

## Title Page

### 1-Title:

The Impact for implementing Balanced Scorecard in Health Care Organizations: A Systematic Review

### 2-Authors affiliations and qualifications:

Faten Amer\*<sup>1,2</sup>, Sahar Hammoud<sup>1</sup>, Haitham Khatatbeh<sup>1</sup>, Szimonetta Lohner<sup>3</sup>, Imre Boncz<sup>2</sup>, Dóra Endrei<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Doctoral School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary, H-7621 Pécs, Maria u. 5-7

<sup>2</sup> Institute for Health Insurance, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pécs, Hungary

<sup>3</sup> Cochrane Hungary, Clinical Center of the University of Pécs, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

### 3-Corresponding Author:

Email Address: [amer.faten@etk.pte.hu](mailto:amer.faten@etk.pte.hu)

ORCID details: Faten Amer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5214-3797>

### 4-Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Vahideh Moghaddam, Diêgo Andrade, and Wang Zhe for their help in translating and data extraction of Persian, Spanish, and Chinese articles respectively. Also, we would like to thank Dr. Duha Shellah for contributing to revising the manuscript.

### 5- Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### 6-Authors' contributions

This systematic review was planned and designed by F.A, S.L, S.H., I.B & D.E. Search and data extraction was performed by F.A & S.H. Interpretation of data analysis was made by F.A, S.H & H.K. Paper was written by F.A. All authors participated in revising the manuscript. Systematic review was

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

supervised by S.L., I.B & D.E. All authors approved the final manuscript and agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

### **7-Availability of data and materials**

The data underlying this article are available in the article and in its online supplementary material.

### **8-Funding**

The authors received no specific funding for this work

### **9-Competing interests**

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

# 1     **The Impact for Implementing Balanced Scorecard** 2     **in Health Care Organizations: A Systematic Review**

## 3     **Abstract**

4     Aims: This systematic review aims to assess the impact of Balanced Scorecard (BSC)  
5     implementation at Health Care Organizations (HCOs) on Health Care Workers' (HCWs')  
6     satisfaction, patient satisfaction, and financial performance. Up to now, no previous systematic  
7     reviews have performed a comprehensive and rigorous methodological approach to figure out  
8     the impact of BSC implementation in HCOs.

9     Methods: This systematic review was prepared according to PRISMA guidelines. PubMed,  
10    Embase, Cochrane, and Google Scholar databases, as well as Google search engine, were  
11    inspected to find all BSC implementations at HCOs until 20 September 2020. Then the resulted  
12    articles were screened to find the implementations which measured the impact of BSC on  
13    HCWs' satisfaction, patient satisfaction, and financial performance. Quality assessment was  
14    performed using the Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies: (StaRI) checklist.

15    Results: Out of 4031 records, 20 articles were finally included for measuring one or more of  
16    the three impact types. 17 measured the impact of BSC on patient satisfaction, 7 on HCWs'  
17    satisfaction, and 12 on financial performance. Studies with higher quality had a higher positive  
18    impact.

19    Conclusion: This paper offers evidence to HCOs and policymakers on the benefits of  
20    implementing BSC. BSC implementations showed a positive impact on patient satisfaction  
21    and financial performance in HCOs. However, less impact was found on HCWs' satisfaction,  
22    which should be given better consideration in future BSC implementations. High and medium-

23 quality BSC studies were associated with higher positive impacts than low ones. BSC can be  
24 utilized as an effective tool to improve HCOs' performance during the COVID-19 pandemic.

## 25 **Keywords**

26 Performance; evaluation; assessment; health; hospital; COVID-19

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

# 41     **The Impact for Implementing Balanced Scorecard** 42     **in Health Care Organizations: A Systematic Review**


## 43     **1. Introduction**

44     In the past 3 decades, Health Care Organizations (HCOs) have been using managerial tools to  
45     enhance their performance and to achieve their targets and plans. The most known tools used  
46     to assess organizational performance are the International Organization for Standardization  
47     (ISO standards), Malcolm Baldrige National excellence model (MBNQA), European  
48     Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) excellence model, Six Sigma, Balanced  
49     Scorecard (BSC), and other tools [1–5].

50     BSC differs from other managerial and performance management tools in that it can be utilized  
51     as a Performance Evaluation (PE), as well as a strategic managerial tool [6]. Many researchers  
52     suggested that the limited success of quality tools was due to the rushing into operational  
53     effectiveness with the lack of integration with the organization strategy [7–9]. The initial  
54     design of the BSC; BSC 1<sup>st</sup> generation, was proposed by Norton and Kaplan in 1992. It  
55     included the evaluation of 4 perspectives: the financial, customer, internal process, and  
56     learning and growth which were steered by the organizational vision and strategy [10], see Fig  
57     (1). Strategic maps were added later in the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of BSC to describe the cause-effect  
58     relationships between strategic objectives for each perspective [11]. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation,  
59     destination statements, measures, and action plans were added to achieve the targets [12].

60     Duke Children's Hospital in the United States of America (USA) was the first health  
61     organization to implement BSC in 2000, and as a result, the hospital was able to convert 11


62 million dollars of losses into 4 million dollars of profits [13]. See Fig (2), which shows Duke



63

64

**Fig (1): Balanced Scorecard Perspectives. [10]**



65

66

**Fig (2): Duke University Health System Strategic Map. [14]**

67 University's health system strategic map [14]. Since then, many hospitals around the world  
68 have implemented this tool to evaluate and develop their performance. However, the impact  
69 or the effect of BSC implementations has not yet been systematically assessed. This might be  
70 because of the varied impact types, which makes the comparison challenging [15].

71 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic imposed financial burdens on countries and  
72 health care systems worldwide, as well as increased psychological stress of patients, HCWs,  
73 and the limited capacity of hospital beds during the COVID-19 pandemic [16–18]. Standard  
74 procedures and guidelines, and their delivery in full and on time were found to have an essential  
75 role in tackling COVID-19 [19]. On the other hand, the lack of standardization capability and  
76 conflicting managerial decisions were considered as dissatisfactory factors to HCWs in the  
77 pandemic [20]. BSC dimensions were suggested to have an essential role in tackling the  
78 COVID-19 pandemic by helping health care managers to mitigate its consequences on HCOs  
79 [18]. However, the effectiveness of BSC on HCOs is still not systematically evaluated. Despite  
80 the availability of systematic reviews for the impact of BSC in non-health-related fields, for  
81 example, in architecture [21] or management, marketing, and accounting fields [22], there is  
82 still limited research of BSC impact in the health care sector. Only 2 reviews discussed the  
83 impact of BSC. However, one of them did not compare the impact between the  
84 implementations or represent the impact quantitatively [15]. While the other, only mentioned  
85 few impact examples [23], indicating that none of them conducted a comprehensive or rigorous  
86 methodological approach to figure out the impact of BSC implementation in HCOs.

87 It is essential to evaluate the historical effectiveness of BSC implementation on HCOs'  
88 performance before being utilized during the pandemic. Since the BSC strategic map shows  
89 that the end-results of the cause-and-effect relationships are pouring at the customer [23] or  
90 the customer and the financial perspectives [11], the objective of this systematic review was

91 designed to assess the impact of implementing BSC at HCOs on HCWs' satisfaction, patient  
92 satisfaction, and financial performance.

## 93 **2. Materials and methods**

94 This systematic review was prepared to be congruent with the 27-point checklist of the  
95 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist  
96 [24], see (S1 Appendix).

### 97 **2.1. Eligibility criteria**

98 The inclusion and exclusion criteria were set as shown in Table (1).

99 Table (1) is to be placed here.

### 100 **2.2 Data sources, search strategy, and study selection**

101 The search strategy was developed by the FA, SH, and SL, the first two are experts in health  
102 care management and BSC, while the third is an expert in systematic reviews and meta-  
103 analysis. The search strategy was initially developed for the PubMed database based on the  
104 PICO tool [25] which focuses on the Population, Intervention, Comparison, and Outcomes,  
105 see Table (1) using both MeSH terms and keywords. Then, the strategy was adapted for  
106 Cochrane CENTRAL, Embase, and Google Scholar databases, as per Cochrane's  
107 recommendations [26]. To see strategies developed for these databases see (S2 Appendix). To  
108 reduce publication bias, grey literature or unpublished papers were additionally searched for  
109 in Google Scholar and the Google engine. Furthermore, we attempted to identify other  
110 potentially eligible trials or ancillary publications by searching the reference lists of included  
111 trials. The databases were searched until September 20, 2020. Afterward, FA conducted the



112 search strategies in the electronic databases and removed the duplicates by using the EndNote  
113 X9.2 program.

114 The selection of eligible studies was independently performed by FA and SH. In case of  
115 disagreements, discussion after each step was made or, if necessary, SL and HK were consulted  
116 for arbitration. In the initial step of study selection, the titles and abstracts of the articles were  
117 examined to eliminate irrelevant papers. In the second step, the full texts of all potentially  
118 relevant records were carefully examined to make a final decision on in- or exclusion based on  
119 the above-mentioned criteria. Authors of studies with no available full texts or unclear impact  
120 duration were contacted to obtain further details and clarification.

## 121 2.3 Data collection and analysis

122 The following data were extracted from the final eligible studies: 1) author/s, year of  
123 publication, 2) country, 3) type of study, 4) duration of data collection 5) setting, 6) the number  
124 of health facilities, 7) the number of participants, 8) data collection tool or data sources, and 9)  
125 outcome (impact on patient satisfaction, HCWs' satisfaction, and financial performance). Data  
126 extraction was done between January and March 2021 by FA and SH independently. The  
127 impact was either extracted directly from the studies or calculated by subtracting before and  
128 after implementation values to calculate the change; based on how each study presented its  
129 results. After that, the unification of units was performed. Next, charts plotting for each  
130 outcome were performed by FA, then reviewed by FA and SH separately. Authors were  
131 contacted if the impact measuring unit was not reported. Finally, a comparison was made to  
132 discuss the differences.

## 133 2.4 Quality assessment

134 To assess the quality of the final included papers a quality assessment was performed by FA  
135 and SH independently based on the Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies (StaRI)  
136 checklist [27]. The assessment was made for each of the included studies between March and  
137 April 2021 based on 22 items. Then the results were compared. In case of disagreement, IB  
138 and DE were consulted.

## 139 **3. Results**

### 140 **3.1 Study Selection**

141 The search strategy resulted in a total of 4031 records. After removing the duplicates, a total  
142 of 2985 records remained, which were screened based on their titles and abstracts. Then,  
143 irrelevant papers were excluded, so 202 papers remained. A careful examination of the resulted  
144 articles' full texts was made, based on that 20 papers were finally included. Details of the study  
145 selection process are shown in the PRISMA flow-chart (Fig 3) and (S3 Appendix).

### 146 **3.2 Study characteristics**

147 The main characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table (2). The BSC  
148 implementation outcomes (impacts) are shown in (Figs 4-7) and (S4 Appendix).

#### 149 **3.2.1 Location/ Country**

150 Regarding the location of the implementations, 9 were implemented in North America, 2 in  
151 Europe, 1 in Africa, 7 in Asia, and 1 did not specify the location. 14 studies were performed in  
152 high-income countries, 2 in upper-middle-income countries, 1 in the lower middle, and only 2  
153 in low-income countries.

#### 154 **3.2.2 Setting**

155 Out of the 20 resulted final papers, 16 were performed in hospitals or hospitals' departments,  
156 and 4 in health facilities or clinics, see Table (2).

### 157 3.2.3 Language

158 Although no limitation was set based on language, all the resulted final 20 studies that  
159 measured the impact of BSC implementation were only in the English language.

### 160 3.2.4 Study Designs

161 Only 3 studies reported their study designs clearly. 1 of them [28] referred to their design as  
162 cross-sectional studies. However, it extracted secondary data for the PE of HCOs in 3 years  
163 and compared them. While, [29] performed a cluster randomized intervention trial. It evaluated  
164 the post-intervention impact after 2 years. The 3rd study [30] reported its design as  
165 retrospective longitudinal study. The rest 17 studies did not report their design specifically. In  
166 our opinion, all the studies are longitudinal studies, which measured the PE before and after  
167 BSC implementation.

### 168 3.2.5 Data collection

169 Variances of the used data collection tools are shown in Table (2). Only 3 studies had randomly  
170 selected HCOs, participants, or both [29,31,32]. The used indicators were clearly validated  
171 only in 6 studies [29,33–37]. Only 5 studies assessed indicators' feasibility [34–38]. Reliability  
172 or piloting of the indicators was performed only in 3 studies [29,33,35]. Also, 5 studies only  
173 assigned weights for indicators or assessed their importance before implementation [34,35,38–  
174 40]. Finally, only 1 study evaluated the indicators depending on more than 1 source [41], for  
175 example; patient satisfaction was evaluated from the patient's perspective as well as the HCWs"  
176 perspective

### 177 3.2.6 BSC generation

178 Resulted studies used different versions of BSC. 1st generation's aspects; explanation and  
179 definition of perspectives and indicators, and how to measure each indicator was performed  
180 only in 7 papers [30,34,36,37,40–42], and partially in 1 paper where only customer and patient  
181 satisfaction were explained with how they were measured [43]. Also, only 5 papers specified  
182 the source for each perspective/indicator [30,35,36,41,42], while one mentioned them partially  
183 [34]. Regarding the aspects of the BSC 2nd generation, objectives for each indicator were  
184 modified by users during implementation to suit strategy, vision, mission, or goals in 5 studies  
185 [36,40,41,43,44], another 2 studies modified them partially or did not explain it sufficiently  
186 [34,38]. Strategic maps were illustrated in 6 studies [30,36,39,40,44,45], while all except 3  
187 studies missed to display the cause-effect cascade between indicators and target/objectives  
188 [36,40,41]. Regarding the 3rd generation's aspects, destination statements or targets within a  
189 time horizon were set in 7 studies [30,36,40–44], and only for the length of stay indicator in 1  
190 study [13]. Strategic initiatives or action plans to achieve the targeted performance were placed  
191 in 1 study only [44].

### 192 3.2.7 Impact variations


193 The included studies assessed different outcomes for implementing BSC. From the final  
194 eligible 20 studies, 17 measured the impact of BSC on patient satisfaction [13,29,39–  
195 41,43,44,46,30–36,38], 7 on HCWs' satisfaction [28,31,32,36,41,42,47], and 12 on the  
196 financial performance [13,28,47,48,30,36,38,41–43,45,46]. However, the measured variables  
197 varied among studies even for the same dependent variable, see (Figs 4-7). For example, the  
198 patient satisfaction varied from overall patient satisfaction to satisfaction of specific categories,  
199 such as adults, children, inpatients (IP), outpatients (OP), patients in the emergency room (ER),  
200 patients in rehabilitation (Rehab), or it varied according to service offered as satisfaction with  
201 home care services and with departmental services. Regarding the HCWs' satisfaction variable,  
202 the targeted group title varied from staff, employee to HCWs, or the HCWs' satisfaction type

203 varied from internal customer satisfaction to job satisfaction or superiors' satisfaction.  
204 However, the financial variable had the greatest variation; from the reduction in costs,  
205 expenditures, HCWs' budget, expenses, catering expenses, expenses/net revenues, bad debt  
206 expenses per net revenue, supply per net revenue, to increase in: different types of revenues,  
207 return, profits, aggregate surplus, funds, the value of Drug-Related Groups (DRG), and Return  
208 On Assets (ROA).

209 Moreover, the unit used for financial impact assessment differed among studies. For example,  
210 all studies used currencies for assessment, where these currencies also varied between studies,  
211 except few articles which used a percentage out of 100 [30,43,47]. For the impact on patients  
212 and HCWs' satisfaction, most articles used score assessment out of 100, except few articles  
213 which performed the assessment based on 4 or 5 points Likert scale [28,36,42]. To make the  
214 comparison of the financial impact easier, all currencies were converted to United States Dollar  
215 (USD). The authors of 1 study were contacted since they did not report the currency [36]. As  
216 a result, (Figs 6 and 7) resulted, one for the impact in currencies, and the other for the impact  
217 in percentage. While for the patients and HCWs' satisfaction comparison, all Likert scales were  
218 converted to scores out of 100%.

219 Moreover, most of the studies did not specify the statistical central tendency measures used for  
220 assessments. However, a few specified using the mean to measure patient satisfaction [33] and  
221 HCWs' satisfaction [28], while only 1 study specified using the median to measure HCWs'  
222 satisfaction and patient satisfaction [31]. Moreover, only 2 studies mentioned testing the  
223 significance of the impact or the difference before and after the use of BSC, the first was  
224 significant in patient satisfaction [33], the second was insignificant in HCWs' satisfaction [28].  
225 Anyhow, all studies were included in this systematic review since significance analysis was

226




227

228

**Fig (3): PRISMA Flow Diagram**

229



230

231 **Fig (4): Patient Satisfaction Impact.** Increase or decrease in patient satisfaction rate after BSC

232 implementation (%)

233



234


235

**Fig 5 to be inserted here**


236 **Fig (5): HCWs' Satisfaction Impact.** Increase or decrease in HCWs' satisfaction rate after

237 BSC implementation (%)





251 **Fig (6): Financial Impact.** Increase or decrease in financial performance after BSC implementation (%)



253 **Fig (7): Financial Impact.** Increase or decrease in financial performance after BSC implementation (USD)

254 not available in all. However, in our analysis, the magnitude of percentage change was taken  
255 into consideration.

### 256 3.2.8 Time until measuring the outcome

257 The period between BSC implementation and measuring the impact also varied across the  
258 included studies. All articles reported results based on 1 year of implementation, except a few  
259 which reported the results of 1.5 years [41], 2 years [39,49], 3 years [28], 4 years [13,33], and  
260 7 years [36]. For an objective comparison and to avoid bias, we reported the time between  
261 implementing BSC and assessing its impact. Due to the previously mentioned variations of  
262 measured variables, time until outcome measurement, and differences of data collection tool  
263 or data sources, see Table (2), the authors decided that conducting a meta-analysis would not  
264 lead to meaningful results, and a comparison of the impact was performed using the bar charts,  
265 see (Figs 4-7).

## 266 3.3 The Impact of BSC Implementation

267 The impacts in the 20 included studies were specified as the following:

### 268 3.3.1 Impact on patient satisfaction

269 Using 39 measures, the impact of BSC on patient satisfaction was evaluated in 17 studies. The  
270 patient satisfaction increased after implementing BSC, since 34 measures were affected  
271 positively. Whereas, five measures were affected negatively, as the patient satisfaction  
272 unexpectedly decreased, see (Fig 4).

### 273 3.3.2 Impact on HCWs' satisfaction

274 The impact of BSC on HCWs' satisfaction was evaluated in 7 studies, which contained 17  
275 measures. 12 measures reflected a positive impact, and 5 reflected a negative impact, see (Fig  
276 5).

### 277 3.3.3 Impact on financial performance

278 The 12 included studies reported the financial impact either in currency or in percentage or  
279 both. These studies used 30 measures, 23 of the measures were reported in currency, and seven  
280 were in percentage. However, out of the currency measures, 19 measures were presented in the  
281 papers as a monetary value before and after implementation, so the percentage change for them  
282 was possible to be calculated by us, so a total of 26 measures were plotted in percentage, see  
283 (Fig 7). But, for the remaining four currency measures presented in three studies [13,41,46],  
284 the available information was only for the final value, so it was impossible to calculate the  
285 percentage for them. As a result, 2 graphs of the financial impact were designed. (Fig 6) shows  
286 the impact in percentage, 11 studies were applicable to it, with 26 measures. While (Fig 7)  
287 shows the monetary impact in currency, where 9 studies were applicable, with 23 measures.

## 288 3.4 Quality assessment

289 Quality assessment was performed for all resulted studies using StaRI checklist. See (S5  
290 Appendix).

## 291 4. Discussion

### 292 4.1. Discussion of the main results

293 This systematic review aimed at finding all the studies which measured the impact of BSC  
294 implementation on 3 variables: HCWs' satisfaction, patient satisfaction, and the financial  
295 performance at HCOs. The impact was analyzed as the following:

#### 296 4.1.1. Impact on patient satisfaction

297 It was noticed that the studies which contained high negative impact had a low-quality  
298 assessment, except for 1 study which had a high-quality assessment and high negative impact  
299 [41], but the authors of this study explained that patient feedback revealed that patient  
300 satisfaction became lower in the 18th month due to the technical work and rearrangement of  
301 clinics noise. This explanation can be re-assured by noticing that the same impact at this study  
302 was positive (18% higher) in the first year, then it started to deteriorate in the following 6  
303 months. However, studies that had either medium quality or high quality generally had a  
304 positive impact on patient satisfaction. Another study that had the highest quality score  
305 according to the StaRI checklist was found to have the highest positive impact on patient  
306 satisfaction [36]. This could be referred either to the lack of proper implementation of BSC  
307 including randomization, indicators' selection, or BSC generation aspects implementation or  
308 due to the lack of sufficient reporting at this study.

#### 309 4.1.2 Impact on HCWs' satisfaction

310 It was noticed that 4 out of the 5 negative measures of impact were mildly negative or close to  
311 zero, and were referred to in 1 study [35]. This can be referred due to the unavailability of  
312 objectives that suit the organization's strategy, causal effects, or action plans in this study. This  
313 deficiency may have imposed a drastic effect on the final results. However, the fifth negative  
314 measure was found in a high-quality study [36]. In which, employee satisfaction with  
315 relationships with colleagues decreased by 25.7% after 7 years of BSC implementation. But,  
316 the same study found another 2 positive impacts for BSC implementation: employee  
317 satisfaction with relationship with patients, and employee satisfaction with professional  
318 fulfillment. These measures increased by 21% and 14.5%, respectively.

#### 319 4.1.3 Impact on financial performance

320 In currency, it was noticed that all high-quality studies had a positive impact for applying BSC  
321 on the financial impact in currency. Medium quality studies had a mix of positive and negative  
322 impacts. However, all negative impacts were mild; thousands of dollars compared to the  
323 millions of dollars in the positive impact. Only 1 study from the medium-quality studies had a  
324 negative impact in millions [30]; in which the revenues from the services covered by the  
325 National Health Insurance (NHI) decreased by USD 4.1 M. However, in the same study and  
326 the same year, the revenues from the services not covered by the NHI increased by USD 494  
327 M, which was the highest positive impact for BSC in all studies included at this systematic  
328 review.

329 For the low-quality studies, all studies showed a positive impact in millions of dollars, except  
330 1 study [37], in which the revenues decreased by USD 70 M. However, analyzing the decrease  
331 by percentage, shows that this decrease only represents a 1% decrease in revenues compared  
332 to the previous year. Also, another measure in the same study shows a positive impact in  
333 percentage. This will be analyzed further in the next paragraph.

334 In percentage, it was noticed that all high-quality studies had a positive impact in percentage  
335 for applying BSC on financial performance. Medium and low-quality studies had a mix of  
336 positive and negative impacts. However, first of all, these negative impacts were accompanied  
337 by positive financial impacts in the same study. For example, the above study shows that the  
338 revenues decreased by 1%, while aggregate surplus increased by 374% [37]. Secondly, the  
339 negative impact in percentage was very low in all studies compared to the positive impact at  
340 the same study except in 1, where the outpatient dietitian return decreased by 94% [42].  
341 However, it increased by 5074% in the subsequent year, which represented the highest positive  
342 impact on the financial aspect in percentage.

## 343 4.2 Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

344 Overall, a remarkable positive impact has been noticed for applying BSC on patient satisfaction  
345 and financial performance, this finding is compatible with another study which listed examples  
346 for applying BSC at HCOs in high-income countries [15], and a second study which listed  
347 examples for implementing BSC in general [23]. Also, the results are coherent with a  
348 systematic review that reviewed BSC's impact in business, management, and accounting fields  
349 [22]. Moreover, in this study, a positive effect has been noticed for BSC on HCWs' satisfaction,  
350 but with a less remarkable impact. One probable explanation for this can be referred to the lack  
351 of managerial engagement with the non-managerial HCWs upon BSC implementation, or their  
352 misunderstanding of BSC advantages, or their fear of BSC use consequences, such as to be  
353 built on for the responsibility and accountability. As a result, this may lead to cooperation  
354 resistance by the HCWs, and will also lead to lowering their satisfaction rate. However, future  
355 researchers should be considering when applying BSC on how to increase the HCWs'  
356 satisfaction rate. One study revealed that employees did not have incentives or motives to  
357 participate in BSC since they were permanent employees, also the HCWs above 40 negatively  
358 influenced creativity and productivity upon BSC implementation [41]. This challenge was also  
359 referred to by other researchers who mentioned that in some health settings, there were major  
360 deficiencies of qualified personnel and significant issues with health care HCWs' aging [50].  
361 However, they have suggested that highly-ranking HCWs' qualifications in the learning and  
362 growth perspective, will eventually generate motivation for HCWs and will resolve this issue.  
363 Other suggested ideas to solve this problem were to create an open environment for learning  
364 and growth and to encourage active communication with HCWs to ensure the successful  
365 implementation of BSC. Other research encouraged senior management commitment along  
366 with the involvement of non-managerial HCWs and clear articulation of benefits and relevancy  
367 to clinicians [51]. This is also coherent with other systematic review findings [52], which  
368 realized that health care professionals' attitudes towards accreditation were negative and

369 skeptical because of concerns about its impact on the quality of health care services and its  
370 cost. They suggested that health care professionals, especially physicians, have to be educated  
371 on the potential benefits of accreditation.

### 372 4.3 Implication during the COVID-19 pandemic

373 Patient satisfaction, financial performance, and HCWs' satisfaction were severely affected  
374 during the COVID-19 pandemic [18]. Reasons for that can be referred to the psychological  
375 stress of patients and HCWs, and the limited capacity of hospital beds during the pandemic  
376 [16,17]. This paper offers evidence on the benefits of implementing BSC at HCOs on these  
377 dimensions. The implication of BSC HCOs during the pandemic may play a vital role in  
378 reducing the pandemic's negative consequences on HCOs' performance. This is compatible  
379 with the recommendations of other studies which emphasized the important role of the PE and  
380 managerial tools at HCOs during the pandemic [18–20].

### 381 4.4 Strengths and weaknesses

382 This paper has several strengths, according to our knowledge, this was the first paper to  
383 analyze all the studies that have measured the impact of BSC on patient satisfaction, HCWs'  
384 satisfaction, and financial performance in HCOs. It also found a positive impact for applying  
385 BSC in HCOs, especially on patient satisfaction and financial performance. However, it  
386 suggested a need for a wider emphasis on the HCWs' role when implementing BSC, as their  
387 satisfaction rate showed slightly positive, almost zero, or small negative scores in most  
388 studies. The 3 aspects of impact this research concentrated on, are considered the last  
389 destination for impact in the strategic maps and the causal effects at most BSC articles.  
390 Moreover, this paper shows that high-quality implementations and studies were mostly linked  
391 with higher positive results. Finally, unlike other BSC reviews [15,23] which included  
392 biobanks, pharmacies, laboratories, radiology, medical colleges in HCOs definition, this



393 review limited the definition to the organizations which offer the 1ry, 2ry, or 3ry health care  
394 services. This strategy leads to homogeneity of the resulted studies and more valid  
395 comparisons among the results.

396 Nevertheless, this paper has some limitations. First, it focused on the impact of BSC at the 3  
397 chosen indicators only. Whereas, impacts on other types of indicators were not studied. This  
398 was due to the vast variations of indicators' types, which would have if not narrowly specified  
399 lead to analysis challenge. Second, medium and low-quality studies were included due to the  
400 lack of high-quality studies. However, this was taken into consideration when the impact was  
401 compared and analyzed. Third, no meta-analysis was applicable for this systematic review, due  
402 to the heterogeneity of studies regarding their data collection tool and the enormous variation  
403 in the types of indicators. Anyhow, the later variation was clarified in the charts, also the data  
404 collection tool was specified for each study. Moreover, only studies that measured impact after  
405 at least 1 year of implementation were included. Finally, it is important to mention that the  
406 impact comparability is likely more rational for patient satisfaction and HCWs' satisfaction  
407 than for financial performance. Due to the feasibility to compare all studies based on a  
408 percentage out of 100 score for the first two variables. While the change of financial  
409 performance based on currency is harder to compare among studies due to its dependence on  
410 other factors such as the HCOs' size or the number of health facilities included in the study,  
411 etc. These factors may have played as confounding factors on the amount of financial impact.  
412 Also, comparing financial performance based on the percentage change does not imply the real  
413 performance change, because the initial magnitude before BSC implementation could be so  
414 small, which would have shown a vast increase in percentage even if a small increase in the  
415 amount occurred. So, the financial performance comparison among articles gave only a general  
416 idea regarding the impact differences, while considering other factors in the analysis was  
417 important too, also using both percentage and currency in the analysis would give a better

418 holistic idea. Finally, due to the difference of currency used among studies, the currency was  
419 converted to USD. However, for studies that did not specify the rate at the time of the study,  
420 the current rate was used in calculations.

## 421 **5. Conclusions**

422 In conclusion, the implementation of BSC positively influences patient satisfaction and  
423 financial performance in HCOs. However, future researchers should have more attention to  
424 HCWs' satisfaction and engagement at BSC implementations. This paper offers evidence to  
425 HCOs and policymakers on the benefits of implementing BSC in health care. Moreover, BSC  
426 may play an effective role in improving HCOs' performance during the COVID-19 pandemic.

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

## 441 6. References

- 442 1. Andersen H V., Lawrie G, Savič N. Effective quality management through third-  
443 generation balanced scorecard. *Int J Product Perform Manag.* 2004;53: 634–645.  
444 doi:10.1108/17410400410561259
- 445 2. Ruiz U, Simon J. Quality management in health care: a 20-year journey. *Int J Health*  
446 *Care Qual Assur.* 2004;17: 323–333. doi:10.1108/09526860410557570
- 447 3. Hojabri R, Manafi M, Eftekhar F, Ghassemzadeh H. Effective methods for health care  
448 organizations: An evaluation of excellence models. *African J Bus Manag.* 2013;7:  
449 2665–2675. doi:10.5897/AJBM11.2747
- 450 4. Klassen A, Miller A, Anderson N, Shen J, Schiariti V, O’Donnell M. Performance  
451 measurement and improvement frameworks in health, education and social services  
452 systems: a systematic review. *Int J Qual Heal Care.* 2010;22: 44–69.  
453 doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzp057
- 454 5. Sheykhoheslam S, Sachin V. A study of performance evaluation models in health care  
455 sector with special reference to EFQM and BSC models. *Int J Multidiscip Res Dev.*  
456 2015;2: 378–385.
- 457 6. Hannula M, Kulmala H, Suomala P. Total Quality management and balanced  
458 scorecard-A comparative analysis. In: Werther WJ et. al., editor. *Productivity &*  
459 *Quality Management Frontiers - VIII.* Bradford, UK: MCB University Press; 1999.
- 460 7. Tennant C, Roberts P. Hoshin Kanri: A tool for strategic policy deployment. *Knowl*  
461 *Process Manag.* 2001;8: 262–269. doi:10.1002/kpm.121
- 462 8. Leonard D, Mcadam R. The strategic impact and application of the business excellence  
463 model: Implications for quality training and development. *J Eur Ind Train.* 2002;26: 4–  
464 13. doi:10.1108/03090590210415858
- 465 9. Porter ME. What Is Strategy? *Harv Bus Rev.* 1996;74: 61–78.
- 466 10. Kaplan R, Norton D. The balanced scorecard--measures that drive performance. *Harv*  
467 *Bus Rev.* 1992;70: 71–9.
- 468 11. Kaplan RS. Conceptual Foundations of the Balanced Scorecard. *Handbooks Manag*  
469 *Account Res.* 2009;3: 1253–1269. doi:10.1016/S1751-3243(07)03003-9

- 470 12. Speckbacher G, Bischof J, Pfeiffer T. A descriptive analysis on the implementation of  
471 Balanced Scorecards in German-speaking countries. *Manag Account Res.* 2003;14:  
472 361–388. doi:10.1016/j.mar.2003.10.001
- 473 13. Meliones J. Saving money, saving lives. *Harv Bus Rev.* 2000;78: 57-62,64, 66–7.
- 474 14. Duke-Children’s-Hospital. Duke Children ’ s Hospital Case Abstract. In: Balanced  
475 Scorecard Collaborative Hall of Fame [Internet]. [cited 15 May 2021] pp. 1–13.  
476 Available:  
477 [https://thepalladiumgroup.com/download?file=AED\\_1551102784\\_116attachment\\_dub](https://thepalladiumgroup.com/download?file=AED_1551102784_116attachment_dubai_boot_camp_-_march_2019_opt.pdf%23Dubai_Boot_Camp_-_March_2019_opt.pdf)  
478 [ai\\_boot\\_camp\\_-\\_march\\_2019\\_opt.pdf%23Dubai\\_Boot\\_Camp\\_-\\_March\\_2019\\_opt.pdf](https://thepalladiumgroup.com/download?file=AED_1551102784_116attachment_dubai_boot_camp_-_march_2019_opt.pdf%23Dubai_Boot_Camp_-_March_2019_opt.pdf)
- 479 15. Rabbani F, Jafri SMW, Abbas F, Pappas G, Brommels M, Tomson G. Reviewing the  
480 application of the balanced scorecard with implications for low-income health settings.  
481 *J Healthc Qual.* 2007;29: 21–34. doi:10.1111/j.1945-1474.2007.tb00210.x
- 482 16. Amer F, Hammoud S, Farran B, Boncz I, Endrei D. Assessment of Countries’  
483 Preparedness and Lockdown Effectiveness in Fighting COVID-19. *Disaster Med*  
484 *Public Health Prep.* 2021;15: e15–e22. doi:10.1017/dmp.2020.217
- 485 17. Lou NM, Montreuil T, Feldman LS, Fried GM, Lavoie-Tremblay M, Bhanji F, et al.  
486 Evaluations of Healthcare Providers’ Perceived Support From Personal, Hospital, and  
487 System Resources: Implications for Well-Being and Management in Healthcare in  
488 Montreal, Quebec, During COVID-19. *Eval Heal Prof.* 2021; 1–4.  
489 doi:10.1177/01632787211012742
- 490 18. Amer F, Hammoud S, Khatatbeh H, Lohner S, Boncz I. A Systematic Review: The  
491 Dimensions and Indicators utilized in the Performance Evaluation of Health Care  
492 Organizations- An Implication during COVID-19 Pandemic. 2021.  
493 doi:10.1101/2021.06.26.21259568
- 494 19. Ali A, Owied MM, Virginia P, Ruth E, Abdullellah AT. Using Logic Model and Key  
495 Performance Indicators to Construct A Field Hospital for Coronavirus Pandemic  
496 Cases. In: *BMC Emergency Medicine* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 25 Jun 2021] pp. 12–14.  
497 doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-102321/v1
- 498 20. Alrawashdeh HM, Al-Tammemi AB, Alzawahreh MK, Al-Tamimi A, Elkholy M, Al  
499 Sarireh F, et al. Occupational burnout and job satisfaction among physicians in times

- 500 of COVID-19 crisis: a convergent parallel mixed-method study. *BMC Public Health*.  
501 2021;21: 811. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10897-4
- 502 21. Hansen EG, Schaltegger S. The Sustainability Balanced Scorecard: A Systematic  
503 Review of Architectures. *J Bus Ethics*. 2016;133: 193–221. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-  
504 2340-3
- 505 22. Ratnaningrum, Aryani YA, Setiawan D. Balanced Scorecard: Is It Beneficial Enough?  
506 A Literature Review. *Asian J Account Perspect*. 2020;13: 65–84.  
507 doi:10.22452/ajap.vol13no1.4
- 508 23. Mcdonald B. A review of the use of the balanced scorecard in healthcare. *BMCD*  
509 *Consult*. 2012; 1–32.
- 510 24. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The  
511 PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies  
512 That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. *PLoS Med*.  
513 2009;6: e1000100. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100
- 514 25. Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO,  
515 PICOS and SPIDER: a comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search  
516 tools for qualitative systematic reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14: 579.  
517 doi:10.1186/s12913-014-0579-0
- 518 26. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, Marshall C, Metzendorf M-I, Noel-  
519 Storr A, Rader T, Shokraneh F, Thomas J WL. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting  
520 studies. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch  
521 VA (editors). *Cochrane Handb Syst Rev Interv* version 62 (updated Febr 2021). 2021.  
522 Available: [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).
- 523 27. Pinnock H, Barwick M, Carpenter CR, Eldridge S, Grandes G, Griffiths CJ, et al.  
524 Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies (StaRI) Statement. *BMJ*. 2017;356  
525 :i6795. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6795
- 526 28. Abdullah M, Makmun D, Fauzi A, Santi A, Endoskopi P, Cerna S, et al. The use of  
527 balanced scorecard to support achievement of business plan in digestive endoscopy  
528 center, 2013. *Indones J Gastroenterol Hepatol Dig Endosc*. 2014;15: 93–97.  
529 doi:10.24871/152201493-97

- 530 29. Mutale W, Stringer J, Chintu N, Chilengi R, Mwanamwenge MT, Kasese N, et al.  
531 Application of balanced scorecard in the evaluation of a complex health system  
532 intervention: 12 months post intervention findings from the BHOMA Intervention : a  
533 cluster randomised trial in Zambia. *PLoS One*. 2014;9: 1–10.  
534 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0093977
- 535 30. Yang M-C, Tung Y-C. Using Path Analysis to Examine Causal Relationships Among  
536 Balanced Scorecard Performance Indicators for General Hospitals. *Health Care*  
537 *Manage Rev*. 2006;31: 280–288. doi:10.1097/00004010-200610000-00003
- 538 31. Hansen PM, Peters DH, Niayesh H, Singh LP, Dwivedi V, Burnham G. Measuring and  
539 managing progress in the establishment of basic health services: the Afghanistan  
540 Health Sector Balanced Scorecard. *Int J Health Plann Manage*. 2008;23: 107–117.  
541 doi:10.1002/hpm.931
- 542 32. Edward A, Kumar B, Kakar F, Salehi AS, Burnham G, Peters DH. Configuring  
543 balanced scorecards for measuring health system performance: Evidence from 5 years’  
544 evaluation in Afghanistan. *PLoS Med*. 2011;8. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001066
- 545 33. Lorden A, Coustasse A, Singh KP. The balanced scorecard framework-A case study of  
546 patient and employee satisfaction. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 2008;33: 145–155.  
547 doi:10.1097/01.HMR.0000304503.27803.aa
- 548 34. Fields SA, Cohen D. Performance enhancement using a balanced scorecard in a  
549 patient-centered medical home. *Fam Med*. 2011;43: 735–739.
- 550 35. Chu H, Wang C. A Study of a Nursing Department Using the Balanced Scorecard and  
551 the Performance Measurement System: Analytic Hierarchy Process. *Nurs Econ*.  
552 2009;27: 401–408.
- 553 36. Catuogno S, Arena C, Saggese S, Sarto F. Balanced performance measurement in  
554 research hospitals: The participative case study of a haematology department. *BMC*  
555 *Health Serv Res*. 2017;17: 1–11. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2479-6
- 556 37. Pink GH, McKillop I, Schraa EG, Preyra C, Montgomery C, Baker GR. Creating a  
557 balanced scorecard for a hospital system. *J Health Care Finance*. 2001;27: 1–20.
- 558 38. Gumbus A, Bellhouse DE, Lyons B. A three year journey to organizational and  
559 financial health using the balanced scorecard: a case study at a Yale New Haven

- 560 Health System Hospital. *J Bus Econ Stud.* 2003;9: 54–64.
- 561 39. Smith C, Christiansen T, Dick D, Howden JS, Wasylak T, Werle J. Performance  
562 management tools motivate change at the frontlines. *Healthc Manag Forum.* 2014;27:  
563 15–19. doi:10.1016/j.hcmf.2013.12.003
- 564 40. Widyasari NLG, Adi NR. Balanced Scorecard Implementation in the government  
565 hospital. *Russ J Agric Socio-Economic Sci.* 2019;93: 285–291.  
566 doi:10.18551/rjoas.2019-09.30
- 567 41. Koumpouros Y. Balanced scorecard: application in the General Panarcadian Hospital  
568 of Tripolis, Greece. *Int J Health Care Qual Assur.* 2013;26: 286–307.  
569 doi:10.1108/09526861311319546
- 570 42. Smith H, Kim I. Balanced scorecard at Summa health system. *J Corp Account Financ.*  
571 2005;16: 65–72. doi:10.1002/jcaf.20137 65
- 572 43. Josey C, Kim I. Implementation of the balanced scorecard at Barberton Citizens  
573 Hospital. *J Corp Account Financ.* 2008; 57–63. doi:10.1002/JCAF.20386
- 574 44. Devitt R, Klassen W, Martalog J. Strategic management system in a healthcare setting-  
575 -moving from strategy to results. *Healthc Q.* 2005;8: 58–65.  
576 doi:10.12927/hcq.2013.17693
- 577 45. Chang W, Tung Y, Huang C. Performance improvement after implementing the  
578 Balanced Scorecard: A large hospital' s experience in Taiwan. *Total Qual Manag Bus*  
579 *Excell.* 2008;19: 1143–1154. doi:10.1080/14783360802323560
- 580 46. Harber B. The balanced scorecard-solution at Peel Memorial Hospital. *Healthc Q.*  
581 1998;1: 59–63. doi:10.12927/hcq..16744
- 582 47. Chu, Hsuan-Lien, Chen-Chin Wang Y-TD. A study of a nursing department  
583 performance measurement system : using the balanced scorecard and the analytic  
584 hierarchy process. *Nurs Econ.* 2009;27: 401–408.
- 585 48. Baker GR, Pink GH. A Balanced Scorecard for Canadian Hospitals. *Healthc Manag*  
586 *Forum.* 1995;8: 7–13.
- 587 49. Bruce W. Harber. The balanced scorecard solution at Peel Memorial Hospital. *Healthc*  
588 *Q.* 1998;1: 59–63. doi:10.12927/hcq..16744

- 589 50. Behrouzi F, Shaharoun AM, Ma'ArAm A. Applications of the balanced scorecard for  
590 strategic management and performance measurement in the health sector. *Aust Heal*  
591 *Rev.* 2014;38: 208–217. doi:10.1071/AH13170
- 592 51. Dyball MC, Cummings L, Yu H. Adoption of the cocept of Balanced Scorecard within  
593 NSW Health: An exploration of staff attitudes. *Financ Account Manag.* 2011;27: 335–  
594 361. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0408.2011.00528.x
- 595 52. Alkhenizan A, Shaw C. The attitude of health care professionals towards accreditation:  
596 A systematic review of the literature. *J Fam Community Med.* 2012;19: 74.  
597 doi:10.4103/2230-8229.98281
- 598 53. Mutale W, Godfrey-Fausset P, Mwanamwenge MT, Kasese N, Chintu N, Balabanova  
599 D, et al. Measuring Health System Strengthening: Application of the Balanced  
600 Scorecard Approach to Rank the Baseline Performance of Three Rural Districts in  
601 Zambia. Eisele T, editor. *PLoS One.* 2013;8: e58650.  
602 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058650
- 603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616



## 617 **7. Appendices**

618 **S1 Appendix. PRISMA checklist.** 27-point checklist of the Preferred Reporting Items for  
619 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist (DOCX).

620 **S2 Appendix.** Search strategies in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane, and Google scholar  
621 (XLSX).

622 **S3 Appendix.** Title-abstract screening, and full text screening (XLSX).

623 **S4 Appendix.** Data extraction of impact and calculations (XLSX).

624 **S5 Appendix.** RoB and quality assessment (XLSX).

<b>Table (1)</b> <b>Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria and Search Strategy for PubMed</b>			
	<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion criteria</b>	<b>Search Strategy (MeSH terms and keywords) for PubMed</b>
<b>Population</b>	Any type of health care organization	Non- health organization	hospitals[MeSH Terms] hospital department[MeSH Terms] health[MeSH Terms]
<b>Intervention</b>	Performance assessment of health care organizations through implementing BSC	Studies that used other TQM tools such as MBNQA, ISO, SQA, six-sigma, etc.	"quality indicators, health care"[MeSH Terms] scorecard*[Text Word] "score card*" [Text Word]
<b>Comparator</b>	-Initiation of BSC implementation (at least one year of implementation) -Or: Comparing 2 measurements after BSC implementation for at least one year -Or: Gross change/ difference after at least one year of implementation	- Initiation of BSC implementation was in less than one year. -Gross change/ difference after less than one year -One-time measurement with no comparability.	No limitation was set in the search strategy, studies that measured BSC impact within less than one year of implementation were excluded after carefully examining the full texts.
<b>Outcome</b>	-Impact on financial indicators: profitability/loss, change in total revenues, change in total cost, ROI, ROA either in currency or in percentage. -Or: Impact on the patient satisfaction rate -Or: Impact on the HCWs' satisfaction rate -The impact should be objective and measured/ quantitative.	-Impact on other indicators. -Number of patient complaints -HCWs' burnout or turnover rate. -Cost/case or revenue/case change -Qualitative or subjective impact, for example: the managers' opinions in impact	patient satisfaction[MeSH Terms] cost-benefit analysis[MeSH Terms] health care costs[MeSH Terms] Hospital personnel management[MeSH Terms] staff development[MeSH Terms] knowledge management[MeSH Terms] efficiency, organizational[MeSH Terms]
<b>Study design</b>	All study designs	–	No limitation regarding study design, type, or time was set in the search strategy

Note: HCOs, Health Care Organizations; Balanced Scorecard, BSC; Total Quality Management, TQM; Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, MBNQA; International Organization for Standardization, ISO; Singapore Quality Award, SQA; Return On Investment, ROI; Return On Assets, ROA;

**Table (2)**  
**Summary of the Final Included Studies**

<b>Author/s, year of publication</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Design of study</b>	<b>Duration of data collection</b>	<b>Setting</b>	<b>No. of health facilities</b>	<b>No. of participants</b>	<b>Data collection tool/ data sources</b>
Harber, 1998 [46]	Canada	NR	NR	Peel Memorial Hospital (Hospital in general + Laboratory)	1	NR	NR
Meliones, 2000 [13]	The USA- North Carolina	NR	1996-2000	Duke Children Hospital	1	NR	NR
Pink et al., 2001 [37]	Canada	NR	1997-1998	Markham Stouffville hospital	1	NR	Surveys + hospitals reports
Gumbus et al., 2003 [38]	USA	NR	1999-2001	Bridge port hospital	1	NR	The patient satisfaction measurement system
Smith & Kim, 2005 [42]	USA	NR	2001-2004	Summa's Food & Nutrition Service Department at Summa Health System (STH & ACH hospitals)	2	NR	Press Ganey's standard inpatient survey + audit checklists

Devitt et al., 2005 [44]	Canada	NR	2004-2005	Toronto East General Hospital	1	NR	Data extraction from hospital records
Yang & Tung, 2006 [30]	Taiwan	Retrospective longitudinal	2000-2002	General hospitals & their supervisor agency	21	NR	Secondary data from the department of health + primary data structured questionnaire measuring hospitals' organizational learning and growth perspective
Lorden et al., 2008 [33]	NR	NR	Jan 1, 1998- June 30, 2004 (4 data collections)	Community hospital	1	300 Inpatient/quarter, 700 outpatient/quarter, 227 employees (1st survey), 191 employees (2nd survey)	Employee satisfaction survey + patient satisfaction survey (via email)
Josey & Kim, 2008 [43]	USA-Ohio	NR	2006	Barberton Citizens hospital (BCH)	1	NR	Patient satisfaction survey
Chang et al., 2008 [45]	Taiwan	NR	2001-2005	Mackay Memorial Hospital	1	NR	NR
Hansen et al., 2008 [31]	Afghanistan	NR	July to October of (2004/2005/2006)	Health facilities	>600	1700 HCWs, 5800 patients-provider interaction	NR

Chu et al., 2009 [35]	Tawian	NR	2004-2006	The nursing department at a public teaching hospital in Taiwan	1	13 reference nurses group	Financial data from hospital + questionnaires to executives (the weights of indicators)
Edward et al., 2011 [32]	Afghanistan	NR	2004-2008	Health facilities in Afghanistan	700	1500 HCWs, 5000 patients	National health services performance Assessment + interviews with patients and HCWs
Fields & Cohen, 2011 [34]	USA	NR	2009-2010	Oregon Health and science university family medicine (Clinics)	1	NR	Press Ganey survey for patient satisfaction + medical records.
Koumpour os, 2013 [41]	Greece	NR	18 months but not specified when exactly	General Panarcadian Hospital of Tripolis	1	NR	Questionnaires and interviews
Smith et al., 2014 [39]	Canada/ Alberta	NR	2010-2011 (12-month trial), March 31, 2013 (results)	Hospitals in Alberta including hip and knee surgeries	12	NR	NR
Abdullah et al., 2014 [28]	Indonesia	Cross-sectional	April-December, 2013	Cibto Mangunkusumo Hospital- Digestive endoscopy center	1	76 patients	Endoscopy reports + interviews based on structured questionnaires

Mutale et al., 2014 [29,53]	Zambia	Cluster randomized intervention trial	2011-2013	Health facilities in Zambia	12	96 HCWs, 429 patient interviews, 410 patient observation	A survey in facilities+ interviews with HCWs and patients + patient observation + survey with households
Catuogno et al., 2017 [36]	Italy	NR	2007-2008 , & 2014-2015	Hematology department at a Research hospital in Italy	1	14	Stakeholder satisfaction; questionnaires + care processes + hospital discharge report + charity report + research process + departmental report + economic and financial; hospital discharge database + departmental report + charity report
Widyasari & Adi, 2019 [40]	Indonesia	NR	During the year 2018	Bali Mandara Hospital of Bali (Governmental hospital)	1	30	Participant observation + structured interviews + semi-structured interviews + documentation.

Note: NR = Not Reported