut, Lebanon.

11 ³ Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton,
12 Ontario, Canada.

13 ⁴ Department of Health Management and Policy, Faculty of Health Sciences, American University of
14 Beirut, Lebanon.

15

16

17 * Corresponding author

18 Email: jade.khalife@med.lu.se (JK)

19

20

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

21 Abstract

22 Background

23 Patient perspectives have received increasing importance within health systems over the past four
24 decades. Measures of patient experience and satisfaction are commonly used. However, these do
25 not capture all the information available through patient engagement. An improved understanding
26 of the various types of patient perspectives and the distinctions between them is needed. The lack of
27 such knowledge limits the usefulness of including patient perspectives as components within pay-
28 for-performance initiatives. This study was aimed to identify and explore patient perspectives on
29 hospital care in Lebanon, and to describe how they relate to the national pay-for-performance
30 initiative.

31 Methods

32 We conducted a qualitative study using focus group discussions with persons recently discharged
33 after hospitalization under the coverage of the Lebanese Ministry of Public Health. This study was
34 implemented in 2017 and involved 42 participants across eight focus groups. Qualitative content
35 analysis was used to analyze the information provided by participants.

36 Results

37 Five overall themes supported by 17 categories were identified, capturing the meaning of the
38 informants' perspectives: health is everything; being turned into second class citizens; money and
39 'wasta' (personal connections) make all the difference; wanting to be treated with dignity and
40 respect; and tolerating letdown, for the sake of right treatment. The most frequently prioritized
41 statement in a ranking exercise regarding patient satisfaction was regular contact with one's doctor.

42 Conclusions

43 Patient perspectives include more than what is traditionally incorporated in measures of patient
44 satisfaction and experience. Patient valuing of health and their perceptions on each of the health
45 system, and access and quality of care should also be taken into account. Hospital pay-for-
46 performance initiatives can be made more responsive through a broader consideration of these
47 perspectives. More broadly, health systems would benefit from wider engagement of patients. We
48 propose a framework relating patient perspectives to value-based healthcare and health system
49 performance.

50

51 Introduction

52 The perspective of patients within health systems has increasingly been recognized over the past
53 four decades. This is exemplified by several landmark reports, though the translation into action has
54 been gradual and interspersed. Griffith's Report in 1983 urged the inclusion of public opinion and
55 perception of healthcare for the UK National Health Service reforms [1]. In 2001 the US Institute of
56 Medicine (IOM) highlighted patient-centeredness as one of the six dimensions of quality of care. In
57 2018 the IOM also called for an expansion towards person-centeredness, whereby the care provided
58 is "respectful of and responsive to individual preferences, needs and values" [2, 3].

59 At the 69th World Health Assembly (2016) member states adopted the Framework on Integrated
60 People-centered Health Services, whose vision emphasized the patients' role in defining their needs
61 and co-producing health services [4]. A 2018 joint report by the World Health Organization, World
62 Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) called patient-
63 centeredness the core of quality, and called for the engagement of people and communities in
64 service design, delivery and assessment [5]. Indeed, patient-centeredness has also been called "the
65 doorway to all qualities", not merely one dimension among others [6]. Moreover, the patient
66 perspective has also been included as the personal value pillar in a re-definition of value-based
67 healthcare [7]. Altogether, these developments represent a modern-day return to a fundamental
68 aspect of early Hippocratic medicine: accompanying the patient and meeting their individual goals.

69 Understanding the patient's perspective is an essential precursor to patient-centeredness. Improved
70 understanding helps in ensuring that they can be "full partners in the service delivery design and
71 governance and in improving their own health" [8]. Patient perspectives have been most commonly
72 addressed through measures of patient satisfaction and experience. One application of these
73 measures has been as components within pay-for-performance (P4P) initiatives, which have become
74 widespread in healthcare over the past two decades. The earliest national initiatives were launched
75 in the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States (US). In the UK the Quality and Outcomes
76 Framework incentivized the measurement of patient satisfaction by practitioners [9]. In the US a
77 national survey by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is used to capture the patients'
78 perspective on care received, and since 2012 the results are linked to incentive payments within the
79 Hospital Value-Based Purchasing program [10].

80 The largest sub-national P4P initiative preceding those in the UK and US was that in the state of São
81 Paulo, Brazil, which created Social Organizations in Health (OSS) in 1998 to manage hospitals [11].
82 The OSS model included a patient satisfaction component (complaints and completion of satisfaction

83 surveys) for the performance component used to set global hospital budgets, alongside volume
84 targets.

85 Patient experience and satisfaction are both recognized as multi-dimensional, but are ambiguous
86 and under-theorized [12]. They also do not capture all the information available from engaging
87 patients, such as the value patients attach to health. Therefore, despite their wide application
88 patient perspectives are not well understood. There is a need for greater clarity on the different
89 types of patient perspectives available, as well as on the distinction between them. The lack of such
90 knowledge limits the usefulness of patient perspectives in pay-for-performance initiatives,
91 potentially leading to unintended consequences [12]. More broadly, it also impedes the movement
92 towards person-centered health systems.

93 In Lebanon patient satisfaction and experience measures have been included in the hospital P4P
94 initiative since 2014, which is used for setting hospital reimbursement tiers by the Ministry of Public
95 Health (MoPH) [13]. In 2019 these measures comprised a fifth of the total performance score set by
96 the MoPH. The inclusion and weight given to this was intended to represent the ministry's
97 commitment to capturing patients' perspectives, and incentivize hospitals to improve their
98 performance. However, considering the aforementioned limitations of patient experience and
99 satisfaction, it is unknown to what extent this represents patients' true perspectives.

100 Studying how patients experience and perceive hospital care in Lebanon would contribute to the
101 overall knowledge on engaging patients towards person-centered health systems, and help improve
102 P4P design and identification of impacts.

103 The aim of this study was to explore how people with experience of being hospitalized perceive the
104 healthcare, focusing on health perceptions, access to care, experiences of hospitalization and
105 satisfaction of care.

106

107 **Methods**

108 **Overall study design**

109 We conducted a qualitative study using focus group discussions (FGDs) with persons who were
110 recently discharged after a hospitalization. A qualitative approach was used, since it allows us to
111 gather information directly from the perspective of patients, on a topic that is not well understood
112 [14]. Qualitative methods may allow a deeper understanding of such perspectives, and would not
113 have the limitations associated with structured questions that are characteristic of quantitative
114 surveys [15].

115 FGDs were chosen, because we were interested in a wide range of views and experiences, and to
116 encourage discussion and explanation of issues. It also limits the influence of an interviewer on a
117 respondent's comments, and allows for more spontaneous issues to arise [16]. FGDs rely on the
118 interaction among group participants to encourage information generation on perceptions, attitudes
119 and beliefs, while also allowing a facilitator to probe further when required [16]. This study is
120 reported in accordance with the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) [17].

121 **Study setting**

122 This study was undertaken in Lebanon, an Eastern Mediterranean country with a population of
123 Lebanon about 6.8 million people, including about 2 million refugees (most of whom are due to the
124 conflict in neighboring Syria). About 52% of Lebanese citizens lack formal health insurance and are
125 therefore under the coverage of the MoPH for hospitalization services. The MoPH contracts with
126 public and private hospitals throughout the country to provide hospitalization services for its
127 beneficiaries. Hospitals are reimbursed by the MoPH for 85% of the hospitalization bill, and 15%
128 remaining as patient co-payment.

129 **Study population and sampling**

130 We used a purposive sample of adult persons who had been hospitalized (and discharged) under the
131 coverage of the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) during the preceding 3 months. Persons covered
132 by the MoPH are typically comprised of the poorest or most disadvantaged stratum, as opposed to
133 those having health coverage from other payers (e.g. employees, students, police, army) [13]. The
134 aim was to capture a maximum variation of experiences in this target group by including both men
135 and women from different age groups and living in urban and rural settings. A database registering
136 all hospitalizations under the MoPH coverage was used to contact potential participants via
137 telephone. People were randomly selected from the database, which includes persons from all

138 regions and hospitals (public and private) which had been hospitalized under the MoPH coverage
139 (comprising about 230,000 hospitalizations per year), until we felt that we had reached an
140 acceptably varied group of participants.

141 The final sample involved 42 participants (22 men, 20 women) with a median age of 49 years (range:
142 25-65 years). Participants resided in different regions throughout Lebanon, including urban and rural
143 areas. All participants had had several instances of interaction with healthcare (including at least one
144 hospitalization, by design). The median duration of discussions was 62 minutes (range: 37-82
145 minutes; see table 1).

146 **Table 1: Focus group discussion characteristics**

FGD #	Duration (min)	Participants, n	Sex
1	65	7	Men
2	37	3	Women
3	64	4	Women
4	57	4	Men
5	58	4	Men
6	59	5	Women
7	82	8	Women
8	79	7	Men

147

148 **Discussion guide and pile-sorting statements**

149 A discussion guide was developed using open-ended questions, to support the facilitation of the
150 discussions. The themes of the key questions were: the meaning of health; description of local
151 healthcare; characteristics of services received; description of 'good' and of 'bad' hospital stays;
152 information needed upon hospital admission; and factors that would make a person revisit a
153 hospital. The guide was piloted in one FGD and subsequently revised for greater clarity, based on the
154 pilot results.

155 To increase our understanding of how patients prioritized different factors regarding their
156 hospitalization, we also prepared a structured pile-sorting exercise. The pile sort is a method that
157 involves asking participants to sort for example statements about the phenomenon of interest in
158 piles of more versus less important [18]. In this study the statements were developed based on our
159 assumptions of what factors may affect the satisfaction and experience of patients, and also using
160 existing literature and survey tools [19, 20]. Following the end of the discussions, participants were
161 asked to sort 16 statements into two piles (more versus less important). These included topics such

162 as the importance of regular contact with personnel, hospital organization, cleanliness,
163 communication, pain and privacy.

164 **Data collection**

165 The FGDs were held between July and September 2017. The groups were arranged separately for
166 men and women since we assumed that this would create a more open discussion climate.
167 Variability in group size was largely due to some cancellations and rescheduling of participants in the
168 period preceding the discussions. They were all held in a private room at the MoPH headquarters in
169 Beirut. Following an introduction to the study, all participants were asked to provide oral consent
170 and agreed to be audio-recorded using a digital recording device.

171 The first author (JK) was the discussion facilitator, while two research assistants (AH, EB) noted the
172 group layout and assessed interactions but they did not participate in the discussions. The first
173 author (JK) introduced himself to participants as being involved in the hospital pay-for-performance
174 initiative, which was a collaboration between the MoPH, the American University of Beirut and Lund
175 University. The discussions involved exploring several thematic areas, with probing questions used to
176 clarify statements or explore them in more depth. The median duration of discussions was 62
177 minutes, with a range between 37 to 82 minutes.

178 No material or financial compensation was given to participants, but all were offered complimentary
179 transport by taxi from their residence to the discussion site and back, and snack refreshments after
180 the FGDs had ended.

181 **Data analysis**

182 The recordings were transcribed and translated from Lebanese Arabic to English verbatim (AH, EB).
183 During the transcription process participant names and other personal identifiers (e.g. residence)
184 were removed. Accuracy and sense-making of the transcription was iteratively assessed by the two
185 research assistants and the facilitator.

186 Qualitative content analysis based on Graneheim & Lundman (2004) was used. The unit of analysis
187 was the focus group discussion transcripts. All transcripts were read several times before coding was
188 begun, to increase the understanding of the issues raised, as well as their depth and breadth.
189 Statements were maintained uncondensed, and then labelled with codes. The statements were
190 analyzed in relation to the specific research questions that also formed the basis for the content
191 areas. Codes sharing communalities were used to construct categories based on expressed and
192 explicit (manifest) meaning. The latent meaning of categories was subsequently used to develop

193 themes. An example of the analytical process is found in Table 2. NVivo 12.0 software was used to
 194 support the coding procedure.

195 **Table 2: An example from the analysis process, moving from text, to code and category.**

Text	Code	Category
You have nothing even if you don't have health, even if you own the whole world. (FGD1-P5)	Without health we have nothing	More important than money or wealth
Briefly, health is the whole life, who does not have good health, has nothing because the sick person is always depressed. (FGD3-P1)	Without health we have nothing	
Health is everything, if you have all the money in the world but you have poor health, it means you are poor and you own nothing. (FGD2-P3)	Health is more important than money	
At the end you give priority to health over other needs, this is how I think, for example I buy anything cheap, but I don't buy a cheap medicine to save money, and same for the doctor [...] a person should be frugal on everything except on his health, this is how I think [...]. (FGD3-P3)	Being frugal except with your health	

196

197 **Ethical considerations**

198 The research protocol approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the American
 199 University of Beirut (ID: FHS.FE.21). All participants were given oral information at the initial
 200 telephone invitation (by AH, EB) and again on-site at the introduction to the FGDs (by JK). This
 201 information included the purpose of the study; the fully voluntary nature of their participation and
 202 right of refusal; that the decision/participation would not be associated with or affect their MoPH
 203 coverage in any manner; that all material would be handled confidentially; and no results would be
 204 presented allowing participant identification. Participants were given the choice to allow the
 205 discussions to be audio-recorded or not (all accepted recording). Participants were also asked to
 206 respect that “what’s said in the group stays in the group”, since the researcher can only promise
 207 confidentiality on behalf of the research group.

208 **Results**

209 The analysis resulted in five overall themes reflecting the underlying meaning of the discussions,
 210 supported by 17 categories giving the more manifest level of the interpretation. The overall results

211 are presented in Figure 1 in relation to five content areas, based on the focus of the study. The first
212 theme “Health is everything” indicates the high value that participants put on health. The second
213 theme “Being turned into second class citizens” illustrates the inequity participants perceived that
214 characterized the health system in general, while “Money and ‘wasta’ make all the difference”
215 specifies how this inequity is manifested in the actual access to healthcare access. The fourth theme
216 “Wanting to be treated with dignity and respect” relates directly to what participants value most
217 when assessing hospital care while the fifth theme “Tolerating letdown, for the sake of right
218 treatment” implies what takes precedence in the end is the medical results.

219 The section below presents the themes as headings in bold, while categories are in italics in the
220 running text. Where relevant, quotes are included in italics, to support the analysis using the
221 participants’ own words.

222

223 **Figure 1: Overview of the main findings including content areas, categories and themes.**

224

225 **Theme 1: Health is everything**

226 This theme illustrates the valuing of health. Participants described health as everything, more
227 important than anything else in life. Health was portrayed as **more important than money or**
228 **wealth**, and they would exchange anything they own to regain their health. Health formed the
229 crucial foundation for life. It was also considered a priority above other goods or services, whereby
230 one may be frugal with other items, but not with health services or medications.

231 *“Health is literally all life, if you don’t have health you don’t have a life; that’s it. Regardless of*
232 *what your disease is, even if you only have headache, this is pain, and no one feels the pain*
233 *except the patient himself.” (FGD1 Men-P3)*

234 Being healthy was not only for one’s own self, but was also important to be able to fulfill one’s role
235 in the family and in the community. This meant supporting those dependent on you, and as a **means**
236 **of survival** to be able to work and provide.

237 *“Health is everything, I am a carpenter and I am paid on a daily basis, I have stopped working*
238 *since a month and a half. Health is the basis of our existence, if we are not healthy we cannot*
239 *work or do anything else.” (FGD4 Men-P3)*

240 Participants valued **not only physical health**, but also psychological and emotional well-being, which
241 are important wherever a person is, be it their workplace or with their family. If you are not healthy,

242 you also lose self-confidence. Although very important, health was also often neglected, as people
243 get busied by other things in life and forget to take care of themselves, until they need a hospital.

244 *“A person runs and endures, endures, endures and endures, and when time comes to relax, he*
245 *finds himself unproductive because of his health, or could not anymore live the way he*
246 *expected to live.” (FGD1 Men-P4)*

247

248 **Theme 2: Being turned into second-class citizens**

249 This theme relates to how the health system is perceived. Participants described how they felt like
250 second-class citizens in their own country. Participants recognized that **“some hospitals are not for**
251 **us”**. Some attributed this to which hospitals they had access to, while others perceived they were
252 taken advantage of by hospitals, due to their educational status. They also reported that very often
253 the first question they would be asked at the emergency room was whether they are under the
254 coverage of private insurance or the NSSF. Participants recognized that those with greater financial
255 means had much better access to healthcare than the poor.

256 *“The hospitals in Lebanon are classified into classes, if you tell someone you are going to [well-*
257 *known hospital X], they tell you ‘this is not for you’; this is the way they reply.” (FGD1 Men-P1)*

258 Participants **felt neglected by the state**, with citizens under the coverage of other payers (non-
259 MoPH) having better healthcare access and services. They highlighted such preferential behavior
260 particularly being given to those covered by the NSSF and private insurance. This was perceived from
261 the first moment of interaction between patients and hospitals; usually the hospital admission desk,
262 but even at the emergency rooms.

263 *“My parents are old and don’t have NSSF nor insurance. [My father was ill and] the hospital*
264 *asked for 650 USD, and I don’t have money. I borrowed the money from someone. This is how*
265 *we live in Lebanon.” (FGD8 Men-P6)*

266 A common perception was that hospitals had less respect for patients covered by the MoPH, as well
267 as the ministry itself. They described the ministry as being weak, and they shared the excuses they
268 would be given by hospitals for refusing hospitalizations, such as no beds being available.

269 Participants thought that the MoPH should more strongly advocate for and safeguard the rights of
270 the poor and “make us feel that we are human beings”. They also wanted to see the ministry
271 actively evaluate and regulate hospitals and primary care centers. This included investigating how
272 some wealthy persons are reportedly receiving services under MoPH coverage, while some of the

273 poor do not. Participants generally did not have complaints regarding MoPH requirements for
274 hospitalization or treatment, but this was not shared by some participants who considered
275 themselves unfairly disadvantaged. Participants recognized the adverse role of what they considered
276 was excessive bureaucracy, such as needing to travel to different locations to receive approvals for
277 certain procedures (e.g. to the MoPH headquarters).

278 *“If you want to benefit this country you need to think of cutting down on the processes; the*
279 *current way is very tiring.” (FGD4 Men-P4)*

280 Participants reported **seeing public hospitals neglected** and having limited resources devoted to
281 them. This neglect was translated into worse services and patients being treated with less dignity
282 and respect than those going to private hospitals. They considered that public hospitals have a major
283 role in supporting the poor, yet their potential was ignored. This neglect was also transferred to
284 nurses, physicians and other staff at public hospitals.

285 *P4: “If they improve the services of the public hospitals, there will be no need for private ones.*
286 *We have a public hospital which is the largest hospital in the Middle East [...], but you cannot*
287 *go there.”*

288 *Moderator: “Why?”*

289 *P1: “Because you would die!”*

290 *P4: “First the treatment is very bad, and the cleanliness is worse!” (FGD3 Women)*

291 Some participants proposed solutions to improve public hospitals. Some ideas shared were:
292 increasing funding of public hospitals, allocating the better/best doctors to public hospitals (“we
293 always follow the big names”), improving services, and accountability of hospital directors.
294 Participants often avoided primary care centers. They perceived these centers to be under-staffed,
295 and that patients had less time, and with less qualified doctors (compared to private clinics). They
296 recognized that healthcare staff at these centers were underpaid, although they also have a duty
297 because “there are also poor people who must be treated”.

298 Participants also said they **found ‘outsiders’ being favored** with faster and free treatment. This
299 referred to refugees with coverage from international non-governmental organizations and
300 agencies.

301

302 **Theme 3: Money and ‘wasta’ make all the difference**

303 This theme illustrates how participants perceived access to healthcare. Participants predominantly
304 linked this closely with the ability to have a ‘wasta’ (‘I know someone’) or have enough money.

305 Participants described that whatever the obstacles to access may be, one who pays directly out-of-
306 pocket or has a ‘wasta’ would solve them. **Needing a ‘wasta’** was recognized as a major factor in
307 accessing healthcare, across the services spectrum. This particularly included hospital admission and
308 surgical operations, but also medications for cancer and other chronic conditions.

309 ‘Wasta’ was also important for healthcare institutions who are connected to political or religious
310 figures/authorities. Participants considered that this relation functioned in both directions: for
311 healthcare institutions to be secure from accountability, and for figures/authorities to use their
312 influence to facilitate coverage for patients at the healthcare institutions.

313 *P1: “There are connections and some people may be protected by others”*

314 *P3: “There are ‘wasayet’ all over the country”*

315 [...]

316 *P2: What is the relationship between hospitals and politics?*

317 *P1: I will tell you: ‘hospital X’ is for ‘politician A’, hospital Y’ is for ‘political party B’, hospital Z is*
318 *for ‘religious council C’” (FGD2 Women)*

319 Another function of ‘wasta’ was to decrease the hospital bill of patients, through the connection
320 with political or religious figures. Participants reported several instances where their use of ‘wasta’
321 for themselves or relatives resulted in a considerable decrease in their hospital bill. ‘Wasta’ was also
322 used to remedy perceived injustice or theft by the hospital through its physicians or administrative
323 personnel. They also recognized that knowing a connection in the ministry gave them an advantage
324 in confrontations with hospitals. Also, in some instances, the treating physician was a friend of a
325 patient, and they would intervene with a ‘wasta’ on behalf of the patient to lower the bill.

326 While ‘wasta’ was considered widespread, participants recognized that this was a negative factor,
327 although it was sometimes unavoidable to resort to. They thought that the health ministry should
328 support them against such practices, and that getting rid of ‘wasta’ everywhere would actually
329 improve both hospital and the health system.

330 *“As long as a person wants to be admitted through ‘wasta’, the hospital will not work*
331 *properly.” (FGD3 Women-P3)*

332 Not all examples of connections were perceived negatively. Living near healthcare institution
333 sometimes gave a relation of familiarity between patients and personnel. Some participants
334 reported having very positive interactions with personnel in local hospitals, many of whom were
335 either relatives or neighbors, or came from the same village or town. This was also sometimes
336 reflected in more trustful behavior regarding payment, for example by patients being allowed to
337 ‘pay later’, as they were known to the personnel. However, there were also the fewer instances

338 where a participant reported being taken advantage of by personnel who were relatives or
339 neighbors.

340 The financial cost of health services was a major concern for participants, specifically **affording to**
341 **pay**. This also affected the perception and behavior of participants towards healthcare. Hospitals
342 were perceived by participants to pursue money above all. Patients that are able to pay out-of-
343 pocket would receive the best treatment, and sometimes you can only be hospitalized if you have
344 the money.

345 *“We ask God to stay healthy because we do not have money to pay for healthcare services.”*
346 *(FGD7 Women-P2)*

347 Money was seen as a solution to any problem encountered at hospitals, especially if one lacked a
348 ‘wasta’. Patients reported that almost all problems occur either at admission or at the cashier.
349 Sometimes hospitals would claim that no hospital beds are available, to deny admission for those
350 covered by the MoPH. Some participants suggested this was a deceptive practice to allow hospitals
351 to retain more profitable patients covered by other payers, or to compel MoPH-covered patients to
352 pay out-of-pocket. One anticipatory approach mentioned by a participant was to claim to pay out-of-
353 pocket at their initial interaction with hospital personnel, but after confirming bed availability he
354 would then seek health ministry coverage.

355 *“[...] I told the nurse my mother is not the daughter of a minister or a president; I cannot pay*
356 *[out-of-pocket]. Then we took her to another hospital [...].” (FGD3 Women-P4)*

357 Unaffordability led some patients to early hospital discharge or to forego medical tests. Participants
358 recognized this was harmful to their health, but they had no alternative that would allow them to
359 pay for these services. Some participants recounted a family member pretending to be better to be
360 discharged earlier, due to the mounting hospital bill. Others questioned the utility of doing medical
361 diagnostic tests, reasoning that since they cannot afford treatment, then it was better for their
362 mental health not to know more about their illness. Some participants resorted to selling personal
363 belongings to cover costs of medical tests and treatment, and sometimes had to forego necessary
364 medical testing for themselves or their children, for conditions such as cancer and neurological
365 illnesses.

366 *“When I had breast cancer [...] I couldn’t do regular tests for checkup. I went through very*
367 *hard times to do the tests and get the treatment. I sold my wedding ring [to get treatment].*
368 *The ministry couldn’t cover all the expenses; I reached a very difficult situation.” (FGD7*
369 *Women-P1)*

370 Resorting to borrowing from family and relatives was often a necessary measure, when the cost of
371 healthcare was unaffordable for patients, despite the partial coverage by the MoPH. Sometimes this
372 also necessitated a ‘wasta’. But recurring costs such as those for chronic medications remained a
373 burden. Participants emphasized that they have a right to health, but they do not know how to
374 realize these rights.

375 The unemployed were particularly vulnerable. Without a source of income, these persons could not
376 afford to pay for visits to doctors’ clinics (outpatient), not afford some of their medications for
377 chronic conditions. The safety nets available for hospitalization (e.g. MoPH coverage) were not
378 available for patient follow-up after leaving the hospital. The impact of unaffordable healthcare
379 costs was not limited to patients alone. Family members would be actively engaged in collecting
380 funds to cover hospitalization costs, as well as in gathering and submitting administrative papers for
381 coverage approvals. This sometimes meant skipping university classes or work.

382 **Risking theft** when seeking healthcare was emphasized by participants. This was a major concern
383 affecting their perception of hospitals as well as health professionals. Although services were often
384 considered to be of good quality, the lack of information and transparency over hospital bills
385 contributed to a feeling of patient distrust towards hospitals; as though ‘they were stealing from us’.
386 Such practice took on different forms, and could involve different actors. A common complaint from
387 participants was of a doctor or nurse misinforming that a procedure was not covered by the MoPH.
388 Some participants also reported doctors soliciting bribes for signing admission approval papers for
389 patients.

390 *“[...] Then we knew that the ministry does cover the surgery, although the doctor has told us*
391 *that it does not [...] my father stopped the cheque [...] The papers were signed after ‘wasta’ [...]*
392 *The doctor had lied to us; why did he do that?” (FGD7 Women-P5)*

393 Participants noted that it was common to be asked by hospitals or physicians for payment above the
394 MoPH pre-defined co-payment amount, sometimes by several times more. However, many were
395 unaware that this was an illegal practice according to the contracting terms between the ministry
396 and hospitals. In some instances, over-charging on co-payment was not hidden from patients, and
397 hospitals or doctors attempted to justify this. Participants recognized that not all doctors are the
398 same. Some were more helpful than others, in informing patients of their rights under MoPH
399 coverage and encouraging them to stand up for their rights. Also, some participants were surprised
400 by the large differences in the cost of some surgical procedures between comparable hospitals,
401 which they considered a signal of over-charging. Other participants noted instances where their
402 copayment was high enough to cover most or all of a surgical procedure’s cost.

403 Some participants reported not being informed of costly tests or procedures in a timely manner.
404 Once hospitalized patients would find these services unaffordable. A common response of hospital
405 personnel in such instances was that the MoPH reimbursement to hospitals was insufficient to cover
406 hospital costs.

407 Insufficient information regarding payment meant that patients had a weaker role in their
408 interaction with hospitals. Participants were aware that they were the weaker of the three parties
409 involved (MoPH and hospitals being the other two), and that they would sometimes bear the burden
410 of mistakes made by the hospital. In some instances, this resulted in patients being over-charged.
411 They were also aware of some of the limitations regarding hospital reimbursement from the MoPH.
412 A downstream impact of these may be further over-charging on patient co-payments.

413 *“Every patient admitted under the ministry’s coverage doesn’t know how much they are*
414 *expected to pay [...]. The ministry delays its payments to hospitals, so [hospitals] want to*
415 *benefit from another source.” (FGD4 Men-P3)*

416

417 Some participants noted that the actual payment and invoice amounts can differ, but they would be
418 obliged to accept it to receive treatment. In some instances, at discharge, participants would find
419 themselves placed in an uncomfortable and embarrassing position by hospital personnel requesting
420 payment for tests or services they claimed were not covered by the MoPH. Participants recognized
421 the importance of speaking up about their challenges for healthcare access, especially
422 hospitalization and medication costs. While they appreciated having coverage from the MoPH, it was
423 far from sufficient for some.

424 Many participants also reported positive interactions with healthcare, whether with the ministry or
425 hospitals. They were **surprised when all goes well**, especially when the administrative process for
426 admission approval went smoothly; upon receiving coverage by the MoPH (85%) for their
427 hospitalization costs; as well during hospitalization. Participants did not have to resort to neither
428 ‘wasta’ nor over-charges for their healthcare services in these instances.

429 Some participants reported being denied surgery or hospitalization under the coverage of private
430 insurance companies they were subscribed to, and then being surprised to have such services under
431 MoPH coverage. Such interactions affected the perception and trust of participants towards the
432 MoPH. In some instances, this was preceded by being let down due to exclusions by private
433 insurance. Although this resulted in positive perceptions towards the health ministry, participants
434 doubted they could rely on other ministries for delivering on other services; “no one cares about us
435 regarding other issues”.

436

437 **Theme 4: Wanting to be treated with dignity and respect**

438 This theme portrays how patients perceive the quality of care received at hospitals, expressed as
439 wanting to be treated with dignity and respect, often implicitly but also explicitly. It also illustrates
440 how patients view the health profession in itself. Reflecting on their past experiences, participants
441 acknowledged both positive and negative interactions. These were not necessarily tied to the bio-
442 physical outcome of treatment, but they did have an impact on how participants perceived
443 hospitals.

444 **Expecting empathy and compassion** during their interactions with hospital personnel was very
445 important. This included the manner of communication between health professionals and patients.
446 The ease of obtaining admission approval and navigating administrative steps once hospitalized
447 were crucial. Negative interactions had strong impressions on patients and their feelings of self-
448 worth. They also had differing perceptions of private and public hospitals, with the former being
449 considered to treat patients with more dignity and respect.

450 *“They are putting me in an endless circle, and ultimately I am not getting anything out of it.*
451 *How can I get admitted to a hospital with dignity?” (FGD1 Men-P2)*

452 When asked what factors result in a positive experience during a hospital stay participants often
453 referred to past interactions when healthcare personnel had been compassionate in their behavior
454 towards them, especially when they had been in pain. The positive demeanor and care of nurses was
455 particularly recalled by some participants.

456 Participants also recounted instances when doctors decreased patient co-payments (e.g. changing
457 hospitals, ‘wasta’), which influenced their perception of their doctor as a compassionate one. In one
458 instance, a participant shared his story of being operated on and followed up by a physician without
459 being asked for any payment.

460 *“[The doctor said I needed surgery] and he visited me in the morning, and noon, and night.*
461 *[...] He doesn’t take a Lira from me. He knew I am poor and suffering. I told him I’m a farmer*
462 *[...] He said ‘my brother, this is helping someone in need.’” (FGD8 Men-P4)*

463 Seeing health practitioners belonging to a **profession of conscience** was also an expression of
464 patients’ desire to be treated with dignity and respect. They considered that being humane was the
465 most important attribute of a doctor or nurse. Participants also noted that all personnel working in
466 healthcare institutions should be bound by the purpose of the institution, which they regarded as to

467 help those in need. This was also specified for administrative personnel, including those in hospital
468 admission and cashier roles.

469 *“Humanity is the most important thing to be found at hospitals” (FGD2 Women-P1)*

470 This also meant that the over-arching priority should be ensuring every person’s ability to receive
471 care, regardless of the ability to pay. This was considered as a fundamental right for humans, despite
472 many being deprived of it.

473 Participants were also **expecting responsiveness** from staff while hospitalized, and reported both
474 positive and negative experiences. There was understanding regarding the long working hours and
475 challenging conditions that hospital staff worked under, particularly for nurses. Some suggested this
476 to be a reason why responsiveness was sometimes lacking. More ‘difficult’ or demanding patients
477 were also considered to be a challenge for staff. However, maintaining patient-centeredness was
478 considered a necessity.

479 *“When the nurse is in this profession, he must be expecting what he will face, he must not get*
480 *annoyed and he must be patient. When the patient is at the hospital, he isn’t going to be*
481 *faking it, he will really be in pain. This is why he will be nagging; because no one nags for no*
482 *reason.” (FGD7 Women-P5)*

483 Staff responsiveness was particularly important when a patient was in pain, or needed aid to use the
484 toilet. The lack of responsiveness in such situations led to strongly negative experiences by patients.

485 Participants highly valued the time personnel devoted to them. It was especially important to have
486 enough time with the doctor, in order to have a clear explanation of their medical condition and
487 treatment options, as well as to get responses to their questions. Doctors that did not make time for
488 their patients were perceived as unresponsive and arrogant, regardless of their reasons.

489 *Moderator: “How would you differentiate between a good and humane doctor, and a bad*
490 *one?”*

491 *P4: “When he provides you with information, as I told you. Because my doctor’s clinic is so*
492 *busy, if I want to ask him a question he says ‘there is no need to know about these things, I*
493 *know about them’; this annoyed me.” [...]*

494 *P5: “The doctor is good when he gives you from his time, even though sometimes he is in a*
495 *rush, but he has to make you relaxed, to explain your condition to you.” (FGD7 Women)*

496 It was also important to have a doctor you are comfortable with. Participants highlighted the
497 importance of having a doctor they could rely on. ‘Following the doctor’ was how participants largely

498 explained their decision to visit or re-visit a hospital. This sometimes included situations where they
499 were not comfortable with the hospital. Participants were aware that countries would have a mix of
500 better and worse doctors, and that none could be right or perfect all the time. They also
501 acknowledged that chance also plays a role in whether you find a good doctor or not, as well as the
502 importance of hearing the recommendation of friends or relatives before choosing a doctor.

503 **Needing clarity in the information** provided by both hospitals and the MoPH was important to
504 participants. From hospitals, they expected more clarity on the treatment options and how long
505 their stay may be. They highlighted the need clearer information from both the MoPH and hospitals
506 regarding the amount for co-payment. More broadly, participants wanted to be more aware of their
507 rights through the MoPH, and thus more empowered to defend themselves.

508 *“The ministry must improve citizens’ awareness [...] We should know which hospitals we*
509 *cannot be admitted to, the services and benefits we can get [...] When we are aware, we can*
510 *fight for our rights.” (FGD 7 Women-P5)*

511 Participants emphasized that information clarity is perhaps even more important in health settings
512 than in other (non-health) services since as a patient one is more vulnerable and dependent on
513 others.

514 More broadly, participants thought it was important to know which hospitals were better
515 performers; the location and medications accessible from medication dispensaries and primary care
516 centers; and the cost (or co-payment) of surgical procedures under MoPH coverage. Regarding the
517 latter, it participants found it illogical and a lapse of accountability that co-payments could not be
518 pre-determined and committed to. Many were unaware of the difference between a deposit receipt
519 and their hospitalization bill, as well as their right to have a detailed hospital bill. There was minimal
520 information provided at discharge regarding their bill, most of which was verbal, not written, with
521 the exception of the receipt.

522 Cleanliness was an important issue for participants, particularly regarding toilets and bedsheets. For
523 some, this was more important than the medical treatment. Participants described some of their
524 experiences and how they **saw uncleanliness as an assault** and as a danger to themselves.

525 *“I was worried of getting a virus there; the toilets are not clean, such things makes me worried*
526 *of getting an infection [...] hygiene and toilets are very important. I care about such things*
527 *more than treatment [...] cleanliness is the most important factor.” (FGD7 Women-P5)*

528 Cleanliness was also something visible that patients sometimes directly associated with quality of
529 treatment. Participants noted cues they would use to assess cleanliness. These included spotting

530 spider webs on ceilings, and the frequency and timing of cleaning staff work. Cleanliness left a strong
531 impression of hospitals among participants; “you see and sense cleanliness”.

532 The responsiveness of nurses and cleaning staff after an incident was also important. Participants
533 with a positive experiences appreciated being attended to quickly, while others recalled negative
534 experiences after having to wait a few hours for a change of bedsheets soiled by their surgical
535 drainage.

536 *“They treated me well [...] my legs were swollen and I couldn’t step on the floor; I couldn’t use*
537 *the toilet. They used to be next to me after one minute of ringing the bell to clean me up and*
538 *wash me.” (FGD5 Men-P3)*

539

540 **Theme 5: Tolerating letdown, for the sake of right treatment**

541 This theme illustrates what participants see it takes to improve one’s health status. They
542 underscored that their purpose in being in a hospital was **to get the right treatment**, and that they
543 generally prioritized this above all else. This was also a major reason why a patient would consider
544 re-visiting a hospital. Some would accept being in a less-favored hospital, if it meant they could
545 ‘follow their doctor’ and get appropriately treated.

546 *“If nurses have a disagreement, it would affect you [...] Sometimes nurses are very nice, it*
547 *depends on your chance [...] At the end we say it is fine and we thank God there is a hospital*
548 *that admits us.” (FGD4 Men-P4)*

549 Some participants noted that they tolerated some delays or behaviors, because they empathized
550 with healthcare personnel’s working conditions. Participants also suggested personnel should have
551 shorter working schedules and more rest time.

552 Getting the right treatment sometimes involved **ignoring some of your rights**. Participants would
553 sometimes be compelled to not voice their concerns or displeasure towards personnel, because they
554 did not want to compromise on their treatment outcomes. In some instances, participants would try
555 to overlook negative behaviors or incidents, and focus on having their health status improved.

556 *“I ignore lots of things, you can say that I ignore 40-50% of my rights, the most important thing*
557 *is to get the treatment.” (FGD4 Men-P4)*

558

559

560 **Pile sorting exercise**

561 When asked directly to rank the 16 pre-formulated statements on patient satisfaction, the most
 562 frequently prioritized statement was regular contact with one’s doctor, with nearly all participants
 563 considering this to be more important. This was followed by clear medication and care instructions
 564 at discharge, room cleanliness, shared decision-making, and good hospital organization (see table 3).
 565 The least frequently prioritized statements were regarding food, privacy and ability to discuss fears
 566 and anxieties. However, it was notable that even these statements were still considered ‘more
 567 important’ by about half of the participants.

568 **Table 3: Results from the pile sorting (n=42)**

Item	Statement	More important	Less important
a	To have regular contact with my doctor	41	1
b	To have clear medication and care instructions at discharge	36	6
c	To be in a clean hospital room	35	7
d	To be involved in any decision related to my health, and to have discussed the treatment plans	35	7
e	hospital admission process To have a clear and efficient	34	8
f	To be in a hospital that is well organized	33	9
g	To be treated with dignity and respect	32	10
h	To feel that communication is good and agreement among the medical personnel, regarding treatment plans	31	11
i	To receive pain relief if I am in pain	28	14
j	To be in a hospital with a good reputation	28	14
k	To have a clear receipt from the hospital	28	14
l	To have regular contact with my nurse	27	15
m	To have all my questions and concerns addressed	23	19
n	To have privacy during discussions with medical personnel	23	19
o	To be able to discuss any fears and anxieties	21	21
p	To have good quality food	15	27

569

570 Statements were similarly prioritized by women and men participants, with few exceptions. Women
 571 more frequently considered it more important to be able to discuss any fears and anxieties (13:8),

572 and to have a clear receipt from the hospital (16:12). Men more frequently considered it more
573 important to have regular contact with their nurse (16:11), and to receive pain relief if in need
574 (16:12).

575 The results of the sorting exercise reflected the wide range of factors that patients consider
576 important during their hospitalization and affects their satisfaction. This provided 'patient
577 satisfaction' as a sixth patient perspective, following the previously identified five perspectives.

578

579 Discussion

580 In this qualitative study, we explored patient perspectives on hospital care in Lebanon. All
581 participants had been recently discharged from a hospital under the coverage of the Ministry of
582 Public Health, which typically includes the poorest or most disadvantaged stratum of Lebanese. To
583 our knowledge, this was the first qualitative research on hospital patient perspectives in Lebanon. It
584 also adds to the very limited international evidence base on patient perspectives, and how patients
585 can evaluate their care [21]. A key message of this research was that patients have a clear idea of
586 what is needed to improve their healthcare access and experience.

587 Summary of findings

588 Health was above everything and necessary for living and having a disease need not be accompanied
589 by dis-ease, if well managed. The participants held the health profession as one of conscience,
590 where all its practitioners are held to a standard. Despite the prioritization of health, they saw that
591 being under the coverage of MoPH meant that they were turned into second-class citizens and felt
592 neglected by the State. They wanted to see more invested in public hospitals, which they considered
593 have been neglected, despite being a national cornerstone for supporting the ill. The results also
594 indicate that money and 'wasta' can overcome any barriers to healthcare, and that this group of
595 patients were vulnerable to over-charging of co-payments. How to pay for one's healthcare was a
596 major concern, causing worry for financial debt.

597 Participants also described positive experiences with healthcare, which were accompanied by
598 feelings of surprise and even pride. This may reflect the wider resonance of negative experiences
599 and barriers in shaping public perception. Health practitioners and institutions are not homogenous,
600 and a patient may have the 'good fortune' to interact with those that are both professional and
601 humane. During hospitalization patients wanted to be treated with dignity and respect. They
602 expected personnel to be empathetic, compassionate and responsive to their needs. Cleanliness was

603 important in affecting patients' perception of hospitals. They wanted to have sufficient time with
604 their doctors to better understand their health status and treatment. Patients wanted to know their
605 rights to be able to break down barriers to healthcare, particularly knowing which services they were
606 entitled to. They also wanted clearer information regarding their hospitalization bill and co-payment.
607 Patients also thought it was important to know which are the better performing hospitals. Patients
608 were sometimes let down, but they tolerated much of this, including compromising on their rights.
609 They did this for the sake of getting treatment to improve their health.

610 Patients placed a distinctly high importance on the contact with their doctor, as well as hospital
611 cleanliness. A wide range of factors were important for patients' hospital experience and
612 satisfaction. Some were considered more important than others, particularly having clear
613 information at discharge, room cleanliness and shared decision-making. Also, patients' satisfaction
614 was not only determined by their interactions and surroundings, but also by their worries regarding
615 payment.

616 **How this relates to other studies**

617 Unsurprisingly, many of the findings were in agreement with previous studies investigating what
618 patients perceived to matter to them. Patients want to be treated by health professionals who are
619 humane, informative, available and not money-driven [22-26].

620 The purpose of being hospitalized is to receive appropriate medical treatment or diagnosis.
621 Nevertheless, our findings suggest that other factors may be equally or more important to some
622 patients, such as having humane personnel and hospital cleanliness. This was not unusual,
623 considering reports such a 2018 England survey, which found that twice as many people would
624 prioritize compassion over medical outcome, than those who would not [27]. While not detracting
625 from the primacy of the medical outcome, this underlines the importance of compassion.

626 The importance of responsiveness was not limited to patient perceptions alone. It has also been
627 linked to incidence of hospital-acquired infections, with poor responsiveness possibly acting as a
628 symptom of wider hospital problems [28]. Participants referred to particular positive or negative
629 experiences repeatedly, often to respond to very different issues. This suggests that discrete
630 experiences can have a major role in shaping patient perceptions of both the hospital and the overall
631 health system. This was also in agreement with research supporting the prominent impact of patient
632 perceptions of care [29, 30].

633 Our study contributes towards untangling the patient experience from satisfaction. 'Patient
634 satisfaction' has been the predominant term used to encompass the patient's perspective since the

635 1970s, originating from consumerist theories as an analogue to ‘customer satisfaction’. In a
636 healthcare context, however, satisfaction has been challenging to define. Our findings suggest that
637 while satisfaction is important, it is a downstream result of other factors such as being comfortable
638 with all or most aspects of care. Fundamentally, satisfaction is an emotion that refers to how
639 patients feel. It is therefore not entirely explainable through objective reasoning. Most theories that
640 attempted to explain satisfaction revolved around the relation with expectation [31]. Nevertheless,
641 it is important to note that expectancy theories were insufficient, and expectation has been found to
642 explain only a minor share of the variation in satisfaction reports [31]. Therefore, satisfaction should
643 not be used alone, as a solitary reductionist measure, while ignoring other patient perspectives.

644 Patient experience is a term often used interchangeably with patient satisfaction. However, despite
645 some overlap, the two terms are not the same. Patient experience may be defined as the sum of all
646 interactions that influence perceptions of patients. Our findings concurred with other research in
647 that this usually reflects the perception of the quality of care experienced by the patient [32]. Our
648 findings also revealed that the patient experience also had a wider influence, such on perceptions
649 regarding healthcare access or overall health system. What precisely is included in perception of
650 quality is less clear, but can be ascertained through the questions included in different measurement
651 tools.

652 **How this is useful for P4P in Lebanon and elsewhere**

653 There are numerous tools designed to quantify the patient’s perception of quality in hospitals, some
654 of which have been used in different pay-for-performance initiatives. A few are considered of high-
655 quality, such as the Ethiopian Patient Experiences with Inpatient Care (I-PAHC), Indian Patient
656 Perceptions of Quality (PPQ), and the US Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and
657 Systems (HCAHPS) [33]. Such tools are predominantly developed using expert opinion, rather than
658 being informed directly by patient perspectives. As such, to improve the validity of these tools, it is
659 important to use qualitative research conducted with patients themselves [26]. Quantitative and
660 qualitative investigations are complementary. Although qualitative investigations make comparisons
661 and generalizations difficult, their strength lies in being based on the patients’ own words [15]. Our
662 research contributes information that may be used in improving the validity of quantitative tools
663 used to evaluate patient perspectives.

664 In the Lebanese context, the tool currently used by the MoPH for its P4P patient-related component
665 was a locally adapted and abbreviated version of the US HCAHPS. By design, this focused
666 predominantly on perception of quality. Our research identified issues that are partly or entirely
667 uncaptured by this tool. Some of these related to perception of quality (e.g. information clarity), but

668 also to other patient perspectives (e.g. risk of theft). It may therefore be useful for the MoPH to
669 consider revision of this tool to enhance its validity. We also note that a preliminary analysis of this
670 data was used to modify some items of the MoPH tool for the 2018 patient survey (e.g. time spent
671 with personnel, discharge information). Our findings also suggest several practical actions that can
672 be undertaken to improve patient healthcare access and experience, such as those relating to co-
673 payment and over-charging.

674 More widely, our findings may also be useful towards developing a Lebanese patient-centered
675 health system. The high value patients attach to health is not necessarily reflected in national
676 governance and spending. Though patients shared numerous positive experiences, our findings
677 suggest there is much space for development of the health system, particularly towards supporting
678 public hospitals and increased accountability of health institutions and personnel. Healthcare cannot
679 always deliver on cure, but it should also address wider patient perspectives and not only health
680 status. This is perhaps best expressed in the oft-cited aphorism adopted by the physician Edward
681 Livingston Trudeau for the Saranac Lake sanatorium: “to cure sometimes, to relieve often, to
682 comfort always”.

683 **How this relates to value-based care and health systems**

684 We also sought to examine how patient perspectives relate to value-based care and person-
685 centered health systems. We had identified six distinct but related patient perspectives. While many
686 health systems include some measures of perception of quality, others are largely uncaptured,
687 namely the valuing of health, perception of access and perception of overall health system. Some
688 systems additionally measure health status, including functionality, often using patient reported
689 outcome measures. We note that these are absent at most Lebanese hospitals.

690 Given the absence of a framework to relate the six patient perspectives to health system
691 performance and value-based healthcare, we developed the framework shown in figure 2. This uses
692 the value pillars recently proposed by the WHO EU Health Observatory and the European
693 Commission, together with the Kruk and Freedman framework for health systems performance [7,
694 34, 35]. The content areas in figure 1 link to the patient perspectives in figure 2.

695 Besides demonstrating the non-interchangeability of patient satisfaction and experience, we also
696 suggest this framework to clarify the current and potential role that patients can have within health
697 systems. Engaging with patients need not be limited to measurement of quality (indirectly),
698 satisfaction and health status. It may also involve assessing healthcare access and the overall health

699 system, thus contributing towards decreasing inequity within populations. How patients value health
700 is important to capture, as it relates to both accountability and participation within a health system.

701 Value-based care has traditionally been focused on technical value (i.e. cost-effectiveness). More
702 recent initiatives have in addition proposed allocative, societal and personal values [7, 35]. These
703 generally concern the equitable resource distribution within a population (allocative value); the
704 contribution of healthcare towards solidarity, connectedness and social cohesion (societal value);
705 and patient-centeredness (personal value). Relating these values to different patient perspectives
706 allows value-based programs (including pay-for-performance) to more widely incentivize values
707 including allocative and societal values which are largely unaddressed.

708

709 **Figure 2: Relating patient perspectives to value-based care and health systems performance**

710

711 **Trustworthiness and methodological considerations**

712 The ‘trustworthiness’ of our research was based on careful consideration of data credibility,
713 dependability and transferability [36].

714 Credibility was improved by selecting a maximum variation of persons who had been recently
715 discharged followed hospitalization under MoPH coverage. This sample purposefully included men
716 and women, from different age groups and representing both rural and urban areas. Credibility was
717 further enhanced by the first author (and moderator) having had experience with the MoPH in
718 patient satisfaction and its P4P initiative. In addition, the moderator and research assistants (AH, EB)
719 held debriefing sessions following each FGD [14]. The MoPH was not involved in the analysis of the
720 data developed.

721 Dependability was improved by using a discussion guide, which ensured core questions were
722 addressed, while allowing discussions to differently explore further topics.

723 To facilitate transferability, we have described the context of the study, the selection of participants
724 and their general background, as well as the data collection and analytical process. We also made
725 wide use of quotations where deemed appropriate. It is thus up to the readers to assess the
726 relevance of the results in other settings.

727 Participants shared a wide range of opinions, many of which was critical, as well as very personal
728 stories. This suggests that they felt comfortable to speak freely. We note that the discussions were

729 held at the MoPH headquarters, and while some participants did share critical opinions also of the
730 ministry, we cannot rule out potential impact of the host location.

731

732 Conclusion

733 Patient perspectives include more than patient experience and satisfaction. In addition to traditional
734 measures, patients may also be engaged on their valuing of health, and perceptions on healthcare
735 access and quality of care.

736 The drive towards patient or people-centered health systems should incorporate a wider
737 consideration of patient perspectives. Pay-for-performance initiatives can also be more responsive
738 and better align patient and provider interests by a broader consideration of patient perspectives.
739 We also propose a framework for relating patient perspectives to value-based healthcare and health
740 system performance.

741 This study specifically highlights the importance of health to people in Lebanon, and the need to
742 prioritize health services to match with people's expectations. Patients want to be treated with
743 dignity and respect by hospitals throughout their healthcare journey. Addressing inequity should
744 include curbing the influence of 'wasta' and greater protection against financial exploitation by
745 providers. The standardization of coverage among healthcare payers (or their unification) would
746 circumvent patients being turned into "second-class citizens".

747 Hippocratic medicine was centered on accompanying the patient and meeting their individual goals.
748 Health systems aiming to return to this fundamental aspect should more widely engage patients for
749 their perspectives, and incorporate these within health system design.

750

751

752

753 Acknowledgements

754 We are very grateful to all the participants in the focus group discussions, without whom this
755 research would not have been possible. We are also grateful to following individuals at the Lebanese
756 MoPH: Rita Freiha, Hilda Harb and Jihad Makouk (feedback and insight); and Rabiaa Rachid and
757 Jenny Romanos (data extraction for sampling); and to Anne Mills (London School of Hygiene and
758 Tropical Medicine, project senior advisor).

759

760 References

- 761 1. Griffiths R, Bett M, Blyth J, Bailey B. NHS Management Inquiry. London: 1983.
- 762 2. Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in A. Crossing the Quality Chasm:
763 A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2001.
- 764 3. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine, Health, Medicine D, Board on Health Care S,
765 Board on Global H, et al. Crossing the Global Quality Chasm: Improving Health Care Worldwide.
766 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2018.
- 767 4. World Health Organization. Framework on integrated, people-centred health services:
768 report by the Secretariat. Geneva: World Health Assembly, 2016.
- 769 5. World Health Organization, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, The
770 World Bank. Delivering quality health services: a global imperative for universal health coverage.
771 Geneva: 2018.
- 772 6. Berwick DM, editor Speakers and moderators at the Policy Forum on the Future of Health:
773 statement by Donald M. Berwick.2017; Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and
774 Development.
- 775 7. Smith PC, Sagan A, Siciliani L, Panteli D, McKee M, Soucat A, et al. European Observatory
776 Policy Briefs. Building on value-based health care: Towards a health system perspective.
777 Copenhagen (Denmark): World Health Organization; 2020.
- 778 8. World Health Organization. The world health report: health systems financing: the path to
779 universal coverage. Geneva2010.
- 780 9. Gillam SJ, Siriwardena AN, Steel N. Pay-for-performance in the United Kingdom: impact of
781 the quality and outcomes framework: a systematic review. *Ann Fam Med*. 2012;10(5):461-8. Epub
782 2012/09/12. doi: 10.1370/afm.1377. PubMed PMID: 22966110; PubMed Central PMCID:
783 PMC3438214.
- 784 10. Joynt Maddox KE, Sen AP, Samson LW, Zuckerman RB, DeLew N, Epstein AM. Elements of
785 Program Design in Medicare's Value-based and Alternative Payment Models: a Narrative Review. *J*
786 *Gen Intern Med*. 2017;32(11):1249-54. Epub 2017/07/19. doi: 10.1007/s11606-017-4125-8. PubMed
787 PMID: 28717900; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5653552.
- 788 11. Cashin C, Chi Y-LS, P. C., Borowitz M, Thomson S. Paying for Performance in Health Care:
789 implications for health system performance and accountability. England: World Health Organization;
790 2014.
- 791 12. Ng JHY, Luk BHK. Patient satisfaction: Concept analysis in the healthcare context. *Patient*
792 *Educ Couns*. 2019;102(4):790-6. Epub 2018/11/28. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2018.11.013. PubMed PMID:
793 30477906.
- 794 13. Khalife J, Ammar W, Emmelin M, El-Jardali F, Ekman B. Hospital performance and payment:
795 impact of integrating pay-for-performance on healthcare effectiveness in Lebanon. *Wellcome Open*
796 *Research*. 2020;5(95). doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15810.2.

- 797 14. Dahlgren L, Hällgren Graneheim U, Sahlén KG, Emmelin M, Winkvist A. Qualitative
798 methodology for international public health. Umeå: Umeå universitet; 2019.
- 799 15. LaVela SG, AS. Evaluation and measurement of patient experience. Patient Experience
800 Journal. 2014;1(1):28-36.
- 801 16. Hennick M. International Focus Group Research: A Handbook for the Health and Social
802 Sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2007.
- 803 17. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for Reporting Qualitative
804 Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. Academic Medicine. 2014;89(9):1245-51. doi:
805 10.1097/acm.0000000000000388. PubMed PMID: 00001888-201409000-00021.
- 806 18. Quintiliani LM, Campbell MK, Haines PS, Webber KH. The Use of the Pile Sort Method in
807 Identifying Groups of Healthful Lifestyle Behaviors among Female Community College Students.
808 Journal of the American Dietetic Association. 2008;108(9):1503-7. doi:
809 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2008.06.428>.
- 810 19. Fitzpatrick R. Surveys of patients satisfaction: I--Important general considerations. Bmj.
811 1991;302(6781):887-9. Epub 1991/04/13. doi: 10.1136/bmj.302.6781.887. PubMed PMID: 1821624;
812 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1669267.
- 813 20. Giordano LA, Elliott MN, Goldstein E, Lehrman WG, Spencer PA. Development,
814 implementation, and public reporting of the HCAHPS survey. Med Care Res Rev. 2010;67(1):27-37.
815 Epub 2009/07/30. doi: 10.1177/1077558709341065. PubMed PMID: 19638641.
- 816 21. Batbaatar E, Dorjdagva J, Luvsannyam A, Savino MM, Amenta P. Determinants of patient
817 satisfaction: a systematic review. Perspectives in Public Health. 2016;137(2):89-101. doi:
818 10.1177/1757913916634136.
- 819 22. Deledda G, Moretti F, Rimondini M, Zimmermann C. How patients want their doctor to
820 communicate. A literature review on primary care patients' perspective. Patient Education and
821 Counseling. 2013;90(3):297-306. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2012.05.005>.
- 822 23. Luthy C, Cedraschi C, Perrin E, Allaz AF. How do patients define "good" and "bad" doctors?
823 Swiss Med Wkly. 2005;135(5-6):82-6. Epub 2005/02/25. PubMed PMID: 15729612.
- 824 24. Borracci RA, Álvarez Gallesio JM, Ciambrone G, Matayoshi C, Rossi F, Cabrera S. What
825 patients consider to be a good doctor, and what doctors consider to be a good patient. Revista
826 médica de Chile. 2020;148:930-8.
- 827 25. Quirk M, Mazor K, Haley H-L, Philbin M, Fischer M, Sullivan K, et al. How patients perceive a
828 doctor's caring attitude. Patient Education and Counseling. 2008;72(3):359-66. doi:
829 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2008.05.022>.
- 830 26. Wensing M, Jung HP, Mainz J, Olesen F, Grol R. A systematic review of the literature on
831 patient priorities for general practice care. Part 1: Description of the research domain. Soc Sci Med.
832 1998;47(10):1573-88. Epub 1998/11/21. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(98)00222-6. PubMed PMID:
833 9823053.
- 834 27. HealthWatch-England. What do people want from the NHS and social care in the future.
835 2018.
- 836 28. Saman DM, Kavanagh KT, Johnson B, Lutfiyya MN. Can Inpatient Hospital Experiences
837 Predict Central Line-Associated Bloodstream Infections? PLOS ONE. 2013;8(4):e61097. doi:
838 10.1371/journal.pone.0061097.
- 839 29. Rapport F, Hibbert P, Baysari M, Long JC, Seah R, Zheng WY, et al. What do patients really
840 want? An in-depth examination of patient experience in four Australian hospitals. BMC Health Serv
841 Res. 2019;19(1):38. Epub 2019/01/17. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-3881-z. PubMed PMID: 30646962;
842 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6332615.
- 843 30. Schoenfelder T, Klewer J, Kugler J. Determinants of patient satisfaction: a study among 39
844 hospitals in an in-patient setting in Germany. Int J Qual Health Care. 2011;23(5):503-9. Epub
845 2011/07/01. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzr038. PubMed PMID: 21715557.

- 846 31. Batbaatar E, Dorjdagva J, Luvsannyam A, Amenta P. Conceptualisation of patient
847 satisfaction: a systematic narrative literature review. *Perspectives in Public Health*. 2015;135(5):243-
848 50. Epub 2015/07/19. doi: 10.1177/1757913915594196. PubMed PMID: 26187638.
- 849 32. Berkowitz B. The Patient Experience and Patient Satisfaction: Measurement of a Complex
850 Dynamic. *Online J Issues Nurs*. 2016;21(1):1. Epub 2016/11/18. doi: 10.3912/OJIN.Vol21No01Man01.
851 PubMed PMID: 27852212.
- 852 33. Beattie M, Murphy DJ, Atherton I, Lauder W. Instruments to measure patient experience of
853 healthcare quality in hospitals: a systematic review. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4:97. Epub 2015/07/24. doi:
854 10.1186/s13643-015-0089-0. PubMed PMID: 26202326; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4511995.
- 855 34. Kruk M, Freedman L. Assessing Health System Performance in Developing Countries: A
856 Review of the Literature 2008. 263-76 p.
- 857 35. European Commission. Defining Value in 'Value-Based Healthcare'. Report of the Expert
858 Panel on effective ways of investing in Health. 2019.
- 859 36. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts,
860 procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2004;24(2):105-12. Epub
861 2004/02/11. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001. PubMed PMID: 14769454.

862

863 **Supplementary figures**

864 **Supplementary figure 1: Demarcating where patient experience occurs in relation to the six**
865 **patient perspectives.**

866

867 **Appendix**

868 The key questions included in the discussion guide are listed below.

869 Q1. What does health mean to you?

870 Q2. Please describe the health care offered in this area? Probe on hospitals and primary care

871 Q3. What characterizes the services that you have experienced so far? Probe on hospitals
872 and primary care

873 Q4. How would you describe a ‘good hospital stay’? Probe on the role of different
874 components (treatment, personal interaction, hygiene etc.)


875 Q5. How would you describe a ‘bad stay in hospital’? Probe the role of different components
876 (treatment, personal interaction, hygiene etc.)

877 Q6. What information about a hospital stay do people need when they are admitted?

878 Q7. What would make a person visit the same hospital again?

879

Patient perspectives



Content areas

How is health valued?

How is the health system perceived?

How is healthcare access perceived?

How is quality perceived?

What does it take to improve health status?

Categories

- More important than money or wealth
- Means of survival
- Not only physical

- Feeling neglected by the State
- Seeing public hospitals neglected
- Finding 'outsiders' being favored

- Needing a 'wasta'
- Affording to pay
- Risking theft
- Surprised when all goes well

- Expecting empathy and compassion
- As a profession of conscience
- Expecting responsiveness
- Needing clarity in information
- Seeing uncleanliness as an assault

- Prioritizing getting the right treatment
- Ignoring some of your rights

Themes

Health is everything


Being turned into
2nd class citizens

Money & 'wasta'
make all the difference

Wanting to be treated with
respect & dignity

Tolerating letdown,
for the sake of right treatment

Figure 1



¹ Smith PC. et al (2020). Building on value-based health care: Towards a health system perspective. European Observatory Policy Briefs. World Health Organization.

² European Commission (2019). Defining Value in 'Value-Based Healthcare'. Report of the Expert Panel on effective ways of investing in Health.

³ Kruk M., Freedman L. (2008). Assessing Health System Performance in Developing Countries: A Review of the Literature; p. 263-276.

Figure 2