

What do Iranians value most when choosing a hospital? Evidence from a discrete choice experiment

Mohammad Ranjbar¹, Mohammad Bazyar², Fatemeh Pahlevanshamsi^{3*}, Blake Angell⁴, and Yibeltal Assefa⁵

Abstract

Background: Individual preferences have preceded the use of health care services, and it has been affected by different hospital attributes. This study aimed to elicit the Iranians' preferences in choosing hospitals using a discrete choice experiment.

Methods: A discrete choice experiment (DCE) was conducted through face to face interviews with 301 respondents. The DCE was constructed by six attributes were included based on a literature review, qualitative interviews, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and stakeholder consultation: waiting time, quality of care, travel time, hospital type, provider competency, and hospital facilities. individuals' preferences for hospital attributes were analyzed using a mixed logit model, and interaction terms were used to assess preference heterogeneity among individuals with different sociodemographic characteristics.

Results: Participants had strong and significant preferences for care delivered in hospitals with 'full' ($\beta=0.6052$, $p<0.001$) or 'moderate' ($\beta=0.5882$, $p<0.001$) hospital equipment and with 'excellent' provider competency ($\beta=0.2637$, $p<0.001$). The estimated coefficients for the "waiting time of 120 minutes" ($\beta=-0.1625$, $p<0.001$) and the "travel time of 30 minutes" ($\beta=-0.1157$, $p<0.001$) were negative and significant. The results also show that the personal characteristics such as age, education level, and income significantly affected individual preferences in choosing a hospital.

¹ Department of health management and economics, Health policy & management research center, school of public health, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical sciences, Yazd, Iran

² Department of Health Management and Economics, Faculty of Health, Ilam University of Medical Sciences, Ilam, Iran

³ Department of health management and economics, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical sciences, Yazd, Iran

⁴ Centre for Health Systems Science, the George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales Sydney, Australia

⁵ School of Public Health, the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

*Corresponding author:

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
E-mail: f.pahlevan76@gmail.com (FP)

Conclusion: Considering people's preferences can be important given the more active role of today's patients in decision-making about their treatment processes. The results of this study should be taken into consideration by health policymakers and all stakeholders to be aware of differences in preferences of people and maximize their satisfaction. In this case, it is important to continuously involve people and consider their preferences in the design, topology, construction, and equipment of hospitals.

Keywords: Hospital, Preferences, Discrete choice experiment

Introduction

Hospitals are the most expensive components of healthcare systems (1), and account for more than two-thirds of public health resources in developing countries (2). Public expectations of hospitals have greatly increased over recent years due to technological developments, rapid growth of medical costs, increases in non-communicable diseases leading to higher engagement with health care facilities, as well as an increase in the level of public knowledge, and the improvement of the economic and social status and other living conditions (2, 3). Therefore, patients are now more sensitive in choosing healthcare services and centers than ever. Moreover, due to the increase in competition between hospitals, the needs and wants of patients have received more attention in recent years. (3, 4, 5)

The right to choose hospitals has become an important element of healthcare systems in many countries, especially Western European countries, and has been often supported by laws (7, 8). Furthermore, the patient's access to hospitals' information on the Internet and virtual space doubles the importance of patients' choices (9). In such a context, the patient is considered an independent consumer and is expected to actively contribute to the choice of the hospital (10). Understanding patient preferences can help hospitals value the most important areas for further investment to improve patient orientation, efficiency, responsiveness, and service quality (7).

Nevertheless, family physicians often greatly contribute to the process of seeking treatment and choosing a hospital to treat patients in countries that traditionally operate based on the referral system and the family physician program (11). It is expected that patients' preferences are also taken into consideration in this process; however, its occurrence is unclear in practice (12). In countries such as Iran, where the referral system and the family physician program are not fully implemented, patients and their family members often make decisions about seeking treatment and choosing a hospital (3, 8, 9, 13, 14). The way such choices are made and the factors driving them have attracted many researchers. Previous studies indicated that the choice of hospitals is affected by several factors, such as personal preferences and interests (13, 15), service cost (3, 16-22), type and severity of the disease (13, 14, 18, 23-26), waiting time to receive services (22, 27), location and distance between the place of residence and the hospital (3, 9, 13, 16-20, 22, 28-31), availability of advanced medical equipment and technology (3, 13, 22-25, 29, 32), having health insurance (16, 23-25), interpersonal skills, and employees' behavior (3, 16, 28, 33-35), physician's expertise (16, 27, 29), hospital reputation (3, 16, 17, 22, 28, 34), service quality (3, 18, 20, 34-36), diversity and method of service provision (3, 16,

21), and patient's economic capacity (13, 18, 23-26, 37). Several studies indicate that most people tend to choose qualified physicians and hospitals with a high reputation, regardless of the type and severity of their diseases in a context where citizens have full freedom (13).

According to previous studies, a variety of factors affect the hospitals' choice (38). The effects of these factors are not necessarily homogeneous and vary depending on the structure, context, personal, economic, and social factors (39, 40). Despite increasing the current knowledge, there are a number of gaps in the existing literature. Notably, most studies have investigated the importance of single factors such that the relative weight and importance of each determinant to patients and the trade-offs they would accept between them is unknown. Therefore, such studies could not simulate the choice trends that were created by changing the specific attributes of service providers. Additionally, most previous studies focused on the services of a particular center and thus may not be generalizable to a broader population. (15). Therefore, this study aimed to elicit the Iranians' preferences in choosing hospitals using a discrete choice experiment (DCE). DCEs ask respondents to indicate their preferred option in a series of hypothetical scenarios that differ based on several key attributes. It is an effective method for eliciting the stated preferences of participants (41-43) and have been widely used in health research, especially in health policy and health economics studies (43-46). DCEs are used to reflect the real-world decision context than other methods in situations where conducting a trial or observational study is impossible or impractical (21, 42, 43). DCEs have been used to identify and evaluate the determinants of hospital choices for patients in a number of settings (9).

Material and Methods

DCE was used to elicit public preferences for hospital selection in Yazd, Iran. DCE is a stated-preference quantitative technique, originating as a mathematical psychology method, which is designed to eliciting individuals' preferences for alternative multi-attribute commodities and services (48 ,47 ,42 ,15).In this technique, respondents are presented with hypothetical choices between two or more alternatives that are described by a common set of attributes. Respondents are asked to complete a series of such choices that comprise different levels of these attributes. It is assumed that respondents select the alternative with the highest utility by considering all information provide (51-49 ,30 ,15) . Our DCE was undertaken in 3 sequential steps: (1) study design development, (2) data collection, and (3) data analysis.

1. study design development

1.1. Selection of attributes and levels

Identifying and developing attributes and levels are vital for the validity of DCE (21, 48, 52-54). Only a limited number of attributes and levels can be included in the DCE due to the complexity and to ensure the accuracy, precision, and validity of the results. Therefore, there is a need to establish a balance between the comprehensiveness of attributes and the management of respondents (55).

We followed recommended guidelines for the development of attributes through a multi-stage process involving a literature review, qualitative interviews with our target population, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and stakeholder consultation (13, 15, 22, 30, 35, 36, 41-43, 48, 53, 54, 56-59, 60-62). We created an initial list of attributes and their levels using a literature review including articles, documents, and government reports. These findings were used to inform face-to-face interviews with health professionals, hospital managers, health experts, and patients. A total of twenty face-to-face interviews were conducted where interviewees provided detailed feedback on the potential attributes and levels. They also ranked the attributes based on their importance. Then, we chose 6 of the most important attributes, which affected the choice of hospitals for treatment, by holding a FGD through the consensus development approach by selected team of interviewers and research team members. In the FGD, we decided on the levels related to each attribute based on the information from the interviews and literature review by considering the context and features aligned with Iran's health system. Table 1 shows the attributes and levels in the final design.

Table 1. Description of attributes and levels

Attributes	Levels	Definition
Waiting time	60 min 90 min 120 min	Waiting time was based on the time between arrivals at the hospital and getting the service
Quality of care	moderate good	quality of care was described based on individual's relative understanding, knowledge, or experience of service quality
Travel time	10 min 20 min 30 min	Travel time was described by the time taken to go to hospital from home (on private vehicles)
Hospital type	public private Social security	Hospital type was based on Hospital ownership type

Provider competency	moderate good excellent	Provider competency was based on technical skills, knowledge, ability, physician–patient communication, team care, empathy, trust, and respectful care of health care providers
Hospital facilities	poor moderate full	hospital facilities were described by the availability of all major and up to date examination or intervention equipment or drugs and Other required supplies

1.2. Experimental design

Experimental design is vital for DCE studies (63). A full factorial design creates preferences for all combinations of attributes and levels. This often leads to numerous choice tasks that make the study impractical (64). Creating fractional factorial design, the experimental design systematically creates choice tasks that provide the best possible model estimation and estimation of main effects and possible interactions. (64, 65)

In our study, 5 attributes with 3 levels, and 1 attribute with 2 levels created 486 choices ($2^1 * 3^5 = 486$) that were impossible for a survey. We used SAS software version 9.4 to create an efficient design that maximizes the D-efficiency (48, 59-62, 66). This created a subset of the full design, containing twenty-four choice sets. In the final design, choice sets divided into 3 blocks with 8 choice sets in the Persian questionnaire (the official language of people in Iran). To familiarize respondents with the DCE and test their understanding, one dominant choice set was included in each block.

Figure 1 shows an example of a choice set (translated to English). Another part of the questionnaire collected personal characteristics, including age, gender, marital status, income level, education level, and insurance status that were associated with the choice of hospital.

To confirm the final version of the questionnaire, we conducted a pilot study with 30 respondents to make sure that the respondents did not have any problems answering the questions or that the questionnaires were not vague and difficult for them. Based on this pilot study, there was no sign of respondent fatigue and task complexity, and the number of choices could be managed. As such, no changes were made to the attributes or levels of the DCE.

2. Data collection

As the rule of thumb proposed by Johnson and Orme (67, 68) and considering the time and other conditions, we targeted a sample of 300 respondents aged 18 and older. Previous studies indicated that the number of participants was large enough for reliable statistical analysis (21).

The questionnaires were given to the participants in paper forms and through door-to-door visits. After giving the necessary explanations, they were asked to carefully study each choice set and choose one of the choice tasks that they preferred the most. The process of completing each questionnaire lasted for 20 to 30 minutes. Written informed consent forms were not obtained from the participants, but they were informed that participation in the research was voluntary and completing a valid questionnaire indicated their consent. A total of 301 valid questionnaires were collected from December 10, 2022, to March 23, 2023.

3. Data analysis

The random utility model provides a theoretical basis for analyzing DCE data (6). Within this framework, it is assumed that individual i should choose among j alternatives and select the alternative that has the highest utility.

The utility individual i derives from choosing alternative j in choice set n is specified as below:

$$U_{ijn} = V_{ijn} + \varepsilon_{ijn} = X_{ijn}\beta + \varepsilon_{ijn} \quad (1)$$

where X_{ij} is a vector of observed attributes of alternative j , β is a vector of individual specific coefficients reflecting the desirability of the attributes and ε_{ij} is a random error term (6).

Different models can be developed for DCE analysis based on Equation 1.

We used the mixed logit model (MLM) in STATA₁₇ software to analyze data and ensure that potential heterogeneity in choices was taken into consideration. MLM assumes that the distribution ε_{ij} for random coefficients is usually characterized by normal distributions. Therefore, both the preferences and the heterogeneity can be estimated in the model (6). In the present study, we first estimated the main effects in the model and then tested the interaction between the attributes and respondents' characteristics to evaluate potential differences in preferences between different groups such as age, income, and education levels.

Results

Respondents' characteristics

Table 2 reports the descriptive characteristics of the sample. A total of 275 (91.4%) out of 301 participants were female, and the largest group of respondents were in the age group of 30-40 years (38.2%). About two-thirds of the respondents had academic degrees. More than half of the respondents had a household of less than 3 family members, and more than 61% of the respondents were covered by social security insurance. About two-thirds of the respondents did not have any type of supplementary insurance, and most of them (97.2%) had income levels of less than 4200 US dollars per year.

Table 2: Respondents' characteristics (n = 301).

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	275	91.4
	Female	26	8.6
Age	<30	49	16.3
	30-40	115	38.2
	40-50	85	28.2
	50-60	34	11.3
	>60	15	5.0
Marriage	Married	229	76.1
	Single	37	12.3
	Other	35	11.6
Educational status	Primary school or below	7	2.3
	Middle school	35	11.6
	High school	62	20.6
	University (academic)	197	65.5
Family size	<3	153	50.8
	3-5	127	42.2
	>5	21	7.0
Insurance type	Social security	184	61.1
	Health insurance	28	9.3
	Other	89	29.6
Supplementary health insurance	Yes	113	37.5
	No	188	62.5
Annual income (US Dollars*)	< 4200\$	294	97.2

> 4200\$ 7 2.8

*1 US Dollar = 420000 IR Rials

DCE results

Table 3 shows the results of the mixed logit model (MLM) analysis.

The results demonstrated that there were several significant predictors of participant choices in the experiment. Participants had strong and significant preferences for care delivered in hospitals with ‘full’ ($\beta=0.6052$, $p<0.001$) or ‘moderate’ ($\beta=0.5882$, $p<0.001$) hospital equipment and with ‘excellent’ provider competency ($\beta=0.2637$, $p<0.001$). The estimated coefficients for the "waiting time of 120 minutes" ($\beta=-0.1625$, $p<0.001$) and the "travel time of 30 minutes" ($\beta=-0.1157$, $p<0.001$) were negative and significant. Other coefficients were not statistically significant suggesting they were not driving participant choices. The estimated SD was significant for some attributes, indicating significant heterogeneity in participants' preferences for specific attribute levels. In other words, people have different preferences based on personal differences for attributes of hospital choice.

Table 3: Results of mixed logit models (main effects)

Attributes/levels	Mean		SD	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Waiting time				
90 min	-0.1506	0.1055	-0.0161	0.1869
120 min	-0.1625*	0.0785	0.6798*	0.1211
Quality of care				
Good	0.0929	0.0885	0.0346	0.1350
Travel time				
20 min	0.0326	0.1016	-0.0401	0.1719
30 min	-0.1157*	0.0745	0.6535*	0.1672
Hospital type				
Private	0.1018	0.0785	0.1326	0.1301
Social security	-0.0502	0.0887	0.1294	0.2215
Provider competency				
Good	0.0547	0.0993	-0.0427	0.1763
Excellent	0.2637*	0.1433	0.0432	0.2014
Hospital facilities				
Moderate	0.5882*	0.1761	0.0288	0.1941
Full	0.6052*	0.1265	-0.4792*	0.1210

Number of respondents = 301
Number of observations = 4,814
Log likelihood = -1636.1428
LR chi2(11) = 31.99

* Denote significance at the 0.05 level

Heterogeneity analysis

Results of the model including interaction terms are presented in Table 4. We found that we could explain some systematic differences with personal characteristics. Based on Table 4, three personal characteristics significantly affected individual preferences in choosing a hospital: Age, education level, and income. It was found that the interaction of age with waiting time was positive and significant ($\beta=2.3106$, $p<0.001$). Higher values of age referred to higher levels of waiting time in the present study, indicating that older people paid more attention to longer waiting times for receiving care. The results also reported a negative interaction between high income and waiting time ($\beta=-0.1562$, $p<0.001$), indicating that respondents with higher income were more sensitive to the waiting time to receive services. The results of Table 4 show negative and significant interactions of age ($\beta=-0.0129$, $p<0.001$) and income level ($\beta=-0.0187$, $p<0.001$) with travel time, indicating that older people and people with lower income paid more attention to travel time. Positive and significant interactions of income status ($\beta=0.2264$, $p<0.001$) and education level ($\beta=0.1190$, $p<0.001$) with full medical facilities indicated that higher education and income levels increased the individuals' sensitivity to choosing more equipped hospitals.

Table 4: Results of the preference heterogeneity analysis

Attributes/levels	Mean		SD	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Waiting time				
90 min	-0.2376	0.2256	-0.6210*	0.1967
120 min	-0.4402*	0.4067	-0.0224	0.1323
Quality of care				
Good	0.1361	0.0912	0.6823*	0.1371
Travel time				
20 min	0.0879	0.2151	-0.0534	0.1709
30 min	-0.4190*	0.3867	-0.0501	0.1558
Hospital type				
Private	0.0645	0.0782	0.4438*	0.1476
Social security	-0.0209	0.0897	-0.1251	0.2598

Provider competency				
Good	0.0887	0.1019	0.0775	0.1806
Excellent	0.2770*	0.1455	0.0052	0.1857
Hospital facilities				
Moderate	0.5665*	0.1768	0.0613	0.2013
Full	0.6067*	0.1273	-0.3894*	0.1452
waiting time × age	2.3106*	0.1032		
travel time × age	-0.0129*	0.0131		
waiting time × income	-0.1562*	0.0340		
travel time × income	0.0187*	0.0455		
full facilities × income	0.2264*	0.1013		
full facilities × education	0.1190*	0.0652		
Number of respondents = 301				
Number of observations = 4,814				
Log likelihood = -1538.2386				
LR chi2(11) = 25.41				

* Denote significance at the 0.05 level

Discussion

The present study evaluated patient preferences over different attributes of hospital care. To our knowledge, it was the first DCE that systematically elicited individual preferences over Iranian healthcare centers. We found that the choice of hospital was significantly affected by hospital facilities, provider competency, waiting time, and travel time. As expected, and based on the positive association of "provider's competency" and "hospital facilities" with participant choice, we found that hospitals with better diagnostic and treatment equipment and the higher competency of healthcare providers were preferred by participants while hospitals with longer waiting or travel time to receive services were less likely to be chosen by people. Other attributes, specifically the quality of medical care and the private ownership of the hospital did not significantly impact participant choices. The dominant role of hospital facilities in respondent choices was also important. These results reflected the important role of advanced technology and facilities in the selection of hospitals (14). The availability of medicine, facilities, and technology is vital for providing high-quality care and people expect high-quality services with advanced hospital facilities (22). Our work shows that these factors are highly valued by people. This result was consistent with previous studies (4, 14-16, 18, 21, 22, 26, 48, 53, 69, 70). Of course, at the same time, we should also pay attention to the fact that some studies have shown that the competition of hospitals to use advanced facilities does not necessarily lead to an improvement in the quality of services or health outcomes (15, 71- 73).

Our study also pointed out the important role of provider competence and indicated that it played an important role in an individual's choice preferences after hospital facilities. Previous studies also reported the significant role of "provider's competency and skill" in choosing a hospital, and their result were consistent with the present study (14-16, 22, 29). The provider's competency depends on the knowledge, expertise, and skill of human resources of any organization. Since human resources are considered the most important resources of healthcare organizations, their competency acts as a competitive advantage (74). In a context, where citizens have full freedom, most people tend to choose the most competent physicians and providers, regardless of the type and severity of their diseases (13). This is higher, especially when people have more severe diseases (15) probably due to the direct relationship between the provider's competency and the service quality. People usually expect more competent providers to provide higher-quality services (20, 33).

Our results also indicated the importance of convenience for people with travel time and waiting time significant predictors of choice. Although our study did not address this issue, the evidence indicates that waiting time and even travel time are affected by the disease severity, service quality, access to hospital, and service cost (6, 8, 14, 15). Previous studies also indicated that when diseases were more severe, the shorter travel and waiting time to receive services were considered important (19) because patients preferred to access treatment in the shortest possible time (15). When the cost of services was not an important challenge for patients, patients sought to choose hospitals that provided their treatment faster even at a higher cost, and thus, the shorter travel and waiting time was considered an advantage (6, 13, 14). Patients are willing to wait in queue for more time or even travel a longer route to access better quality services when it is difficult to access the hospital or when the quality of service is important for them (18, 26, 33).

The estimates of the mixed logit model (MLM) indicated the heterogeneity of preferences among people with different demographic characteristics. Regarding the waiting time, we found that younger people and those with higher income levels were more sensitive to the waiting time and preferred hospitals that provided services in the shortest possible time. However, this sensitivity decreased at older age and even lower annual income. Elderly people and those with lower income levels were less worried about this issue. Regarding travel time, we found that elderly people and those with lower income levels were more worried about prolonged travel time, indicating their concern about travel costs, as well as their worse

physical status, and unwillingness to travel long distances. The results of our research were consistent with previous studies (6, 19, 75-77).

Regarding the interaction of demographic characteristics and hospital facilities, we found a direct relationship between the preference for more equipped hospitals with the income and education levels of individuals in a way that the higher the individuals' education and income levels, the greater the individuals' desire to choose more equipped hospitals. To our knowledge, the increase in education level increases the individuals' expectation and this can increase the level of expectation from hospitals to provide higher-quality services using advanced facilities. On the other hand, the more the households' income levels are improved, the more their capacity to pay for more advanced treatments increases. The results of our study were consistent with previous studies (6, 76).

The different models of preferences for different groups of participants in different conditions indicate that the government and other health policymakers should focus their efforts on key groups. Since the population of Iran is aging at a high rate, future policies of the health system in the field of access to healthcare centers should specifically consider the preferences of elderly people.

It is worth mentioning that imposing international sanctions and economic pressures against Iran, which has decreased international relations, and thus Iran's lack of access to medicine and advanced medical equipment may cause the lack of development of hospitals and lower satisfaction with hospitals. Furthermore, Iran is now experiencing an unexpected increase in the immigration of physicians, nurses, and other elites, and it has a negative effect on the provider's competence and cause many problems for hospitals in the future if the right policies are not adopted.

Our study provides a valuable guide for the government and health policymakers to identify the key components of hospital care valued by patients in Iran. It also helps to guide appropriate decisions for better access of people to hospital services. It highlights the need to focus on vulnerable groups such as the elderly and low-income people, according to the existing conditions and challenges.

Study limitations

As with other DCEs, our study is potentially limited by its reliance on stated rather than revealed preference data. Previous studies, which compared the results of stated preferences

with actual choices, indicated that the assumed bias could be significant (78). However, numerous studies indicated a consistency between the results of DCE and real-world decisions (42) and we followed recommended guidelines to ensure the relevance of our DCE to the real-world decision being modelled. Another type of bias is that the results of DCEs are conditioned on a limited set of included attributes. The introduction of other prominent attributes can affect the research findings. The results should be interpreted according to this issue (42).

Conclusion

Individual choices of which hospital to receive care is more than an academic question in Iran. Individuals' choices were affected by a complex interaction between a variety of personal and hospital characteristics. Our results highlighted the relative importance of hospital facilities, provider competence, waiting time, and travel time. We also found evidence for the preference heterogeneity associated with the individuals' socioeconomic background in Iran. In particular, people's age, education level, and income caused significant differences in people's choices. Considering people's preferences can be important given the more active role of today's people in decision-making about their treatment processes. The results of this study should be taken into consideration by health policymakers and all stakeholders to be aware of differences in preferences of people and maximize their satisfaction. In this case, it is important to continuously involve people and consider their preferences in the design, topology, construction, and equipment of hospitals.

Declarations:

Ethics approval and consent to participate.

This research was approved by the ethics committee of Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences in Yazd based on the approval of IR.SSU.SPH.REC.1401.102. All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations. All participants voluntarily accepted our interview and were informed about all aspects of the study.

Availability of data and materials

The data sets generated during the study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

We are grateful to Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences for supporting the study.

Authors' contributions

M.R., M.B., and F.P. contributed to the conception and design of the study; F.P. and M.R. collected the data; M.R., B.A., and M.B. analyzed and interpreted the data; M.R. wrote the first draft of the manuscript; B.A., M.B., Y.A., F.P. reviewed and wrote sections of the manuscript; and B.A., Y.A., M.R., M.B., and F.P. critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the submitted version.

Acknowledgements

This paper has been extracted from the MSc research thesis of Shahid Sadoughi University of medical sciences. The authors would like to thank all respondents who have completed the questionnaire and who helped us in gathering data and giving information to enrich the content of the study.

References

- .1 Shamsaii M, Shamsaii M, Mohammdnezhad S, Bahlgard R, Esfahani P. Comparison of some hospital indicators before and after the implementation of the transformation plan in training hospitals affiliated to Zabol University of Medical Sciences. Qom University of Medical Sciences Journal. 2021;15(2):92-9.
- .2 Ranjbar M, Bahrami M, Baghian N, Izadi R, Eftekhari A, YousefZadeh S. The Reasons of Teaching Hospitals Selection by patients in Yazd Province for Treatment in 2016 Journal of Healthcare Management. 20.90-81:(1)8;17
- .3 Bahadori M, Teymourzadeh E, Ravangard R, Nasiri A, Raadabadi M, Alimohammadzadeh K. Factors contributing towards patient's choice of a hospital clinic from the patients' and managers' perspective. Electronic Physician. 2016;8(5):2378-87.
- .4 Berhane A, Enquselassie F. Patients' preferences for attributes related to health care services at hospitals in Amhara Region, northern Ethiopia: a discrete choice experiment. Health Sciences. 2015;8:22-40.
- .5 Merle V, Germain JM, Tivolacci MP, Brocard C, Chefson C, Cyvoct C, et al. Influence of infection control report cards on patients' choice of hospital: pilot survey. J Hosp Infect. 2009;71(3):263-8.

- .6 Jingrong Zhu JL, Zengbo Zhang, Hao Li, Lingfei Cai. Exploring determinants of health provider choice and heterogeneity in preference among outpatients in Beijing: a labelled discrete choice experiment. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:1-11.
- .7 Victoor A, Noordman J, Sonderkamp JA, Delnoij DMJ, Friele RD, van Dulmen S, et al. Are patients' preferences regarding the place of treatment heard and addressed at the point of referral: an exploratory study based on observations of GP-patient consultations. *BMC Family Practice*. 2013;14(1):189.
- .8 Victoor A, Delnoij DM, Friele RD, Rademakers JJ. Determinants of patient choice of healthcare providers: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2012;12:272.
- .9 HSCCPC, Kyprianou A. Patient choice modelling: how do patients choose their hospitals? *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2018;21:259-68.
- .10 Victoor A, Friele RD, Delnoij DM, Rademakers JJ. Free choice of healthcare providers in the Netherlands is both a goal in itself and a precondition: modelling the policy assumptions underlying the promotion of patient choice through documentary analysis and interviews. *BMC health services research*. 2012;12(1):1-11.
- .11 Dixon A, Robertson R, Bal R. The experience of implementing choice at point of referral: a comparison of the Netherlands and England. *Health Economics, Policy and Law*. 2010;5(3):295-317.
- .12 Winblad U. Do physicians care about patient choice? *Social science & medicine*. 2008;67(10):1502-11.
- .13 Yu W, Meina Li, Feng Ye CX, Zhang L. Patient preference and choice of healthcare providers in Shanghai ,China: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:1-16.
- .14 Liu Y, QK, SW ,LZ, Klundert Jvd. The impact of hospital attributes on patient choice for first visit: evidence from a discrete choice experiment in Shanghai, China. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2019;35:267-78.
- .15 Yun Liu, QK, EW, Bekker-Grob d. Public preferences for health care facilities in rural China: A discrete choice experiment. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2019;237:1-11.
- .16 Mosadeghrad AM. Patient choice of a hospital: implications for health policy and management. *Int J Health Care Qual Assur*. 2014;27(2):152.64-
- .17 Armstrong G, editor *Factors Affecting Patients' Preferences in Choosing a Hospital Based on the Mix Marketing Components in Isfahan*2018.
- .18 Habtom GK, Ruys P. The choice of a health care provider in Eritrea. *Health Policy*. 2007;80(1):202-17.
- .19 Borah BJ. A mixed logit model of health care provider choice: analysis of NSS data for rural India. *Health Econ*. 2006;15(9):915-32.
- .20 Tembon AC. Health care provider choice: the North West Province of Cameroon. *Int J Health Plann Manage*. 1996;11(1):53-6.7
- .21 Jia E, Gu Y, Peng Y, Li X, Shen X, Xiong MJJ. Preferences of Patients with Non-Communicable Diseases for Primary Healthcare Facilities: A Discrete Choice Experiment in Wuhan, China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17.(11)
- .22 Lendado TA, Bitew S, Elias F, Samuel S, Assele DD, Asefa M. Effect of hospital attributes on patient preference among outpatient attendants in Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia: discrete choice experiment study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2022;22(1):661.
- .23 Jayapalan S. Determinants of delay in the health care seeking behaviour of STD patients. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health*. 2015;3:S69-S74.
- .24 Hvidberg L, Wulff CN, Pedersen AF, Vedsted P. Barriers to healthcare seeking, beliefs about cancer and the role of socio-economic position. A Danish population-based study. *Prev Med*. 2015;71:107-13.

- .25 O'Mahony M, Hegarty J, McCarthy G. Women's help seeking behaviour for self discovered breast cancer symptoms. *Eur J Oncol Nurs*. 2011;15(5):410-8.
- .26 Liu Y, QK, Shasha Yuan, JvdK. Factors influencing choice of health system access level in China: A systematic review. *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13:1-21.
- .27 Hole AR. Modelling heterogeneity in patients' preferences for the attributes of a general practitioner appointment. *Health Economics*. 2008:1078-94.
- .28 Raadabadi M, Pourshariati F, Askarzadeh E, Mousavi SM, editors. *Factors Affecting Patients' Preferences Based on the Mixing Factors of Marketing Services in Hospital Selection* 2019.
- .29 Dündar C. Health-seeking behavior and medical facility choice in Samsun, Turkey. *Health Policy*. 2017;121(9):1015-9.
- .30 Salampessy BH, Ikkersheim D, Portrait FRM, Koolman X. Do patients' preferences prevail in hospital selection?: a comparison between discrete choice experiments and revealed hospital choice. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):1136.
- .31 Propper C, Damiani M, Leckie G, Dixon J. Impact of patients' socioeconomic status on the distance travelled for hospital admission in the English National Health Service. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2007.9-153:(3)12;
- .32 Akinci F, Esatoğlu AE, Tengilimoglu D, Parsons A. Hospital choice factors: a case study in Turkey. *Health Mark Q*. 2004;22(1):3-19.
- .33 Kazemi-Karyani A, VRD, FK, Zhila Seyedi Miankali, SS, Soof M, MKaBKM. Eliciting preferences of patients about the quality of hospital services in the west of Iran using discrete choice experiment analysis. *BMC*. 2021;19:1-8.
- .34 Jung K, Feldman R, Scanlon D. Where would you go for your next hospitalization? *J Health Econ*. 2011;30(4):832-41.
- .35 Groenewoud S, Van Exel NJ, Bobinac A, Berg M, Huijsman R, Stolk EA. What Influences Patients' Decisions When Choosing a Health Care Provider? Measuring Preferences of Patients with Knee Arthrosis, Chronic Depression, or Alzheimer's Disease, Using Discrete Choice Experiments. *Health Serv Res*. 2015;50(6):1941-72.
- .36 Kazemi-Karyani A, Ramezani-Doroh V, Khosravi F, Miankali ZS, Soltani S, Soofi M, et al. Eliciting preferences of patients about the quality of hospital services in the west of Iran using discrete choice experiment analysis. *BMC*. 2021;19:1-8.
- .37 Victoor A, Delnoij DM, Friele RD, Rademakers JJ. Determinants of patient choice of healthcare providers: a scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12.(272)
- .38 Olenja J. Editorial Health seeking behaviour in context. *East African medical journal*. 2003;80(2):61-2.
- .39 Andersen RM, Davidson PL, editors. *Improving Access to Care in America: Individual and Contextual Indicators* 2007.
- .40 Wu D, Lam TP, Lam KF, Zhou XD, Sun KS. Health reforms in china :the public's choices for first-contact care in urban areas. *Family practice*. 2017;34(2):194-200.
- .41 Liu T, Li S, Yang R, Liu S, Chen G. Job preferences of undergraduate nursing students in eastern China: a discrete choice experiment. *Human Resources for Health*. 2019;17(1):1.
- .42 O'Hara NN. Eliciting Health Care Preferences With Discrete Choice Experiments. *JAMA Network Open*. 2022;5(4):e228794-e.
- .43 Xu CTJ, Zhang M. The choice and preference for public private health care among urban residents in China :evidence from a discrete choice experiment. 2016:1-11.
- .44 Mühlbacher AC, Bridges JFP, Bethge S, Dintsios CM, Schwalm A, Gerber-Grote A, et al. Preferences for antiviral therapy of chronic hepatitis C: a discrete choice experiment. *The European Journal of Health Economics*. 2017;18(2):155-65.
- .45 Robyn PJ, Bärnighausen T, Souares A, Savadogo G, Bicaba B, Sié A, et al. Health worker preferences for community-based health insurance payment mechanisms: a discrete choice experiment. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2012;12(1):159.

- .46 de Bekker-Grob EW, Donkers B, Jonker MF, Stolk EA. Sample Size Requirements for Discrete-Choice Experiments in Healthcare: a Practical Guide. *Patient*. 2015;8(5):373-84.
- .47 Kaambwa B, Ratcliffe J, Shulver W, Killington M, Taylor A, Crotty M, et al. Investigating the preferences of older people for telehealth as a new model of health care service delivery: A discrete choice experiment. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2017;23(2):301-13.
- .48 Shanahan M, Larance B, Nielsen S, Cohen M, Schaffer M, Campbell G. A protocol for a discrete choice experiment: understanding patient medicine preferences for managing chronic non-cancer pain. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(8):e027153.
- .49 Bresser Jd, Knoef M, Ooijen R. Preferences for in-kind and in-cash home care insurance. *Journal of Health Economics*. 2022;84.(102626)
- .50 Nicolet A, Perraudin C, Wagner J, Gilles I, Krucien N, Peytremann-Bridevaux I, et al. Patient and Public Preferences for Coordinated Care in Switzerland: Development of a Discrete Choice Experiment. *Patient*. 2022;15(4):485-96.
- .51 Sarikhani Y, Ostovar T, Rossi-Fedele G, Edirippulige S, Bastani P. A Protocol for Developing a Discrete Choice Experiment to Elicit Preferences of General Practitioners for the Choice of Specialty. *Value Health Reg Issues*. 20.9-25:80;21
- .52 Determann D, Lambooi MS, Bekker-Grob EWd, Hayen AP, Varkevisser M, Schutd FT, et al. What health plans do people prefer? The trade-off between premium and provider choice. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2016;265:10-8.
- .53 Yun Liu, Liwei Zhong, Shasha Yuan, Klundert Jvd. Why patients prefer high-level healthcare facilities: a qualitative study using focus groups in rural and urban China. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018;3:1-11.
- .54 Liu J, Yin H, Zheng T, Ilia B, Wang X, Chen R, et al. Primary health institutions preference by hypertensive patients: effect of distance, trust and quality of management in the rural Heilongjiang province of China. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19(1):852.
- .55 Bridges JFP, Hauber AB, Marshall D, Lloyd A, Prosser LA, Regier DA, et al. Conjoint Analysis Applications in Health; a Checklist: A Report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for Conjoint Analysis Task Force. *Value in Health*. 2011;14(4):403-13.
- .56 Kleij K-S, Tangermann U, Amelung VE, Krauth C. Patients' preferences for primary health care – a systematic literature review of discrete choice experiments. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2017;17(1):476.
- .57 Obse A, Ryan M, Heidenreich S, Normand C, Hailemariam D. Eliciting preferences for social health insurance in Ethiopia: a discrete choice experiment. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31(10):1423-32.
- .58 Darrudi A, Daroudi R, Yunesian M, Akbari Sari A. Public Preferences and Willingness to Pay for a COVID-19 Vaccine in Iran: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *PharmacoEconomics - Open*. 2022;6(5):669-79.
- .59 Ajisegiri WS, Peiris D, Abimbola S, Odusanya OO, Tesema AG, Joshi R, et al. It is not all about salary: a discrete-choice experiment to determine community health workers' motivation for work in Nigeria. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2022;7.(10)
- .60 Cutler H, Gu Y, Olin E. Assessing choice for public hospital patients. centre for the health economy, Macquarie University; 2017.
- .61 Sarikhani Y, Ghahramani S, Edirippulige S, Fujisawa Y, Bambling M, Bastani P. What do Iranian physicians value most when choosing a specialty? Evidence from a discrete choice experiment. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation*. 2022;20(1):23.
- .62 Genie MG, Loría-Rebolledo LE, Paranjothy S, Powell D, Ryan M, Sakowsky RA, et al. Understanding public preferences and trade-offs for government responses during a pandemic: a protocol for a discrete choice experiment in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(11):e043477.
- .63 Soekhai V, de Bekker-Grob EW, Ellis AR, Vass CM. Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Economics: Past, Present and Future. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2019;37(2):201-26.
- .64 de Bekker-Grob EW, Ryan M, Gerard K. Discrete choice experiments in health economics: a review of the literature. *Health Econ*. 2012;21(2):145-72.

- .65 Ranjbar Ezatabadi M, Rashidian A, Shariati M, Rahimi Foroushani A, Akbari Sari A. Using Conjoint Analysis to Elicit GPs' Preferences for Family Physician Contracts: A Case Study in Iran. *Iran Red Crescent Med J*. 2016;18(11):e29194.
- .66 Reed Johnson F, Lancsar E, Marshall D, Kilambi V, Mühlbacher A, Regier DA, et al. Constructing Experimental Designs for Discrete-Choice Experiments: Report of the ISPOR Conjoint Analysis Experimental Design Good Research Practices Task Force. *Value in Health*. 2013;16(1):3-13.
- .67 Orme B. Sample size issues for conjoint analysis studies. Sequim: Sawtooth Software Technical Paper. 1998.
- .68 Johnson R, Orme B. Getting the most from CBC. Sequim: Sawtooth Software Research Paper Series, Sawtooth Software. 2003.
- .69 Kruk ME, Johnson JC, Gyakobo M, Agyei-Baffour P, Asabir K, Kotha SR, et al. Rural practice preferences among medical students in Ghana: a discrete choice experiment. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2010;88(5):333-41.
- .70 Boz C, Sur H, Soyuk S. The Affecting Factors of Healthcare Services Demand in terms of Health Services Use: A Field Application. 2016;1(2):e74053.
- .71 Lin X, Cai M, Fu Q, He K, Jiang T, Lu W, et al. Does Hospital Competition Harm Inpatient Quality? Empirical Evidence from Shanxi, China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15.(10)
- .72 Qian J, Jingwei He A, Dean-Chen Yin J. The medical arms race and its impact in Chinese hospitals: implications for health regulation and planning. *Health Policy Plan*. 2019;34(1):37-46.
- .73 Pan J, Qin X, Hsieh CR. Is the pro-competition policy an effective solution for China's public hospital reform? *Health Econ Policy Law*. 2016;11(4):337-57.
- .74 Soltani S, Ghafari S, Salehi M, Mohamadi A, Mollazadeh-Moghaddam K, Moradi F. Factors Affecting the Selection of a Hospital: A Case Study in Milad Hospital, Iran. *Health Information Management*. 2016;12(6):791-8.
- .75 van den Broek-Altenburg EM, Atherly AJ. Patient preferences for provider choice: a discrete choice experiment. *Am J Manag Care*. 2020;26(7):e219-e24.
- .76 Jia E, Gu Y, Peng Y, Li X, Shen X, Jiang M, et al. Preferences of Patients with Non-Communicable Diseases for Primary Healthcare Facilities: A Discrete Choice Experiment in Wuhan, China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17.(11)
- .77 Peter Burge, Nancy Devlin, John Appleby, Grant CRAJ. Do Patients Always Prefer Quicker Treatment? A Discrete Choice Analysis of Patients' Stated Preferences in the London Patient Choice Project. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* 2004;3:183-94.
- .78 Fifer S, Rose J, Greaves S. Hypothetical bias in Stated Choice Experiments: Is it a problem? And if so, how do we deal with it? *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*. 2014;61:164-77.

Fig 1. Example of a choice set

Attributes	Hospital A	Hospital B
Waiting time	60 min	60 min
Quality of care	moderate	good
Travel time	30 min	10 min
Hospital type	public	Social security
Provider competency	good	moderate
Hospital facilities	poor	full
Which hospital would you choose? (Please tick one box only)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.11.23296901>; this version posted October 12, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).