

1

1 **Health service improvement using positive patient feedback:**
2 **systematic review and change model**
3 **Short title: Health service improvement through positive patient feedback**

4 Rebecca Lloyd¹, James Munro², Kerry Evans³, Amy Gaskin-Williams⁴, Ada Hui³, Mark Pearson³, Mike Slade^{1,5},
5 Yasuhiro Kotera¹, Giskin Day^{6,7}, Joanne Loughlin-Ridley¹, Clare Enston¹, Stefan Rennick-Egglestone^{1*}

6

7 ¹School of Health Sciences, Institute of Mental Health, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

8 ²Care Opinion, Sheffield, UK

9 ³School of Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

10 ⁴Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Nottingham, UK

11 ⁵Nord University, Faculty of Nursing and Health Sciences, Health and Community Participation Division,
12 Namsos, Norway

13 ⁶Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery and Palliative Care, King's College London, UK

14 ⁷Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, UK

15

16 *Rennick-Egglestone is the corresponding author: Institute of Mental Health, Triumph Road, Nottingham, NG7

17 2TU, UK. stefan.egglestone@nottingham.ac.uk

18

19 **Abstract**

20 **Background:** Patients, families, and communities regularly provide feedback about care and treatment
21 received from healthcare services, most of which is positive. The aim of this review was to examine how
22 positive feedback creates change within healthcare settings.

23 **Methods:** Included documents were empirical studies where the full text is publicly available in English, and
24 where a change has occurred within healthcare services attributed to positive feedback from service users,
25 their families, or the community. They were identified through database searches (ACM Digital Library, AMED,
26 ASSIA, CINAHL, MEDLINE and PsycINFO), forwards and backwards citation, and expert consultation. Data was
27 synthesised into a change model describing forms, mediators and moderators of change. A protocol was
28 prospectively registered: <https://osf.io/5x46c>.

29 **Results:** Sixty-eight papers were included, describing research conducted in 32 countries across six continents,
30 with qualitative (n=51), quantitative (n=10), and mixed (n=7) methods. Only two described interventional
31 studies. The most common form of feedback was 'appreciation' (n=28). The most common recipients were
32 nurses (n=29). Positive feedback was most commonly given in hospitals (n=27) and community healthcare
33 (n=19). Positive feedback mostly led to positive outcomes categorised as (a) short-term emotional change for
34 healthcare workers (including feeling motivated and improved psychological wellbeing), (b) work-home
35 interactional change for healthcare workers (such as improved home-life relationships), and (c) work-related
36 change for healthcare workers (such as improved performance and staff retention). Undesirable changes
37 included embarrassment when receiving feedback, tension in the patient-professional relationship, and envy
38 when not receiving positive feedback.

39 **Conclusion:** Positive feedback can provide the opportunity to create meaningful health service change.
40 Healthcare managers may wish to use positive feedback more regularly, and to identify and address barriers to
41 staff receiving feedback. Further interventional research is required to establish the effectiveness of receiving
42 positive feedback in creating change, and to understand the influence of feedback content.

43 **Keywords:** patient feedback; change model; complex intervention; systematic review; health service

45 Introduction

46 The term 'feedback' often refers to the process whereby the effect of an action is fed back to change future
47 actions. Feedback can be positive, where the gap between actual and desired experience is narrow, for
48 example, when healthcare treatment aligns with patient wishes. Feedback can also be negative, where the gap
49 between actual and desired experience is wide (1). For example, when healthcare treatment falls short of
50 patient wishes. People working in health services regularly receive feedback about the treatment provided to
51 patients, including from the patients themselves, family members, and informal carers (2). Patient feedback
52 differs from patient engagement, which can be defined as patients taking an active role in their healthcare
53 experience to meet a particular objective, such as accessing additional support groups (3).

54 The most frequent form of feedback from healthcare service users is informal feedback, usually exchanged
55 through conversations day-to-day (2), but also via letters and online forums (4). Formal feedback is a
56 structured evaluation, often collected through methods such as national or local surveys (5). Both types of
57 feedback can be given in-person or online and can include generic content (such as 'fantastic care'), or specific
58 (such as 'the food was fantastic during my hospital stay') (6). Some feedback is solicited, such as staff
59 requesting patients to complete feedback surveys (7) , whereas some is unsolicited (8).

60 Positive feedback is much more common than negative feedback, with a linguistic analysis of comments
61 posted on the UK's National Health Service (NHS) Choices website finding positive evaluations to be three
62 times as likely as negative (6). Positive feedback tends to be shorter, often expressed just as a single word such
63 as 'fantastic' (9), and may be conceptualised as including material displays, such as gift-giving, cards, and
64 donations to healthcare services (10). Positive feedback is evident in a variety of forms, such as favourable
65 responses to surveys (4), online comments (9), compliment letters (11), and informal thanks (4). Positive and
66 negative evaluations may also be given in combination, forming 'mixed' feedback (12). Increasingly, feedback
67 is received through online sources, with online feedback being mostly positive in tone (13). Expressions of
68 positive feedback may differ culturally; British culture tends to be less emotionally expressive than American
69 culture (14). Eastern cultures tend to value low arousal emotions such as peacefulness, whereas Western
70 cultures tend to value high arousal emotions such as happiness (15).

71 One purpose of collecting service user feedback is to assist with performance monitoring and assurance, such
72 as comparison between healthcare providers, impact of service changes, informing commissioning decisions,

73 and compliance with standards. Another purpose is to share understanding and information to assist with
74 service choices for other service users, highlight service problems and hold services accountable, and increase
75 staff understanding of service user experience (16).

76 Service users may want to give positive feedback to acknowledge, reward, and promote desired behaviour in
77 healthcare staff (11). This frequently includes expressions of gratitude, conceptualised as the communication
78 of an emotion or state which signals recognition that others have done something to benefit us (17).

79 Expressions of gratitude and positive feedback are interrelated, but not synonymous. Gratitude can describe
80 an individual's attitude, moral values, daily habits, or emotional state, with the intention of reciprocity often at
81 its core (17).

82 In some cases, expressions of gratitude can serve as a positive evaluation of an individual or group
83 accomplishment, and therefore be a form of positive feedback. For example, grateful postcards and letters
84 sent to palliative care units from patients and families recognised the care and treatment received, the value
85 of palliative care, and offered messages of support and encouragement about the service (18). Similarly,
86 throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, many healthcare service users used Twitter to express their gratitude for
87 the work, effort, saving and caring of healthcare staff and services (19). However, not all expressions of
88 gratitude will be given with the intention of recognising accomplishments, such as habitually thanking
89 healthcare staff in the expectation that it would ensure continuation of good treatment (20). Similarly, not all
90 positive feedback will include expressions of gratitude, with some offering objective descriptions of excellent
91 care and treatment practices. The current review will characterise expressions of gratitude towards healthcare
92 staff as a type of positive feedback, acknowledging how these concepts interrelate and discriminating between
93 them where possible.

94 Patient feedback is given in abundance and the use of readily available patient feedback may offer a cost-
95 effective way to create meaningful change within healthcare services (4). In one case study, service user
96 accounts of distress during admission to mental health inpatient services were used as a resource to inform
97 service improvement work. An 80% drop in complaints was observed over the following 14 months after
98 implementation (21). Similarly, the NHS in England uses the Friends and Family Test (FFT) to collect
99 information about patient experience of what is going well and what needs improving (22). The FFT was able
100 to highlight positive patient views about remote appointments during the pandemic. In Buckinghamshire

101 Healthcare NHS Trust, for example, patients felt that video or telephone appointments were safer, saved time,
102 removed need for finding and paying for parking, allowed more time for talking, was better for the
103 environment, and were more likely to be on time (23). This provides valuable insight in how patients are
104 experiencing changes to healthcare services. In Japan, healthcare workers also reported that positive
105 communication and acknowledgement, including from patients, acted as a mental health resource during the
106 Covid-19 pandemic (24).

107 Formal processes exist within healthcare services, such as the UK's NHS, to use service user feedback. In the
108 UK, registered healthcare professionals are often required to collect and reflect on service user feedback as a
109 formal requirement of practice. The UK Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) describe the process of
110 revalidation required for all nurses and midwives in the UK to maintain their registration with the NMC,
111 promote good practice, and strengthen public confidence (25). The revalidation process requires five pieces of
112 feedback which can come from a variety of sources and forms, including from service users. Similarly, the
113 General Medical Council (GMC) require reflection on feedback from service users at least once in each
114 revalidation cycle, which is required every five years (26). Doctors with the GMC are encouraged to reflect on
115 feedback from existing sources of patient feedback, such as letters, cards, or team feedback, and should cover
116 the whole scope of their practice. However, the Health and Care Professionals Council (HCPC) standard
117 guidelines state that asking for, receiving, and reflecting on service user feedback is not a specific requirement,
118 but can be useful for continuing professional development (CPD) (27). This feedback refers to evidence that
119 changes made in line with CPD standards have been beneficial to the service user, such as letters produced for
120 a CPD audit. Positive feedback from service users therefore has the potential to be used in current formal
121 practice requirements for UK healthcare professionals. However, some have described the process as a 'hoop
122 jumping' exercise with no impact on patient care, and some take issue with using feedback because patient-
123 facing working patterns do not create equitable patient-facing opportunities (28).. The infrequency at which
124 patient feedback is required for formal processes may contribute to the view that patient feedback is
125 unrepresentative and tokenistic. Despite expressing sceptical views, healthcare staff have described its value
126 as beneficial (28).

127 Feedback can also be used for quality improvement. Aggregating feedback can provide insight into quality of
128 care for service users and highlight real-time priorities for service inspections and improvement (29). The NHS

129 promotes two models for improving quality by implementing changes (30). The first is the five-step
130 improvement approach, which offers a systematic framework for improvement projects. The five stages are
131 preparation (preliminary planning such as defining aims, objectives, and collecting baseline data), launch (the
132 official start of a project), diagnosis (understanding the current process and defining the problem being
133 addressed), implementation (testing potential solutions to the problem), and evaluation (achievements and
134 learning are captured to make improvements the norm in that service). The second quality improvement
135 model fits into the implementation phase of the five-stage improvement approach. The model for
136 improvement asks three preliminary questions: what are we trying to accomplish? How will we know that a
137 change is an improvement? And what changes can we make that will result in the improvements that we seek?
138 The model consists of four components: plan, do, study, act (PDSA). Improvements can be made by planning
139 how to test change, carrying out what has been planned, measuring the outcomes of the test, and acting on
140 the results to modify and improve services (30).

141 However, there are a range of organisational barriers to the effective use of patient feedback by health
142 services (31). Staff can lack the time or skills required to interpret formal feedback (4), and might be reluctant
143 to engage with feedback communicated informally through online platforms such as Facebook or Twitter (9,
144 32). In some contexts, online feedback is emerging at a faster rate than health services could respond to (16).
145 An example is Care Opinion, an online service for the collection of feedback that enables staff responses, but
146 conversations are often closed with a 'thank you' in response to positive feedback (4) rather than with an
147 account of how this feedback was used to create change. Even where informal feedback is acted on by
148 healthcare staff, the improvements made are often informally implemented in real-time and hence are not
149 captured by quality improvement methods (33). Formal methods of processing service user feedback are also
150 focussed on complaints in healthcare and positive feedback is often overlooked as a useful source of feedback
151 (34). Healthcare staff may assume that feedback is negative in tone (13), and can dismiss or fail to value
152 positive feedback (9). The lack of credibility afforded to positive feedback may be due to its tendency to be
153 shorter and may be viewed by staff working in quality improvement as lacking direct measurability compared
154 with clinical outcomes or complaints (33).

155 Three reviews have investigated the value of gratitude in healthcare settings (35-37) . A meta-narrative review
156 of 56 studies investigated gratitude in healthcare with a particular focus of interpersonal experiences (36). The

157 review described how gratitude can act as ‘social capital’ as it empowers and motivates recipients through
158 strengthened social bonds, connectedness, and an increased willingness to reciprocate. Day (2020) also
159 highlights how patient gratitude can benefit staff wellbeing, such as being protective against burnout and
160 having physical health benefits and may be an indicator of quality of care. A scoping review (35) included 32
161 studies from three databases, and examined the characteristics, focus, and effects of gratitude. It found that
162 gratitude influenced healthcare professionals professionally and personally, generating positive feelings such
163 as pride, satisfaction, and a sense of wellbeing. It also generated reciprocal gratitude among other healthcare
164 professionals. The review highlighted a limited evidence base and concluded that a systematic investigation
165 into the effects of patient gratitude was needed, in line with Medical Research Council (MRC)
166 recommendations on intervention development processes (38).

167 A narrower systematised review on the impact of gratitude in healthcare settings included 23 studies from
168 three databases (37). The review found one harmful change, where service user gift-giving resulted in
169 healthcare staff feeling tension and pressure to meet patient expectations, undermining the service user-
170 professional relationship. The review found that patient gratitude can also create helpful changes for
171 healthcare staff, identified as work-related change (such as improved team performance and work-related
172 satisfaction), direct benefits to staff health (such as increased sleep quality and decreased headaches), and
173 proximal emotional change (such as feeling rewarded, proud, motivated, and fulfilled). In some cases, change
174 was mediated by team information sharing, and was moderated by the psychological demands of the job role.
175 A preliminary change model was produced as a result of the review findings which presented a summarised
176 version of the change process. Following expressions of gratitude from patients, healthcare staff experience a
177 change in their perceptions, either within their relationships with patients or colleagues or the way they
178 experience work. Psychological demands of staff job role moderated this change. A change in perception lead
179 to the harmful and helpful changes previously described, with helpful changes mediated by work-related
180 satisfaction and increased information sharing.

181 **Aims and objectives**

182 Whilst three reviews have examined patient gratitude in healthcare settings, none has examined the impact of
183 positive feedback more broadly. The aim of this review is to examine how positive feedback received by health
184 services about care and treatment can create change within healthcare settings. The objectives were (1) to

185 identify measures used to quantify change; (2) to create a model describing types of change and how it occurs;
186 and (3) to identify recommendations for the collection and use of positive feedback by health services.

187 **Methods**

188 A systematic review of empirical studies was conducted. Positive feedback was defined as a response from
189 healthcare service users, families or the community indicating concordance between desired and actual
190 experiences regarding their care or treatment, delivered to healthcare staff or systems. The 2021 update of
191 the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist was used in
192 reporting the review (39). A review protocol was prospectively registered with the Open Science Framework
193 (<https://osf.io/5x46c>), which extended the protocol for a prior review (37), with extensions validated through a
194 scoping review. A narrative synthesis of review data was performed to create a preliminary model of change
195 (40).

196 **Search strategy**

197 *Electronic database searches*

198 Databases were selected to cover a range of domains relating to healthcare service delivery. Searches were
199 conducted from inception to 18th March 2022 on PsycINFO, AMED, MEDLINE, CINAHL, and the ACM Digital
200 Library (ACM DL), and from inception to 15th December 2021 on ASSIA (the shorter date was due to a
201 constraint in institutional access). The ACM DL indexes papers where computation and human interaction with
202 technology is a primary focus and was included as feedback is frequently collected via electronic systems.
203 Search terminology was extensively tested during a previously conducted systematised review focusing on
204 expressions of patient gratitude (37) , extended for the current review to encompass positive feedback beyond
205 gratitude and healthcare systems more generally, and informed by the learning from the scoping searches.
206 Scoping searches identified terms which were synonymous with ‘positive feedback’, such as ‘positive
207 evaluation’ and ‘praise’, and terms which described healthcare systems, such as ‘healthcare services’ and
208 ‘healthcare communities’.
209 Search terms which linked less closely to positive feedback but produced a high volume of documents, such as
210 recognition, were searched in titles only. In the initial filter by title, the screening team took care not to
211 exclude papers in the event of ambiguity.

212 The following search strategy was used for MEDLINE, PsycINFO, and AMED (all searched through Ovid):

- 213 1. Health* staff.ti,ab.
- 214 2. Health* worker*.ti,ab.
- 215 3. Medical staff.ti,ab.
- 216 4. Medical worker*.ti,ab.
- 217 5. Exp Health Personnel/
- 218 6. Health* system*.ti,ab.
- 219 7. Health* service*.ti,ab.
- 220 8. Health* organi#ation*.ti,ab.
- 221 9. Health* communit*.ti,ab.
- 222 10. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9
- 223 11. Grat*.ti,ab.
- 224 12. Appreciat*.ti,ab.
- 225 13. Recog*.ti.
- 226 14. Thank*.ti.
- 227 15. Positive* feedback.ti,ab.
- 228 16. Positive* evaluat*.ti,ab.
- 229 17. Praise*.ti,ab.
- 230 18. 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17
- 231 19. 10 and 18
- 232 20. Remove duplicates from 19

233

234 This search strategy was amended for CINAHL and ASSIA (amendments in S1 File).

235 The ACM Digital Library only allows searches constructed using combinations of keywords, which generates a
236 series of online pages of possible matches in order of relevance. Keyword combinations were identified from
237 the MEDLINE search strategy (searches in S1 File). For each keyword combination, results pages were
238 sequentially inspected for potentially includable documents, and inspection was discontinued when three
239 subsequent pages of non-relevant results were observed.

240 When developing the search strategy, documents from the prior review (37) were used as marker papers to
241 evaluate search strategy sensitivity.

242 *Citation tracking*

243 Reference lists for included documents were manually inspected for further includable documents (backwards
244 referencing). Forward referencing of included documents was conducted using Google Scholar. Forward and
245 backward citation was repeated on additional included documents until no further documents were included.

246 *Expert consultation*

247 Once the final list of includable documents from electronic databases was identified, three experts in
248 healthcare service delivery were asked to identify any potentially includable documents which had been
249 omitted. Experts consisted of a healthcare manager responsible for feedback, an academic expert, and a
250 technology creator who collects feedback about healthcare. Proposed documents were inspected for inclusion
251 by the researcher. Forwards and backward referencing was conducted on additional included documents
252 identified during expert consultation and repeated until no further documents were included.

253 **Document inclusion**

254 The Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, Study Design (PICOS) search tool was used to specify
255 inclusion (41).

256 *Study design*

257 Included documents were empirical studies where the full text is publicly available in English, with a clearly
258 defined research method. Documents were included where a change has occurred within healthcare services
259 attributed to positive feedback from service users, their families, or the community. Change was inclusive of
260 individual healthcare staff changes, such as behavioural, emotional, and attitudinal shift, and systematic or
261 procedural change within healthcare structure.

262 Documents describing systematic, literature, or scoping reviews, policy statements, conference abstracts,
263 protocols, and documents presented in a blog format were excluded. Documents were excluded where it was
264 unclear whether change occurred as a result of positive feedback, where the identified change preceded
265 positive feedback or directionality was ambiguous (e.g., where a change in healthcare staff or systems caused
266 positive service user feedback), or where the impact of positive feedback was not presented as a study finding
267 but was briefly mentioned as a discussion point.

268 *Context*

269 Included documents described research in the context of a healthcare setting, defined as any formal service
270 where healthcare is being delivered, such as in hospitals, outpatient services, hospices, healthcare education,
271 or correctional medical facilities. This was not limited to private or public healthcare services. Documents
272 describing community healthcare settings were also included if staff were providing a formal healthcare
273 service in the community. Documents were excluded where they describe positive feedback occurring within a
274 healthcare system in relation to research being conducted, such as feedback about participation in a
275 randomized clinical trial.

276 *Intervention*

277 Included documents described the voluntary expression of positive feedback from healthcare service users,
278 their families, or community members, relating to the care or treatment provided, with healthcare workers or
279 healthcare services as recipients. This included positive feedback expressed verbally and in invariant forms
280 (such as in writing), and positive feedback provided both in-person and remotely (such as online). Expressions
281 of gratitude were included as they may indicate service user feelings about care and treatment and hence can
282 be used as a source of information by healthcare staff or systems. Studies describing 'recognition' of
283 healthcare staff or services in relation to appreciation of care and treatment provided were included.
284 Documents were excluded if (1) the type of service user feedback was not identified as positive, was negative
285 or mixed, ambiguous, or was hypothetical (2) the source of positive feedback was not healthcare service users,
286 families, communities, or was ambiguous (3) positive feedback from healthcare service users, families, or
287 communities was not distinct from feedback provided by peers or the organisation, or (4) expressions of
288 positive feedback were not voluntary (for example, where service users felt that their care and treatment may
289 be negatively impacted if they do not express positive feedback). Feedback was assumed to be given
290 voluntarily unless otherwise stated. Documents describing recognition awards or honours informed by the
291 treatment and care experiences of healthcare service users, such as the Diseases Attacking the Immune
292 System (DAISY) Award (42), were excluded. Similarly, documents describing feedback given via Appreciative
293 Inquiry (a strength-based approach to creating change with a focus on appreciation and positive
294 conversations) were excluded if service user involvement was not explicitly stated or distinguishable from peer
295 or organizational feedback (43). Documents describing donations or gifts to healthcare services were excluded
296 if the motivation for donation was not explicitly described as positive feedback or gratitude towards the

297 healthcare staff or system (37). Studies which describe positive recognition of healthcare staff regarding social
298 status rather than care or treatment provided, such as community support, approval, acceptance, or respect,
299 were excluded (44). Studies were also excluded where healthcare service user satisfaction with care and
300 treatment was described, but not explicitly delivered as positive feedback to healthcare staff or services.

301 *Participants*

302 Included documents described participants as working within a formal healthcare environment. The following
303 were in scope: paid or volunteer workers within any healthcare system worldwide; students carrying out a
304 formal healthcare role as part of their studies. Documents describing research into healthcare systems at an
305 organizational level (e.g., where there were no staff participants) were also included. Healthcare systems were
306 defined as any healthcare structure delivering care services to healthcare users.

307 Documents were excluded where authors did not state whether feedback was provided within a healthcare
308 setting, if participant roles were informal such as unpaid familial caregivers, or if participants were unable to
309 receive feedback.

310 **Analysis plan**

311 Documents from database searches were exported to EndNote (45) and duplicates were removed. Documents
312 were screened for eligibility, filtered on title in stage one and abstract in stage two. Concordance checking was
313 conducted on a randomly selected 20% of exclusions by a second researcher [SRE] for both stages (title and
314 abstract) of exclusion. Selection processes were piloted until a concordance rate of 95% was achieved on
315 exclusions. Stage 3 screened remaining documents for eligibility based on full text. Retrieved documents were
316 reviewed for inclusion by two researchers, with 100% concordance required on inclusions and exclusions for
317 Stage 3. Uncertainty about the eligibility of a document from both researchers led to it being carried forward
318 to the next stage of screening. At Stage 3, reasons for exclusion were recorded and agreement was required
319 between RL and SRE.

320 *Data abstraction and synthesis*

321 A data abstraction table (DAT) was modified from the systematised review (37) . The DAT was amended for the
322 purpose of the current systematic review and was piloted using a small number of includable documents to
323 ensure appropriate and efficient design.

324 The DAT categorised information about study context (such as country of study and healthcare setting), study
325 methodology (such as measures and purpose of measures), recipients and givers of feedback (including
326 healthcare role and healthcare service), type of positive feedback considered, and forms of observed change.
327 For types of feedback, donations were recorded under the higher category of 'gifts'. The observed change was
328 split into sections: outcomes, mechanisms, moderators, facilitators, barriers, and mediators.

329 Outcomes were defined as observed changes that have occurred following positive feedback. Mechanisms
330 were defined as processes which produce change. Moderators were defined as factors which alter the degree
331 of change following positive feedback. Facilitators were defined as factors enhancing the observed change.
332 Barriers were defined as factors impeding the observed change. Mediators were defined as factors creating an
333 indirect pathway between two variables for the change process to occur (46).

334 Specific links between outcomes, mechanisms, mediators, moderators, facilitators, and barriers were retained
335 in the DAT, for example if an included document presented evidence that a specific outcome was produced by
336 a specific mechanism. Items were listed in all relevant categories where there was variation in categorisation
337 among studies. Where papers reported more than one study within a single paper, only data from relevant
338 studies were extracted. Quality assessment score was also reported in the DAT, and if a section of the DAT was
339 not clearly stated in a document, it was recorded as 'N/A'.

340 *Change model development*

341 Each category was assessed for similar items and were combined to develop a synthesised typology. A
342 preliminary change model was produced to describe outcomes, mechanisms, mediators, and factors
343 enhancing or supporting change. Moderators, facilitators, and barriers were combined into two tables
344 reflecting factors that enhance change and factors that hinder change. The change model was reviewed by an
345 expert panel consisting of national and local health service representatives experienced with working with
346 feedback, the director of a company providing a public online feedback platform (JM), and three experienced
347 researchers.

348 *Subgroup analysis*

349 Subgroup analyses were planned for documents which identify change through expressions of healthcare
350 service user gratitude, and for documents which were assessed as having high quality methodology. Quality of
351 included documents was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) due to its rigorous
352 assessment of mixed methods study methodologies and high applicability (47). An additional unplanned
353 subgroup-analysis compared mainly public versus mainly private healthcare settings.

354 **Results**

355 **Summary of papers**

356 Database searches identified 17,619 records once duplicates were removed. Sixty-eight papers were included
357 (see Fig 1). The PRISMA checklist is in S2 File.

358 Fig 1 – *PRISMA Flow Diagram of Included and Excluded Screening Process.*

359 **Characteristics of included studies**

360 A summary DAT is in Table 1, and the full DAT is in S3 Table. One included study presented methodology and
361 results across two papers (48, 49) which were merged to form one record [ID 67]. Where several papers were
362 created from a single study, these were considered companion papers. Three studies had corresponding
363 companion papers [ID 3 and 4; ID 11 and 12; ID 45 and 46].

364 **Table 1 – Summary data abstraction table**

ID	Reference	Year	Country	Study type	Design	Setting	Sample size
1	Akintola, O. (2010). Perceptions of rewards among volunteer caregivers of people living with AIDS working in faith-based organizations in South Africa: a qualitative study. <i>Journal of the International AIDS Society</i> , 13(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/1758-2652-13-22	2010	South Africa	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	55
2	Akintola, O., & Chikoko, G. (2016). Factors influencing motivation and job satisfaction among supervisors of community health workers in marginalized communities in South Africa. <i>Human Resources for Health</i> , 14(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-016-0151-6	2016	South Africa	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	26
3	Alam, K., & Oliveras, E. (2014). Retention of female volunteer community health workers in Dhaka urban slums: a prospective cohort study. <i>Human Resources for Health</i> , 12(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-12-29	2014	Bangladesh	Mixed (Interviews Survey)	Observational	Community	542
4	Alam, K., et al. (2012). Performance of female volunteer community health workers in Dhaka urban slums. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i> , 75(3), 511-515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.039	2012	Bangladesh	Mixed (Questionnaire Focus groups Interviews)	Observational	Community	542
5	Alibhai, A. A. (2013). The effectiveness of a volunteer community health worker program to support an antiretroviral treatment program for AIDS patients in western Uganda. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I.	2013	Uganda	Mixed (Questionnaire Interviews Focus groups)	Observational	Community	169

<http://nottingham.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/effectiveness-volunteer-community-health-worker/docview/1504615762/se-2?accountid=8018>

6	Aparicio, M., et al. (2019). Gratitude from patients and relatives in palliative care—characteristics and impact: a national survey. <i>BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care</i> . 10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-001858	2019	Spain	Quantitative (Survey)	Observational	Palliative care units Community	186
7	Ashley, C., et al. (2021). The psychological well-being of primary healthcare nurses during COVID-19: a qualitative study. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> , 77(9), 3820-3828. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14937	2021	Australia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	GPs Community	25
8	Bakker, D., et al. (2010). Canadian cancer nurses' views on recruitment and retention. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 18(2), 205-214. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.01029.x	2010	Canada	Qualitative (Focus groups)	Observational	Oncology Ambulatory care Hospitals Community	91
9	Barnes, A. L. (2015). Relationship between job satisfaction among frontline staff and patient satisfaction: Evidence from community health centers in South Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina). https://www.proquest.com/docview/1765406972?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true	2015	USA	Quantitative (Survey)	Observational	Community	303
10	Beate, A., & Jacobsen, F. F. (2020). The art of caring in selected Norwegian nursing homes: a qualitative approach. <i>International Journal of Caring Sciences</i> , 13(2), 820. https://hdl.handle.net/11250/2738332	2020	Norway	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Nursing homes	11
11	Bhatnagar, A. (2014). Determinants of motivation and job satisfaction among primary health workers: case studies from Nigeria and India (Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University). http://jhir.library.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/37851	2014	Nigeria India	Mixed (Interviews Survey)	Observational	Primary health care	29
12	Bhatnagar, A., et al. (2017). Primary health care workers' views of motivating factors at individual, community and organizational levels: a qualitative study from Nasarawa and Ondo states, Nigeria. <i>The International Journal of Health Planning and Management</i> , 32(2), 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2342	2017	Nigeria	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	29
13	Blank, F. S., et al. (2014). A comparison of patient and nurse expectations regarding nursing care in the emergency department. <i>Journal of Emergency Nursing</i> , 40(4), 317-322. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2013.02.010	2014	N/A	Mixed (Survey)	Observational	Emergency department	100
14	Cameron, P. J., et al. (2010). Physician retention in rural Alberta: key community factors. <i>Canadian Journal of Public Health</i> , 101(1), 79-82. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03405568	2010	Canada	Qualitative (Interviews Document review Observations)	Observational	Community	15
15	Chou, W. C., et al. (2006). Perceptions of physicians on the barriers and facilitators to integrating fall risk evaluation and management into practice. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i> , 21(2), 117-122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-006-0244-3	2006	USA	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Primary care offices	18
16	Christiansen, B. (2008). Good work—how is it recognised by the nurse? <i>Journal of Clinical Nursing</i> , 17(12), 1645-1651. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02139.x	2008	Norway	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals Clinic	10
17	Ciocănel, A., et al. (2018). Helping, mediating, and gaining recognition: the everyday identity work of Romanian health social workers. <i>Social Work in Health Care</i> , 57(3), 206-219. https://doi.org/10.1080/00981389.2018.1426674	2018	Romania	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals Emergency department Maternity unit School-based Community Hospice	21
18	Cleary, M., et al. Mental health nurses' perceptions of good work in an acute setting. <i>International Journal of Mental Health Nursing</i> , 21(5), 471-479. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1447-0349.2011.00810.x	2012	Australia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Mental health centres	40

19	Converso, D., et al. (2015). Do positive relations with patients play a protective role for healthcare employees? Effects of patients' gratitude and support on nurses' burnout. <i>Frontiers in Psychology</i> , 6, 470. 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00470	2015	Italy	Quantitative (Questionnaire)	Observational	Hospitals Emergency department Oncology	204
20	Cortese, C. G. (2007). Job satisfaction of Italian nurses: an exploratory study. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 15(3), 303-312. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2007.00694.x	2007	Italy	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	64
21	Dageid, W., et al. (2016). Sustaining motivation among community health workers in aids care in Kwazulu-natal, South Africa: challenges and prospects. <i>Journal of Community Psychology</i> , 44(5), 569-585. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21787	2016	South Africa	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	12
22	Danet, A. D., et al. (2020). Emotional paths of professional experiences in transplant coordinators. <i>Nefrología (English Edition)</i> , 40(1), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nefro.2019.05.005	2020	Spain	Qualitative (Questionnaire Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals Transplant coordination	22
23	Datiko, D. G., et al. (2015). Exploring providers' perspectives of a community based TB approach in Southern Ethiopia: implication for community based approaches. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 15(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1149-9	2015	Ethiopia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	37
24	de Oliveira, A. R., et al. (2019). Satisfaction and limitation of primary health care nurses' work in rural areas. <i>Rural and Remote Health</i> , 19(2), 55-64. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.143753391883465	2019	Brazil	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Family health units	11
25	Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). The role of performance feedback in the self-assessment of competence: a research study with nursing clinicians. <i>Collegian</i> , 13(1), 10-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1322-7696(08)60511-9	2006	Australia	Qualitative (Focus groups)	Observational	Hospitals Midwifery General surgical General medical	26
26	Fontanini, R., et al. (2021). Italian nurses' experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative analysis of internet posts. <i>International Nursing Review</i> , 68(2), 238-247. https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12669	2021	Italy	Qualitative (Descriptive study)	Observational	Hospitals Community	380
27	Fort, A. L., & Voltero, L. (2004). Factors affecting the performance of maternal health care providers in Armenia. <i>Human Resources for Health</i> , 2(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-2-8	2004	Armenia	Quantitative (Interviews Survey Observations)	Observational	Reproductive health services	285
28	Johansson, M., et al. (2019). Nursing staff's experiences of intensive care unit diaries: a qualitative study. <i>Nursing in Critical Care</i> , 24(6), 407-413. https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12416	2019	Sweden	Qualitative (Focus groups)	Observational	University Hospitals ICU	27
29	Judd, M. J., et al. (2017). Workplace stress, burnout and coping: a qualitative study of the experiences of Australian disability support workers. <i>Health & Social Care in the Community</i> , 25(3), 1109-1117. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12409	2017	Australia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Disability Services	12
30	Kelly, D., et al. (2020). The experiences of cancer nurses working in four European countries: a qualitative study. <i>European Journal of Oncology Nursing</i> , 49, 101844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2020.101844	2020	Estonia Germany Netherlands UK	Qualitative (Interviews Focus groups)	Observational	Oncology	97
31	Khowaja, K., et al. (2005). Registered nurses perception of work satisfaction at a Tertiary Care University Hospital. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 13(1), 32-39. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2004.00507.x	2005	Pakistan	Qualitative (Interviews Focus groups)	Observational	Hospitals Critical care Medical-surgery Ambulatory Maternity Emergency department	45
32	Kim, Y. M., et al. (2008). Factors that enable nurse-patient communication in a family planning context: a positive deviance study. <i>International Journal of Nursing Studies</i> , 45(10), 1411-1421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.01.002	2008	Indonesia	Qualitative (Interviews Focus groups)	Observational	Clinic	34

33	MacLeod, M. L., et al. (2021). The meaning of nursing practice for nurses who are retired yet continue to work in a rural or remote community. <i>BMC Nursing</i> , 20(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-021-00721-0	2021	Canada	Qualitative (Survey)	Observational	N/A	101
34	Maharani, C., et al. (2022). The National Health Insurance System of Indonesia and primary care physicians' job satisfaction: a prospective qualitative study. <i>Family Practice</i> , 39(1), 112-124. https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmab067	2022	Indonesia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Primary health care	34
35	Martínez-Taboas, A., et al. (2014). Gifts in psychotherapy: attitudes and experiences of Puerto Rican psychotherapists. <i>Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología</i> , 25(2), 328-339. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=233245622011	2014	Puerto Rico	Quantitative (Questionnaire)	Observational	Private practice Hospitals University	75
36	Minooee, S., et al. (2021). Catastrophic thinking: is it the legacy of traumatic births? Midwives' experiences of shoulder dystocia complicated births. <i>Women and Birth</i> , 34(1), e38-e46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2020.08.008	2021	Australia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	25
37	Muntz, J., & Dormann, C. (2020). Moderating effects of appreciation on relationships between illegitimate tasks and intrinsic motivation: a two-wave shortitudinal study. <i>European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology</i> , 29(3), 391-404. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1706489	2020	Germany	Quantitative (Panel study)	Observational	Hospitals	241
38	Nwala, E. (2015). The impact of nonmonetary job benefits on job retention in rural healthcare (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). https://www.proquest.com/docview/1735405605?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true	2015	USA	Qualitative (Interviews Observations)	Observational	Clinic	13
39	Oluwole, A., et al. (2019). Optimising the performance of frontline implementers engaged in the NTD programme in Nigeria: lessons for strengthening community health systems for universal health coverage. <i>Human Resources for Health</i> , 17(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-019-0419-8	2019	Nigeria	Qualitative (Workshops)	Observational	Community	N/A
40	Ortiz, J. A. (2014). New graduate nurses' experiences of what accounts for their lack of professional confidence during their first year of practice (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University). https://www.proquest.com/docview/1650654883?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true	2014	USA	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	12
41	Pal, L. M., et al. (2014). Utilising feedback from patients and their families as a learning strategy in a foundation degree in palliative and supportive care: a qualitative study. <i>Nurse Education Today</i> , 34(3), 319-324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2013.06.012	2014	UK	Qualitative (Focus groups Questionnaire)	Observational	Nursing homes Hospitals Hospices Oncology wards Community	12
42	Pariseault, C. A., et al. (2022). Nurses' experiences of caring for patients and families during the Covid-19 pandemic: communication challenges. <i>American Journal of Nursing</i> , 122, 22-30. 10.1097/01.NAJ.0000805644.85184.d2	2022	USA	Qualitative (Descriptive study)	Observational	Hospitals	17
43	Peteet, J. R., et al. (1992). Relationships with patients in oncology: can a clinician be a friend? <i>Psychiatry</i> , 55(3), 223-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1992.11024596	1992	USA	Mixed (Interviews)	Observational	Oncology	192
44	Pooley, H. M., et al. (2015). The experience of the long-term doctor-patient relationship in consultant nephrologists. <i>Journal of Renal Care</i> , 41(2), 88-95. https://doi.org/10.1111/jorc.12092	2015	UK	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Renal department	7
45	Prytherch, H., et al. (2012). Maternal and newborn healthcare providers in rural Tanzania: in-depth interviews exploring influences on motivation, performance and job satisfaction. <i>Rural and Remote Health</i> , 12(3), 1-15. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.625974688045681	2012	Tanzania	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Health centres	35
46	Prytherch, H., et al. (2013). Motivation and incentives of rural maternal and neonatal health care providers: a comparison of qualitative findings from Burkina Faso, Ghana and Tanzania. <i>BMC Health Services Research</i> , 13(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-149	2013	Burkina Faso Ghana Tanzania	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Health centres	35

47	Raingruber, B., & Wolf, T. (2015). Nurse perspectives regarding the meaningfulness of oncology nursing practice. <i>Clinical Journal of Oncology Nursing</i> , 19(3), 292-296. 10.1188/15.CJON.292-296	2015	USA	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Oncology wards Medical-surgical unit	8
48	Reis, M. J. D., et al. (2010). Experiences of nurses in health care for female victims of sexual violence. <i>Revista de Saude Publica</i> , 44, 325-331. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-89102010000200013	2010	Brazil	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Sexual violence service	6
49	Riskin, A., et al. (2019). Expressions of gratitude and medical team performance. <i>Pediatrics</i> , 143(4). https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2018-2043	2019	Israel	Quantitative (Randomised study)	Interventional	Hospitals NICU	172
50	Robinson, D. (2019). Exploring experiences of burnout, engagement, and social support networks: a qualitative study of hospital medicine physicians (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University). https://www.proquest.com/docview/2244361153?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true	2019	USA	Mixed (Interviews Survey)	Observational	Hospitals	15
51	Roca, J., et al. (2021). Experiences, emotional responses, and coping skills of nursing students as auxiliary health workers during the peak Covid-19 pandemic: a qualitative study. <i>International Journal of Mental Health Nursing</i> , 30(5), 1080-1092. https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12858	2021	Spain	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Nursing homes Hospitals COVID-19 specialized unit	22
52	Ronnie, L. (2019). Intensive care nurses in South Africa: expectations and experiences in a public sector hospital. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 27(7), 1431-1437. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12826	2019	South Africa	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals ICU	44
53	Sakai, M., et al. (2013). Home visiting nurses' attitudes toward caring for dying patients, and related workplace factors. <i>International Journal of Palliative Nursing</i> , 19(4), 195-204. https://doi.org/10.12968/ijpn.2013.19.4.195	2013	Japan	Quantitative (Questionnaire)	Observational	Community	206
54	Seitovirta, J., et al. (2015). Registered nurses' experiences of rewarding in a Finnish university hospital—an interview study. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 23(7), 868-878. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12228	2015	Finland	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	10
55	Seitovirta, J., et al. (2017). Attention to nurses' rewarding—an interview study of registered nurses working in primary and private healthcare in Finland. <i>Journal of Clinical Nursing</i> , 26(7-8), 1042-1052. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.13459	2017	Finland	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Healthcare organisations	20
56	Smallwood, N., et al. (2021). Moral distress and perceived community views are associated with mental health symptoms in frontline health workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. <i>International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health</i> , 18(16), 8723. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168723	2021	Australia	Quantitative (Survey)	Observational	Hospitals	7846
57	Tang, P. M., et al. (2021). How and when service beneficiaries' gratitude enriches employees' daily lives. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 107(6), 987-1008. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000975	2021	China Singapore	Quantitative (Experience Sampling Method)	Observational	Hospitals	275
58	Vachon, M., & Guité-Verret, A. (2020). From powerlessness to recognition the meaning of palliative care clinicians' experience of suffering. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being</i> , 15(1), 1852362. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2020.1852362	2020	Canada	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Medical centre	21
59	Vail, L., et al. (2011). Healthcare assistants in general practice: a qualitative study of their experiences. <i>Primary Health Care Research & Development</i> , 12(1), 29-41. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1463423610000204	2011	UK	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	GP	14
60	Vandecasteele, T., et al. (2015). Nurses' perceptions of transgressive behaviour in care relationships: a qualitative study. <i>Journal of Advanced Nursing</i> , 71(12), 2786-2798. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12749	2015	Belgium	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	18
61	Wahlberg, A. C., & Bjorkman, A. (2018). Expert in nursing care but sometimes disrespected—telenurses' reflections on their work environment and nursing care. <i>Journal of Clinical Nursing</i> , 27(21-22), 4203-4211. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14622	2018	Sweden	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Telephone service	24

62	Waltz, L. A., et al. (2020). Exploring job satisfaction and workplace engagement in millennial nurses. <i>Journal of Nursing Management</i> , 28(3), 673-681. https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12981	2020	USA	Qualitative (Focus groups)	Observational	Hospitals	33
63	Warburton, J., et al. (2014). Extrinsic and intrinsic factors impacting on the retention of older rural healthcare workers in the north Victorian public sector: a qualitative study. <i>Rural and Remote Health</i> , 14(3), 131-146. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.451178784672507	2014	Australia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	N/A	17
64	Wasko, K. (2014). Medical practice in rural Saskatchewan: factors in physician recruitment and retention. <i>Canadian Journal of Rural Medicine</i> , 19(3), 93. https://srpc.ca/resources/Documents/CJRM/vol19n3/pg93.pdf	2014	Canada	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	62
65	Weaver, S. H., et al. (2020). The impact of real-time patient feedback using a gamified system. <i>Nursing Management</i> , 51(12), 14-21. 10.1097/01.NUMA.0000721812.13386.81	2020	USA	Mixed (Interviews Focus groups Survey)	Interventional	Hospitals Medical-surgical unit	22
66	Wright, S. M., et al. (2013). Ethical concerns related to grateful patient philanthropy: the physician's perspective. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i> , 28(5), 645-651. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-012-2246-7	2013	USA	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	University	20
67	Zulu, J. M., et al. (2015). 1/3. Hope and despair: the community health assistant role in Zambia. <i>British Journal of Healthcare Assistants</i> , 9(9), 458-465. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjha.2015.9.9.458 Zulu, J. M., et al. (2016). Hope and despair 3/3: pluses and minuses for community health assistants in rural Zambia. <i>British Journal of Healthcare Assistants</i> , 10(1), 31-35. https://doi.org/10.12968/bjha.2016.10.1.31	2015 2016	Zambia	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Community	12
68	Zwack, J., & Schweitzer, J. (2013). If every fifth physician is affected by burnout, what about the other four? Resilience strategies of experienced physicians. <i>Academic Medicine</i> , 88(3), 382-389. 10.1097/ACM.0b013e318281696b	2013	Germany	Qualitative (Interviews)	Observational	Hospitals	200

365

366 Research was located in 32 countries across six continents (Table 2). Two studies were located in multiple

367 countries (50, 51). One study did not state the study location (52).

368 **Table 2 – Research location of included studies in order of quantity**

369 Multiple papers from the same study counted as having a single location unless reporting results from
370 different locations.

Continent	Quantity	Country	Quantity	Study ID(s)
Europe	23	UK	4	30, 41, 44, 59
		Germany	3	30, 37, 68
		Italy	3	19, 20, 26
		Spain	3	6, 22, 51
		Finland	2	54, 55
		Norway	2	10, 16
		Sweden	2	28, 61
		Belgium	1	60
		Estonia	1	30
		Netherlands	1	30
		Romania	1	17
North America	16	USA	11	9, 15, 38, 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, 62, 65, 66
		Canada	5	8, 14, 33, 58, 64
Africa	12	South Africa	4	1, 2, 21, 52
		Nigeria	2	11, 39
		Burkina Faso	1	46
		Ethiopia	1	23
		Ghana	1	46
		Tanzania	1	46
Uganda	1	5		

		Zambia	1	67
Asia	9	Indonesia	2	32, 34
		Armenia	1	27
		Bangladesh	1	4
		China	1	57
		Israel	1	49
		Japan	1	53
		Pakistan	1	31
		Singapore	1	57
Australasia	7	Australia	7	7, 18, 25, 29, 36, 56, 63
South America	3	Brazil	2	24, 48
		Puerto Rico	1	35

371

372 The median year of publication was 2015 (Table 3).

373 **Table 3** – *Year of publication for included papers in chronological order with corresponding study IDs*

374 Multiple papers from the same study were included separately due to differing publication dates

Year	Quantity	Study ID(s)
1992	1	43
2004	1	27
2005	1	31
2006	2	15, 25
2007	1	20
2008	2	16, 32
2010	4	1, 8, 14, 48
2011	1	59
2012	3	4, 18, 45
2013	5	8, 11, 32, 34, 45
2014	8	3, 11, 13, 35, 40, 41, 63, 64
2015	8	9, 19, 23, 38, 44, 47, 54, 60
2016	3	2, 21, 67
2017	3	12, 29, 5
2018	2	17, 61
2019	7	6, 24, 28, 39, 49, 50, 52
2020	7	10, 22, 30, 37, 58, 62, 65
2021	7	7, 26, 33, 36, 51, 56, 57
2022	2	34, 42

375 Most studies were qualitative, and all but two studies were observational, in that they presented evidence

376 relating to existing uses of positive feedback (Table 4).

377 **Table 4** – *Methods of included papers, in order of quantity*

378 Multiple papers from the same study were counted as having a single study methods. Three companion papers
379 were not counted in the ‘total quantity’ column.

380 Many papers used multiple methods, each counted separately in the ‘quantity’ column.

Type of study	Total quantity	Method	Quantity
Qualitative	49	Interviews	40
		Focus groups	8
		Questionnaire/survey	4
		Observations	2
		Descriptive study	2
		Workshops	1

Quantitative	10	Questionnaire/survey	6
		Experience Sampling Method	1
		Observations	1
		Panel study	1
		Randomised study	1
Mixed	6	Interviews	5
		Questionnaire/survey	5
		Focus groups	3

381

382 The two intervention studies were as follows:

383 *Riskin et al, 2019 [ID 49]*

384 This study used pre-recorded video to simulate the impact on Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) team
385 performance of gratitude expressed by two different sources. NICU teams (n = 43) were randomly assigned to
386 1 of 4 conditions: (1) maternal gratitude (2) physician-expressed gratitude (3) combined maternal and
387 physician gratitude, or (4) control (same agents communicated neutral statements). Subsequent team
388 performance in a training workshop was evaluated by a blinded panel, on a five-point Likert scale. Maternal
389 gratitude produced a significant positive affect on team performance (3.9 ± 0.9 vs 3.6 ± 1.0 ; $P = .04$). Most of
390 this effect was explained by the positive impact of gratitude on team information sharing (4.3 ± 0.8 vs $4.0 \pm$
391 0.8 ; $P = .03$). As a result, accuracy of diagnostic work was improved (95% CI = 0.018 to 0.395; $P = .03$)

392 *Weaver, 2020 [ID 65]*

393 This study evaluated the impact of using a gamified feedback system on a medical-surgical unit in the US. The
394 feedback system allowed service users to use a tablet to input free-text comments, which were later sent as
395 text alerts to nurses and technicians. Its impact was evaluated using interviews, focus groups, and surveys.
396 Healthcare staff described that receiving recognition and appreciation through the feedback system made
397 them feel good, boosted confidence, morale and motivation, and helped them to feel comfortable in their job.
398 Staff were initially enthusiastic about using the feedback system, which was seen to support the effect of
399 positive feedback. Similarly, when staff became less enthusiastic and motivated to use the system over time,
400 this hindered the effects of positive feedback. Night shift staff reported less opportunity to receive feedback
401 from service users. The system was hindered by the lengthy process of accumulating points and rewards,
402 making feedback from service users less timely, consistent, or meaningful.

403 **Characteristics of positive feedback in included studies**

404 Positive feedback was described in included studies as having a variety of forms, most commonly described in
405 their original papers as appreciation and gratitude (Table 5). The form of feedback was categorised as material
406 or ambiguous. Material feedback referred to physical items given by service users, families, or the community.
407 In a substantial number of included papers, the precise form of feedback was not explicitly stated, and hence
408 was ambiguous. For example, gratitude might incorporate a variety of actions, but this was often not stated in
409 published work.

410 **Table 5 – Positive feedback in included studies in order of quantity**

411 Multiple papers from the same study were counted as having a single type of feedback

Feedback category	Type of positive feedback	Quantity	Study ID(s)
Ambiguous	Appreciation	28	1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 19, 21, 24, 26, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 61, 64, 68
	Gratitude	22	6, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, 24, 32, 33, 35, 42, 43, 46, 48, 52, 53, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62
	Thanks	16	5, 6, 14, 18, 30, 33, 35, 36, 40, 46, 47, 50, 54, 55, 65, 66
	Positive feedback	13	4, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44, 62
	Recognition	10	1, 11, 24, 27, 32, 43, 50, 55, 60, 68
	Praise	3	28, 41, 50
	Being valued	1	63
	Patient satisfaction	1	67
Material	Gifts	7	6, 14, 22, 25, 52, 58, 66
	Cards	5	14, 16, 18, 25, 65
	Flowers	2	52, 65
	Food	2	6, 62
	Hugs	1	16
	Letters	1	6

412
413 Included studies identified that positive feedback was delivered by service users (n = 53), the community (n =
414 18), and families (n = 16), with some studies identifying multiple sources of feedback.

415 Recipients of positive feedback were described using a broad variety of labels, most commonly identified as
416 clinical staff providing direct care and treatment to service users (n = 68) (Table 6). In some studies, non-
417 clinical staff received feedback (n = 3).

418 **Table 6 – Feedback recipients of positive feedback in included studies in order of quantity**

419 Multiple papers from the same study were counted as a single feedback recipient

Recipient category	Feedback recipient	Quantity	Study ID(s)
Clinical staff	Nurses	29	7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 37, 40, 42, 47, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 65

	Community health workers	7	4, 5, 7, 21, 23, 39, 67
	Physicians	6	14, 15, 43, 64, 66, 68
	Healthcare professionals	3	6, 22, 34
	Clinical staff	2	30, 58
	Frontline health workers	2	9, 56
	Health social workers	2	17, 43
	Healthcare personnel	2	10, 38
	Healthcare students	2	41, 51
	Midwives	2	27, 36
	Adult treatment team members	1	43
	Doctors	1	57
	Healthcare assistant	1	59
	Healthcare providers	1	45
	Healthcare workers	1	63
	Hospitalists	1	50
	Neonatal Intensive Care Unit team	1	49
	Nephrologists	1	44
	Primary health worker	1	11
	Psychologists	1	35
	Volunteer community caregivers	1	1
	<hr/>		
Non-clinical staff	Supervisors	1	2
	Technicians	1	65
	Disability support worker	1	29

420

421 Healthcare staff worked in a range of settings, categorised as clinical (primarily provides a health-related
422 medical function) and non-clinical (primary purpose is not to provide a direct health-related medical function).

423 Most studies considered clinical settings (n = 74) (Table 7). Two included papers did not explicitly state the
424 setting (53, 54).

425 **Table 7 - Feedback settings of positive feedback delivery in included studies in order of quantity**

426 Multiple papers from the same study were counted separately only if the setting differed between papers

Setting category	Feedback setting	Quantity	Study ID(s)
Clinical setting	Hospitals	27	8, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 60, 62, 65, 68
	Oncology	6	8, 19, 30, 41, 43, 47
	Emergency department	4	13, 17, 19, 31
	Clinics	3	16, 32, 38
	General Practice (GP)	3	7, 25, 59
	Health centres	3	18, 45, 58
	Intensive care	3	28, 49, 52
	Maternal care	3	17, 25, 31
	Medical surgery	3	31, 47, 65
	Nursing homes	3	10, 41, 51
	Primary care	3	11, 15, 34
	Ambulatory care	2	8, 31
	Hospices	2	17, 41
	Covid-19 unit	1	51
	Critical care	1	31
	Family health units	1	24
	Palliative care	1	6

	Private practice	1	35
	Renal department	1	44
	Reproductive health services	1	27
	Sexual violence services	1	48
	Transplant coordination	1	22
Non-clinical setting	Community (including home-based care and faith-based organisations)	19	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26, 39, 41, 53, 64, 67
	University	3	28, 35, 66
	Disability services	1	29
	School-based	1	17
	Telephone services	1	61

427

428 Objective 1: Measures of change

429 There was a considerable variation in the outcome domains and measures used in studies (n = 11) (Table 8).

430 The remaining 57 studies did not include a standardised outcome measure. A measure was concluded to be

431 standardised if a citable reference was available.

432 **Table 8 – Outcome domains and outcome measures used in included studies**

Outcome domain	Standardised outcome measure	Quantity	Study ID(s)
Attitudes towards caring for dying patients	Frommelt Attitudes Toward Care of the Dying scale, form B, Japanese version (FATCOD B-J)	1	53
Attitudes towards death	The Death Attitude Inventory (DAI)	1	53
Baseline affective states	Short Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)	1	57
Beliefs, attitudes, experiences of gifts	Scale of Attitudes and Behaviors toward Gifts in Psychotherapy (SABGP)	1	35
Burnout	Maslach Burnout Inventory	2	50, 68
Burnout	Maslach Burnout Inventory for Human Service Sector	1	19
Completion of clinical/non-clinical tasks	MEASURE Evaluation's Quick Investigation of Quality (QIQ) tool	1	27
Engagement at work	Gallup Worker Engagement Survey	2	50, 65
Experiences, understandings, meanings	Nursing Practice in Rural and Remote Canada II (RRNII)	1	33
Illegitimate tasks	Bern Illegitimate Tasks Scale	1	37
Job satisfaction	Job Enjoyment Scale	1	65
Patient behaviour as a psychological resource	Customer-initiated support scale	1	19
Patient satisfaction	Hospital Consumer Assessment of Health Plans Survey (HCAHPS)	1	65
Perception of service user gratitude	PGRate scale	1	19
Psychological demands	Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) subscales	1	19
Resilience	Abbreviated 2 item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC 2)	1	56
Resilience	Abbreviated Impact of Event Scale (IES-6)	1	56
Resilience	Abbreviated Maslach Burnout Inventory (AMBI)	1	56
Resilience	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)	1	56
Resilience	The Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD-7)	1	56

433 **Objective 2: Model development**

434 *Outcomes*

435 All identified outcomes were reported as change for healthcare staff. Three papers reported a change in the
436 therapeutic staff-service user relationship rather than the healthcare staff individually, listed under the
437 category most relevant to reported outcomes. Outcomes reporting a change in staff-service user relationships
438 describe a strengthened therapeutic alliance (55-57). Most papers identified helpful changes to healthcare
439 staff and services (Table 9).

440 **Table 9 – Helpful outcomes identified in included studies, arranged by higher-level category and sub-category**

441 Multiple papers from the same study were counted separately only if reporting different outcomes. Some
442 outcomes were described ambiguously in their original papers and therefore included in, but not expanded on,
443 in the table.

444

Higher category	Outcomes	Study ID(s)
Short-term emotional change for healthcare workers	Boosted confidence	40, 41, 65
	Boosted morale	38, 65
	Confirmation of doing good work	16, 18, 25, 28, 33, 41, 42, 50, 58, 62
	Coping resource at work	55
	Enthusiasm for the job	54
	Experience of having a good day	50, 60
	Feeling comfortable in their job	65
	Feeling empowered	7
	Feeling encouraged	5, 11, 28, 42, 45, 54, 55
	Feeling engaged	50
	Feeling fulfilled	6, 39
	Feeling good	38, 40, 41, 48, 51, 65
	Feeling happy	10, 24, 29, 38, 39, 55
	Feeling honoured to serve their community	33
	Feeling inspired	1, 54
	Feeling positive about work	51, 53, 63
	Feeling proud of work	2, 6
	Feeling rewarded	1, 6, 20, 24, 29, 40, 43, 44, 45, 54, 55, 59, 62
	Feeling successful	10
	Feeling supported	7
Feeling valued	2, 7, 36, 55, 58, 63	
Feelings of hope	26	
Feelings of love for work	30	
Feeling that the reciprocal respect between service user and healthcare worker is fulfilled	52	
Increased individual energy at work	30, 58	
Increased gratification	22, 33, 48, 68	
Increased gratitude of healthcare workers	6, 55	

	Increased motivation at work	2, 5, 6, 11, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 32, 37, 38, 39, 42, 46, 47, 54, 55, 65, 67
	Increased personal satisfaction	51, 58
	Increased psychological wellbeing	6, 7, 36, 56, 58
	Increased sense of achievement	45
	Greater self-reflection about practice	6
	Source of strength/support during difficult times	6, 28, 68
Work-home interactional change for healthcare workers	Improved familial satisfaction for spouses of healthcare workers	57
	Improved work-home relationship	57
Work-related change for healthcare workers	Created a positive work environment	61
	Improved communication with service users	32
	Improved team diagnostic and procedural performance	49
	Increased commitment to work	28, 31, 54, 55
	Increased connection to service users and families	50, 68
	Increased intention to refer to a service being positively evaluated	15
	Increased sense of doing meaningful work	16, 24, 45, 50
	Increased staff retention	3, 6, 8, 9, 14, 38, 63, 64
	Increased work-related activity	4
	Increased work-related satisfaction	1, 6, 9, 13, 17, 20, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63
	Reduced burnout	6, 19, 56
	Reduced perception that assigned tasks are avoidable or outside of job role responsibility	37
Strengthened therapeutic alliance	35	

445

446 Some papers identified undesirable changes (Table 10).

447 **Table 10 - Undesirable changes for healthcare staff identified in included studies**

Change category	Sub-category	Study ID(s)
Short-term emotional change for healthcare workers	Feeling embarrassed when being delivered feedback from tutors	41
	Feelings of envy and stress when not rewarded with positive feedback	55
	Feelings of guilt after accepting a gift	35
	Feelings of tension and pressure to meet philanthropic service user expectations	66

448

449 One change was identified which could be viewed as both helpful and undesirable. An altered responsiveness

450 to grateful service users who give philanthropic gifts could be viewed as helpful as responding more quickly to

451 those giving gifts may increase the likelihood of future donations (56). However, altered responsiveness may
452 undermine the professional relationship between staff and service-users and result in a decreased
453 responsiveness to those not giving gifts.

454 *Mechanisms*

455 A mechanism is a process by which positive feedback causes change. Mechanisms identified in included
456 studies are in Table 11.

457 **Table 11** – *Mechanisms identified as cause of change in included studies*

Mechanism	Study ID(s)
Construction of professional identity as a 'helping professional'	17
Intensified prosocial behaviour of staff at work	49
Protective resource against trauma involving service users at work	36
Relationship shift between staff and service user after gift-giving	66
Staff self-reflection about their practice	41
Validation of staff role and performance	8, 17, 30

458 *Moderators, facilitators, and barriers*

459 Factors were identified which can alter the degree of change following positive feedback. Some factors
460 enhanced the effect of positive feedback (Table 12).

461 **Table 12** – *Factors enhancing the effect of positive feedback in included studies*

462 Type of factor refers to facilitators [F], or moderators [M].

Higher-category factors enhancing change	Sub-factors enhancing change	Study ID(s)	Type of factor [F/M]	
Nature of healthcare role	Staff work in the oncology department	19, 43, 47	F	
	Psychological demands of healthcare role are manageable	19	M	
	Staff are confident using Personal Protective Equipment	56	F	
	Nature of individual experience of healthcare system	Staff are enthusiastic about feedback system	65	F
Nature of individual experience of healthcare system	Staff are confident when asking for feedback	41	F	
	Staff perceive events positively	68	F	
	Staff have previous experience of working in an environment focussing on negative feedback	41	F	
	Staff having strong occupational identity	57	M	
	Staff value service users as the source of positive feedback	37, 49	F	
	Nature of feedback	Positive feedback is received frequently	6	F
		Feedback given is genuine and central to staff identity within their role	49	F

463

464 Some studies also identified barriers to change, where the effect of positive feedback was hindered (Table 13).

465 **Table 13** – *Factors hindering the effect of positive feedback in included studies*

Higher-category factors hindering change	Sub-factors hindering change	Study ID(s)
Nature of healthcare role	Staff receive positive feedback as a result of other absent medical staff who have delegated tasks; dissatisfaction overshadows positive effect of feedback	20
	Being a nurse compared to being a doctor associated with reduced positive beliefs about community appreciation	56
	Staff experience negative stigma faced during the Covid-19 pandemic as 'plague spreaders'	26
	Staff have less opportunity to gain feedback (e.g., night-shift staff)	65
	Staff work in the medical-surgical department	47
Nature of individual experience of healthcare system	Staff experience confidence issues when requesting feedback from service users	41
	Staff are not enthusiastic about feedback system	65
	Staff feel burdensome when asking for feedback from those who have received bad news	41
Nature of feedback	Feedback system is time-consuming	65
	Feedback is not consistently given	32

466

467 Three studies described working in oncology as enhancing the effects of positive feedback. One study

468 described having increased intimacy and closeness with oncology service users, facilitating feelings of reward

469 and satisfaction (58). Another described how working in oncology felt more worthwhile and like a gift, with

470 service users expressing deep appreciation which is not seen in other wards. In comparison, working in a

471 medical-surgical unit can feel robotic (59).

472 One study described how working in oncology had fewer psychological demands (60). The psychological

473 demands of the healthcare role impacted the degree of change between service user gratitude and burnout.

474 Emergency units were perceived to have higher psychological demands than oncology wards, due to work

475 shifts, workloads, and the shorter, more superficial relationships with service users. For emergency nurses,

476 personal accomplishment as a mediator of burnout diminished with increased psychological demands. In

477 contrast, oncology nurses had higher perceptions of service user gratitude and higher personal

478 accomplishment. The institutional context may influence the extent to which staff members are able to

479 encounter and engage with positive feedback.

480 Occupational identity was also identified in another study as factor enhancing the effect of service user
481 gratitude, with changes to energy within relationships, spousal family satisfaction, and relationship-based
482 family performance (61). Receiving service user gratitude improved healthcare staff's home environment, and
483 this was amplified when staff strongly identified with their role.

484 In one study, appreciation reduced the relationship between intrinsic motivation (a type of motivation that is
485 based on inherent pleasure or passion, rather than extrinsic rewards such as money or fame) and the
486 perception of illegitimate tasks (62). Illegitimate tasks were unnecessary (tasks that could have been avoided
487 with better organisation) or unreasonable (tasks that were not the responsibility of that staff member).
488 Motivated staff perceived a higher number of unnecessary tasks being assigned to them, but appreciation
489 from service users reduced this relationship.

490 *Mediators*

491 A mediator is a factor which is essential in the change process and must be in place for change to occur. In the
492 study by Riskin et al (2019), team information sharing partially mediated the impact of gratitude (63). In a
493 study by Tang et al (2021) energy within relationships mediated the effect of service user gratitude and
494 spousal family satisfaction (95% CI = 0.007 to 0.042; $P = .02$) and relationship-based family role performance
495 (95% CI = 0.010 to 0.054; $P = .03$) (61). Receiving gratitude from service users acts as an energy resource within
496 relationships, which healthcare staff are then able to utilise in the family domain. As a result, increased
497 relational energy led to increased familial satisfaction.

498 **Change model**

499 Forms of change are summarised in a model presented in Fig 2, which extends a preliminary model from a
500 prior review (37).

501 **Fig 2.** *How positive feedback from service users, families, and communities can create change in healthcare*
502 *settings conceptualised in a change model*

503 Listed factors are not exhaustive.

504 **Subgroup analyses**

505 *Quality assessment*

506 Only one study (reported on in two papers) did not meet the 60% threshold for quality assessment due to a
507 lack of a clear research question (50, 64). Findings from this study were not consequential to the change model
508 due to these being reinforced by other studies (50).

509 *Studies conducted in a mostly public versus mostly private healthcare system*

510 One difference between studies conducted in a mostly public healthcare system (UK) and mostly private
511 healthcare systems (US) was the type of positive feedback provided. All UK studies described ambiguous types
512 of positive feedback. While many US studies also described ambiguous feedback, two described material
513 feedback in the form of cards, flowers, and gifts (56, 65). One undesirable change was identified in both UK
514 and US studies. In the UK, research identified that students feel embarrassed when receiving positive feedback
515 from feedback forms via tutors (66), whereas in the US, tension and pressure surrounding the service user-
516 professional relationship was identified after gift-giving (56).

517 **Discussion**

518 **Summary of findings**

519 The review included a broad range of papers presenting evidence that change can be created in health services
520 using positive patient feedback. The largest body of evidence relates to beneficial short-term emotional
521 changes experienced by healthcare workers as the result of receiving feedback, such as feeling more hopeful
522 and motivated, and to beneficial work-related change (such as increased retention and reduced burnout).
523 Beneficial changes to the home environment were also documented. A small number of undesirable changes
524 were identified. These included feeling embarrassed when receiving feedback, feeling envy and stress when
525 not rewarded with positive feedback, and feeling guilt, tension, and pressure when accepting gifts. Tensions
526 surrounding service user gift-giving may arise due to health professionals being restricted to only accepting
527 'trivial' gifts, which may create uncertainty in staff regarding boundaries due to vague definitions (67). The
528 type of gift (such as those marking an occasion, inexpensive, or 'over the top') and recipient (such as individual
529 staff or donation to the service) may influence staff reactions. Gifts which fail to align with ethical practice,
530 such as 'over the top' displays of gratitude, may be more likely to produce undesirable change (68).
531 Importantly, only two intervention studies were identified (63, 65), and neither quantified effect in a real-
532 world healthcare setting. This means that no evidence on the size of effect produced by positive feedback was

533 available. This points to a substantial gap in knowledge which might be addressed by future research studies. A
534 broad range of measures were used in quantitative studies, suggesting a lack of consensus in the research
535 community on the most important constructs to consider, and how to assess them. Most work has been
536 conducted within the last 10 years, which potentially relates to the widespread emergence of technological
537 solutions to the collection and distribution of feedback, creating the potential for new forms of intervention.
538 The current review has identified factors which enhance or hinder the creation of change through feedback.
539 Some of these factors relate directly to the nature of specific healthcare roles and professions. For example,
540 change was enhanced if feedback recipients worked in roles which allow more meaningful interaction with
541 service users, and hindered for feedback recipients working night shifts and hence potentially having less
542 direct contact with patients. This suggests that positive feedback may not be an accurate measure for
543 assessing quality of care as some staff are not given the opportunity to influence and receive feedback. It is
544 unlikely that feedback will be equally received by staff across services due to their varying nature with the
545 implementation of a single feedback system. Tailoring feedback systems to the settings and contexts in which
546 staff work may be beneficial to ensure similar opportunities to receive feedback but understanding the
547 fundamental differences between services is crucial when assessing quality improvement priorities.

548 **Relationship to prior work**

549 The current review extends a previous systematised review which investigated how expressions of service user
550 gratitude creates change in healthcare services (37). Due to the current review having a mostly broader focus,
551 68 papers were included compared to 26 papers in the previous review, and this has resulted in a broader
552 range of short-term emotional benefits and undesirable impacts being identified.

553 In a scoping review investigating service user gratitude in healthcare, receiving gratitude was found to enhance
554 healthcare worker wellbeing, act as a positive force against stress, increase motivation, increase reciprocated
555 gratitude, and reduce burnout (35). Aparicio and colleagues identified 32 includable papers, only two of which
556 were included in the current review (59, 60). Despite a lack of cross-over in included studies due to differences
557 in inclusion criteria, the findings remain consistent. For instance, gratitude acting as a positive force against
558 distress is also seen in the current review, categorised as increased psychological wellbeing and a protective

559 force against trauma. The methodology of the current review builds on the scoping review by examining
560 literature systematically, in line with MRC recommendations (38).

561 The benefits of positive feedback identified in this review may be particularly relevant for the occupational
562 health of healthcare staff. For example, the number of nurses leaving the profession rose in 2021 by 25% (69),
563 with increased workload leading to higher levels of burnout (70). Healthcare workers have been found to have
564 high levels of intrinsic motivation, where motivation to perform well is a product of inner drives. This was
565 particularly evident in permanent healthcare staff (71). Validation of having done good work may therefore be
566 positively reinforced with positive feedback and be of greater value than for those who are extrinsically
567 motivated by factors such as financial reward or promotion (72). Increased intrinsic motivation may boost
568 affective commitment and lead to reduced turnover intention among healthcare staff (73). Similarly, finding
569 intrinsic meaning in their work was helpful for healthcare workers in Japan to cope during the Covid pandemic
570 (24)). Self-determination theory also suggests that intrinsic motivation can assist with the development of
571 professional identity for healthcare staff (74).

572 Shifting healthcare staff attitudes surrounding service user feedback may be essential for implementing
573 meaningful change which utilises positive feedback due to the belief that feedback is largely negative (13). The
574 Lewin Change model describes three steps for creating change (75), starting with 'unfreezing' whereby a shift
575 away from current beliefs is initiated through challenging defensiveness towards change and dismantling
576 current views. This may be possible through exposure to positive feedback. The second stage is 'movement'
577 which describes a change occurring, such as beneficial outcomes as a result of positive feedback. The third
578 stage is 'refreezing' which describes a replacement of old views and processes with new ones, which begins to
579 normalise the new methods of operating. For positive feedback in healthcare, this may reflect system-level
580 change such as policy implementation.

581 However, this model may be limited to healthcare staff's willingness to engage with positive feedback. The
582 idea of a 'learning organisation' was introduced by Senge, who described a group of people continually
583 working to enhance their capacities and create results that they want (76). A learning organisation describes
584 one which is not operating as a machine, but rather a humanistic never-ending process of development and
585 learning. Adapted for healthcare settings, learning organisations have five disciplines (77). 'Open systems
586 thinking' describes services being viewed as a whole rather than isolated by disease, procedures, or structures,

587 and aims to create interconnectedness beyond departmental boundaries. ‘Improving individual capabilities’
588 describes striving for excellence by improving personal proficiencies of staff. ‘Team learning’ describes learning
589 as a collective rather than via single professionals. ‘Updating mental models’ describes updating the deeply
590 held assumptions and generalisations held by individuals within the organisation and finding new ways of
591 operating. Finally, ‘a cohesive vision’ describes empowering and enabling staff being counterbalanced by
592 strategic direction and clear values to guide individual action to produce shared understanding. Healthcare
593 systems have identified that being a ‘learning organisation’ encourages a culture celebrating innovation and
594 success (77). Positive feedback may offer a means for learning organisations to create a cultural shift towards
595 valuing positive service user experiences rather than focussing solely on negative incidents and risk reduction.

596 **Strengths and limitations**

597 A strength of the review is that a broad range of publications databases was searched, including a database
598 specific to computing publications and rarely used in systematic reviews, which is important when feedback is
599 routinely collected through technological means. Compared to the prior narrower review, broader inclusion
600 criteria have enabled the inclusion of papers describing changes to healthcare systems, enabling the
601 identification of changes such as increased referral intentions following positive feedback from service users
602 about a particular service (78). The addition of search terms such as ‘positive feedback’ and ‘positive
603 evaluation’ have enabled new forms of change to be identified, such as non-clinical staff benefiting from
604 positive feedback as well as those in clinical roles. A strength of the review is that inclusion criteria were
605 carefully designed to exclude papers where there was ambiguity about the source of feedback or the direction
606 of change, meaning that studies were excluded where causality was uncertain, such as in studies using
607 correlation analyses (79). This has provided a solid foundation to develop a change model.

608 Another strength of the review is that it was inclusive of studies which were conducted in non-WEIRD
609 (western, educated, industrialised, rich, and democratic) countries, despite being limited to papers published
610 in English. For example, included studies reflected healthcare systems in eight African regions. Although
611 emotional expressions differ across cultures (15), positive feedback was deemed helpful to healthcare
612 organisational outcomes. Findings were robust across studies despite differing locations and healthcare
613 systems, reinforcing the value of positive feedback.

614 A limitation of the review is that the definition of positive feedback is not straightforward. A subgroup analysis
615 was planned for documents which identify change through expressions of healthcare service user gratitude
616 specifically. Ambiguity in the distinction between positive feedback and gratitude definitions meant that the
617 subgroup analysis could not be performed. Medical definitions of positive feedback describe the body being
618 amplified from its normal state (80), but this review did not include positive physical or medical signals from
619 service users. However, seeing a patient improve was described in some studies as a form of positive feedback
620 (81). Physiological markers may not reflect positive healthcare experiences and would not reflect quality of
621 care given by palliative care teams. Further, service user gratitude was seen to create change for other service
622 users (20), but this was excluded as it could not be considered a change for healthcare staff or systems.
623 Furthermore, positive feedback was defined as a response from healthcare service users, families or the
624 community indicating concordance between desired and actual experiences regarding their care or treatment,
625 delivered to healthcare staff or systems. However, the assumption was made that positive feedback was
626 expressed with the intention of communicating this concordance between desired and actual care, but other
627 contextual and motivating factors may have existed, such as feeling obligated to give positive responses when
628 asked for feedback in person (82), service users attempting to influence their future care and treatment and
629 prevent punitive treatment for negative feedback (20), and social norms surrounding expressions of thanks
630 which may be expressed habitually (83).

631 **Implications of the review and change model**

632 *Implications for practice*

633 Managers of health service units seeking to address problems such as staff burnout or low motivation should
634 consider the integration of mechanisms for making positive feedback available to staff members and should
635 seek to identify barriers to the use of positive feedback in their units. Health service managers in units already
636 making use of positive feedback should examine whether particular staff groups are disadvantaged, for
637 example if working in circumstances that make the provision of positive feedback more difficult, or increasing
638 exposure of positive feedback to individuals from minority ethnic backgrounds who may be more likely to
639 receive complaints (84). Policymakers should consider adopting policies that encourage the collection and
640 distribution of positive feedback. Requirements of healthcare professional bodies to make use of feedback in

641 reflective practice might be used to motivate change, though it is unclear whether this phenomenon extends
642 beyond the UK. This may also exclude individuals whose roles do not require professional registration.
643 Integrating positive feedback from service users, families, or communities into standard clinical supervision
644 rather than formal requirements may create an attitudinal shift away from revalidation scepticism to become
645 an essential part of practice (28). Effective clinical supervision can prevent burnout (85), and positive feedback
646 may enhance these benefits.

647 *Implications for research*

648 There is a need for the research community to conduct and replicate intervention studies of precisely
649 designed feedback interventions, ideally in the form of randomised controlled trials designed to collect
650 evidence on effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. The research community should seek to reach consensus on
651 the most important measures to be assessed in trials, to enable meta-analyses pooling findings from multiple
652 trials to be conducted. Future research may investigate the effects of positive feedback depending on
653 healthcare role, comparing those who have consistent access to feedback (such as oncology staff) (59), to
654 those who feel overlooked and undervalued (such as healthcare assistants) (86). Future research may
655 investigate the effects of positive feedback at multiple levels of the organisation, such as individual impacts
656 like resilience, and organisational culture and system-level change, and whether the effect of positive feedback
657 changes depending on individual or team receipt.

658 The research community should also aim to investigate the influence of feedback content and form in eliciting
659 change and whether content has practical utility. Examples include whether content of feedback is meaningful
660 to staff, and if relationships with service users are more significant than numerical indicators of satisfaction.
661 Feedback with specific utility, such as an appointment being 'on time', may also produce differing effects to
662 interpersonal emotional connections. This may assist with the development of a typology to characterise
663 feedback and assist with understanding whether positive feedback should be used and delivered universally.
664 Research may also benefit from being co-designed with healthcare workers with practical knowledge to
665 enhance the functional integration of findings into clinical practice.

666 Conclusions

667 Positive feedback from service users, families, and the community can lead to meaningful change. Change is
668 largely positive, with emotional, familial, and work-related change being recognised. However, some
669 undesirable changes were identified in relation to healthcare staff emotions. Overall, positive feedback
670 provides the opportunity to create meaningful change but requires further interventional investigation.

671 Acknowledgements

672 For the purposes of open access, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to any author
673 accepted manuscript version arising from this submission

674 References

- 675 1. Ramani S, Könings KD, Ginsburg S, van der Vleuten CPM. Feedback Redefined: Principles and Practice.
676 *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2019;34(5):744-9.
- 677 2. Hardavella G, Aamli-Gagnat A, Saad N, Rousalova I, Sreter KB. How to give and receive feedback
678 effectively. *Breathe*. 2017;13(4):327-33.
- 679 3. Barello S, Graffigna G, Vegni E. Patient Engagement as an Emerging Challenge for Healthcare Services:
680 Mapping the Literature. *Nursing Research and Practice*. 2012;2012:905934.
- 681 4. Locock L, Graham C, King J, Parkin S, Chisholm A, Montgomery C, et al. Understanding how front-line
682 staff use patient experience data for service improvement: an exploratory case study evaluation. 2020;8:13.
- 683 5. Coulter A, Locock L, Ziebland S, Calabrese J. Collecting data on patient experience is not enough: they
684 must be used to improve care. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2014;348:g2225.
- 685 6. Brookes G, Baker P. What does patient feedback reveal about the NHS? A mixed methods study of
686 comments posted to the NHS Choices online service. *BMJ open*. 2017;7(4):e013821.
- 687 7. Stahl K, Groene O. ASK ME!—Routine measurement of patient experience with patient safety in
688 ambulatory care: A mixed-mode survey. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16(12):e0259252.
- 689 8. Marsh C, Peacock R, Sheard L, Hughes L, Lawton R. Patient experience feedback in UK hospitals: What
690 types are available and what are their potential roles in quality improvement (QI)? *Health Expectations*.
691 2019;22(3):317-26.
- 692 9. Maxwell E, Lamont T. Improving care by using patient feedback. 2019.
- 693 10. Capozzi JD, Rhodes R. Gifts from Patients. *JBJS*. 2004;86(10).
- 694 11. Gillespie A, Reader TW. Identifying and encouraging high-quality healthcare: an analysis of the
695 content and aims of patient letters of compliment. *BMJ quality & safety*. 2021;30(6):484-92.
- 696 12. James TL, Villacis Calderon ED, Cook DF. Exploring patient perceptions of healthcare service quality
697 through analysis of unstructured feedback. *Expert Systems with Applications*. 2017;71:479-92.
- 698 13. Powell J, Atherton H, Williams V, Mazanderani F, Dudhwala F, Woolgar S, et al. Using online patient
699 feedback to improve NHS services: the INQUIRE multimethod study. *Health Services and Delivery Research*.
700 2019;7(38).
- 701 14. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk B, Wilson PA. Expressive and reserved cultural linguistic schemas: British
702 and American pride clusters. *Cultural linguistics and world Englishes*: Springer; 2021. p. 261-93.
- 703 15. Lim N. Cultural differences in emotion: differences in emotional arousal level between the East and
704 the West. *Integrative medicine research*. 2016;5(2):105-9.
- 705 16. Maxwell E. Patient feedback: how effectively is it collected and used. *Nurs Times*. 2020;116(12):27-9.
- 706 17. Emmons RA, McNamara P. Sacred emotions and affective neuroscience: Gratitude, costly signaling,
707 and the brain. Where God and science meet: How brain and evolutionary studies alter our understanding of
708 religion. 2006;1:11-31.
- 709 18. Aparicio M, Centeno C, Carrasco JM, Barbosa A, Arantzamendi M. What are families most grateful for
710 after receiving palliative care? Content analysis of written documents received: a chance to improve the
711 quality of care. *BMC palliative care*. 2017;16(1):1-11.

- 712 19. Day G, Robert G, Leedham-Green K, Rafferty AM. An outbreak of appreciation: A discursive analysis of
713 tweets of gratitude expressed to the National Health Service at the outset of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health*
714 *Expectations*. 2022;25(1):149-62.
- 715 20. Campbell C, Scott K, Skovdal M, Madanhire C, Nyamukapa C, Gregson S. A good patient? How notions
716 of 'a good patient' affect patient-nurse relationships and ART adherence in Zimbabwe. *BMC infectious*
717 *diseases*. 2015;15:404.
- 718 21. The Point of Care Foundation. Case study 1: Oxleas Mental Health Trust 2022 [Available from:
719 [https://www.pointofcarefoundation.org.uk/resource/experience-based-co-design-ebcd-toolkit/case-](https://www.pointofcarefoundation.org.uk/resource/experience-based-co-design-ebcd-toolkit/case-studies/case-study-1-oxleas-mental-health-trust/)
720 [studies/case-study-1-oxleas-mental-health-trust/](https://www.pointofcarefoundation.org.uk/resource/experience-based-co-design-ebcd-toolkit/case-studies/case-study-1-oxleas-mental-health-trust/)].
- 721 22. NHS England. Friends and Family Test 2022 [Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/fft/>].
- 722 23. NHS England. Using the Friends and Family Test to gain insight on the trust's response to the
723 pandemic: NHS England; 2022 [Available from: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/fft/case-studies/using-the-fft-to-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/fft/case-studies/using-the-fft-to-gain-insight-on-the-trusts-response-to-the-pandemic/)
724 [gain-insight-on-the-trusts-response-to-the-pandemic/](https://www.england.nhs.uk/fft/case-studies/using-the-fft-to-gain-insight-on-the-trusts-response-to-the-pandemic/)].
- 725 24. Kotera Y, Ozaki A, Miyatake H, Tsunetoshi C, Nishikawa Y, Kosaka M, et al. Qualitative Investigation
726 into the mental health of healthcare workers in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of*
727 *environmental research and public health*. 2022;19(1):568.
- 728 25. Nursing & Midwifery Council. Revalidation 2021 [Available from:
729 <https://www.nmc.org.uk/revalidation/>].
- 730 26. General Medical Council. Your supporting information – feedback from patients or those you provide
731 medical services to 2022 [Available from: [https://www.gmc-uk.org/registration-and-licensing/managing-your-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/registration-and-licensing/managing-your-registration/revalidation/guidance-on-supporting-information-for-appraisal-and-revalidation/your-supporting-information---feedback-from-patients-or-those-to-whom-you-provide-medical-services)
732 [registration/revalidation/guidance-on-supporting-information-for-appraisal-and-revalidation/your-supporting-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/registration-and-licensing/managing-your-registration/revalidation/guidance-on-supporting-information-for-appraisal-and-revalidation/your-supporting-information---feedback-from-patients-or-those-to-whom-you-provide-medical-services)
733 [information---feedback-from-patients-or-those-to-whom-you-provide-medical-services](https://www.gmc-uk.org/registration-and-licensing/managing-your-registration/revalidation/guidance-on-supporting-information-for-appraisal-and-revalidation/your-supporting-information---feedback-from-patients-or-those-to-whom-you-provide-medical-services)].
- 734 27. Health & Care Professionals Council. Standards of continuing professional development 2018
735 [Available from: <https://www.hcpc-uk.org/standards/standards-of-continuing-professional-development/>].
- 736 28. Tazzyman A, Ferguson J, Hillier C, Boyd A, Tredinnick-Rowe J, Archer J, et al. The implementation of
737 medical revalidation: an assessment using normalisation process theory. *BMC Health Services Research*.
738 2017;17(1):749.
- 739 29. Griffiths A, Leaver MP. Wisdom of patients: predicting the quality of care using aggregated patient
740 feedback. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2018;27(2):110.
- 741 30. NHS Improving Quality. Five steps towards quality improvement: A simple guide to improving
742 services. 2014.
- 743 31. Wensing M, Vingerhoets E, Grol R. Feedback based on patient evaluations: a tool for quality
744 improvement? *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2003;51(2):149-53.
- 745 32. Ramsey LP, Sheard L, Lawton R, O'Hara J. How do healthcare staff respond to patient experience
746 feedback online? A typology of responses published on care opinion. *Patient Experience Journal*. 2019;6(2):42-
747 50.
- 748 33. Donetto S, Desai A, Zoccatelli G, Robert G, Allen D, Brearley S, et al. Organisational strategies and
749 practices to improve care using patient experience data in acute NHS hospital trusts: an ethnographic study.
750 2019;7:34.
- 751 34. Day G. Enhancing relational care through expressions of gratitude: insights from a historical case
752 study of almoner–patient correspondence. *Medical Humanities*. 2020;46(3):288.
- 753 35. Aparicio M, Centeno C, Robinson C, Arantzamendi M. Gratitude between patients and their families
754 and health professionals: A scoping review. *Journal of Nursing Management*. 2019;27(2):286-300.
- 755 36. Day G, Robert G, Rafferty AM. Gratitude in health care: A meta-narrative review. *Qualitative health*
756 *research*. 2020;30(14):2303-15.
- 757 37. Lloyd R, Rennick-Egglestone S. A systematic review investigating how expressions of patient gratitude
758 can create change in healthcare settings [Protocol Registration]. National Institute for Health Research.
759 2021;PROSPERO 2021 CRD42021265334. .
- 760 38. Craig P, Dieppe P, MacIntyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex
761 interventions 2019 [Available from: www.mrc.ac.uk/complexinterventionsguidance].
- 762 39. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020
763 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Systematic reviews*. 2021;10(1):1-11.
- 764 40. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Rodgers M, et al. Guidance on the conduct of
765 narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A product from the ESRC methods programme Version.
766 2006;1(1):b92.


- 767 41. Methley AM, Campbell S, Chew-Graham C, McNally R, Cheraghi-Sohi S. PICO, PICOS and SPIDER: a
768 comparison study of specificity and sensitivity in three search tools for qualitative systematic reviews. *BMC*
769 *health services research*. 2014;14(1):1-10.
- 770 42. The DAISY Foundation. What is The DAISY Award? 2022 [Available from:
771 <https://www.daisyfoundation.org/daisy-award>.
- 772 43. Trajkovski S, Schmied V, Vickers M, Jackson D. Using appreciative inquiry to transform health care.
773 *Contemporary nurse*. 2013;45(1):95-100.
- 774 44. Cox CL. 'Healthcare Heroes': problems with media focus on heroism from healthcare workers during
775 the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 2020;46(8):510.
- 776 45. The EndNote Team. EndNote. EndNote X9 ed. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate; 2013.
- 777 46. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research:
778 Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. 1986;51:1173-82.
- 779 47. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed Methods
780 Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for information*.
781 2018;34(4):285-91.
- 782 48. Zulu JM, Kinsman J, Michelo C, Hurtig A-K. Hope and despair: community health assistants'
783 experiences of working in a rural district in Zambia. *Human resources for health*. 2014;12:30.
- 784 49. Zulu JM, Michelo C, Kinsman J, Hurtig A-K. 1/3. Hope and despair: the community health assistant role
785 in Zambia. *British Journal of Healthcare Assistants*. 2015;9(9):458-65.
- 786 50. Kelly D, Lankshear A, Wiseman T, Jahn P, Mall-Roosmae H, Rannus K, et al. The experiences of cancer
787 nurses working in four European countries: A qualitative study. *European journal of oncology nursing : the*
788 *official journal of European Oncology Nursing Society*. 2020;49:101844.
- 789 51. Prytherch H, Kagoné M, Aninanya GA, Williams JE, Kakoko DC, Leshabari MT, et al. Motivation and
790 incentives of rural maternal and neonatal health care providers: a comparison of qualitative findings from
791 Burkina Faso, Ghana and Tanzania. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2013;13(1):149-.
- 792 52. Danet AD, Jimenez Cardoso PM, Perez Villares JM. Emotional paths of professional experiences in
793 transplant coordinators. *Rutas emocionales en las experiencias profesionales de los equipos de coordinacion*
794 *de trasplantes*. 2020;40(1):74-90.
- 795 53. MacLeod MLP, Zimmer LV, Kosteniuk JG, Penz KL, Stewart NJ. The meaning of nursing practice for
796 nurses who are retired yet continue to work in a rural or remote community. *BMC Nursing*. 2021;20(1):1-13.
- 797 54. Warburton J, Moore ML, Clune SJ, Hodgkin SP. Extrinsic and intrinsic factors impacting on the
798 retention of older rural healthcare workers in the north Victorian public sector: a qualitative study. *Rural and*
799 *Remote Health*. 2014;14(3):[131]-[46].
- 800 55. Martinez-Taboas A, Cordero-Soto MM, Davila T, Oben A, Pujals K, Medina M, et al. Gifts in
801 psychotherapy: Attitudes and experiences of Puerto Rican psychotherapists. *Revista Puertorriquena de*
802 *Psicologia*. 2014;25(2):328-39.
- 803 56. Wright SM, Wolfe L, Stewart R, Flynn JA, Paisner R, Rum S, et al. Ethical concerns related to grateful
804 patient philanthropy: The physician's perspective. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2013;28(5):645-51.
- 805 57. Zwack J, Schweitzer J. If every fifth physician is affected by burnout, what about the other four?
806 Resilience strategies of experienced physicians. *Academic Medicine*. 2013;88(3):382-9.
- 807 58. Peteet JR, Ross DM, Medeiros C, Walsh-Burke K, et al. Relationships with patients in oncology: Can a
808 clinician be a friend? *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*. 1992;55(3):223-9.
- 809 59. Raingruber B, Wolf T. Nurse perspectives regarding the meaningfulness of oncology nursing practice.
810 2015(1538-067X (Electronic)).
- 811 60. Converso D, Loera B, Viotti S, Martini M. Do positive relations with patients play a protective role for
812 healthcare employees? Effects of patients' gratitude and support on nurses' burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
813 2015;6.
- 814 61. Tang PM, Ilies R, Aw SS, Lin KJ, Lee R, Trombini C. How and when service beneficiaries' gratitude
815 enriches employees' daily lives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2021.
- 816 62. Muntz J, Dormann C. Moderating effects of appreciation on relationships between illegitimate tasks
817 and intrinsic motivation: A two-wave shortitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*
818 *Psychology*. 2020;29(3):391-404.
- 819 63. Riskin A, Bamberger P, Erez A, Riskin-Guez K, Riskin Y, Sela R, et al. Expressions of gratitude and
820 medical team performance. *Pediatrics*. 2019;143(4).
- 821 64. Hendren K, Luo QE, Pandey SK. The state of mixed methods research in public administration and
822 public policy. *Public Administration Review*. 2018;78(6):904-16.

- 823 65. Weaver SH. The impact of real-time patient feedback using a gamified system. *Nursing Management*.
824 2020;51(12):14-22.
- 825 66. Pal LM, Dixon RE, Faull CM. Utilising feedback from patients and their families as a learning strategy in
826 a Foundation Degree in palliative and supportive care: A qualitative study. *Nurse Education Today*.
827 2014;34(3):319-24.
- 828 67. Royal College of Nursing. Gifts and wills 2022 [Available from: [https://www.rcn.org.uk/Get-Help/RCN-](https://www.rcn.org.uk/Get-Help/RCN-advice/gifts-and-wills)
829 [advice/gifts-and-wills](https://www.rcn.org.uk/Get-Help/RCN-advice/gifts-and-wills)].
- 830 68. Zolkefli Y. Healthcare Dilemma Towards Gift Giving by Patients. *The Malaysian Journal of Medical*
831 *Sciences: MJMS*. 2021;28(5):137.
- 832 69. Nursing Notes. New NMC figures reveal sharp rise in nurses leaving the profession 2021 [Available
833 from: [https://nursingnotes.co.uk/news/workforce/new-nmc-figures-reveal-sharp-rise-in-nurses-leaving-the-](https://nursingnotes.co.uk/news/workforce/new-nmc-figures-reveal-sharp-rise-in-nurses-leaving-the-profession/)
834 [profession/](https://nursingnotes.co.uk/news/workforce/new-nmc-figures-reveal-sharp-rise-in-nurses-leaving-the-profession/)].
- 835 70. Greenglass ER, Burke RJ, Fiksenbaum L. Workload and burnout in nurses. *Journal of Community &*
836 *Applied Social Psychology*. 2001;11(3):211-5.
- 837 71. Kumar P, Mehra A, Inder D, Sharma N. Organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation of regular
838 and contractual primary health care providers. *Journal of family medicine and primary care*. 2016;5(1):94.
- 839 72. Kotera Y, Conway E, Van Gordon W. Ethical Judgement in UK Business Students: Relationship with
840 Motivation, Self-Compassion and Mental Health. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*.
841 2019;17(5):1132-46.
- 842 73. Galletta M, Portoghese I, Battistelli A. Intrinsic Motivation, Job Autonomy and Turnover Intention in
843 the Italian Healthcare: The Mediating Role of Affective Commitment. *Journal of Management Research*.
844 2011;3(2):E7.
- 845 74. Wilkins EB. Facilitating Professional Identity Development in Healthcare Education. *New Directions for*
846 *Teaching and Learning*. 2020;2020(162):57-69.
- 847 75. Lewin K. *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers* (Edited by Dorwin Cartwright.).
848 1951.
- 849 76. Senge PM. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*: Broadway Business;
850 2006.
- 851 77. Davie HTO, Nutley SM. Developing learning organisations in the new NHS. *BMJ*. 2000;320(7240):998.
- 852 78. Chou WC, Tinetti ME, King MB, Irwin K, Fortinsky RH. Perceptions of physicians on the barriers and
853 facilitators to integrating fall risk evaluation and management into practice. *Journal of general internal*
854 *medicine*. 2006;21(2):117-22.
- 855 79. Prins JT, Hoekstra-Weebers JEHM, Gazendam-Donofrio SM, van de Wiel HBM, Sprangers F, Jaspers
856 FCA, et al. The role of social support in burnout among Dutch medical residents. *Psychology, Health &*
857 *Medicine*. 2007;12(1):1-6.
- 858 80. Davis CP. Medical Definition of Feedback 2021 [Available from:
859 <https://www.medicinenet.com/feedback/definition.htm>].
- 860 81. McCollum R, Otiso L, Mireku M, Theobald S, de Koning K, Hussein S, et al. Exploring perceptions of
861 community health policy in Kenya and identifying implications for policy change. *Health Policy and Planning*.
862 2016;31(1):10-20.
- 863 82. Dudhwala F, Boylan A-M, Williams V, Powell J. VIEWPOINT: What counts as online patient feedback,
864 and for whom? *DIGITAL HEALTH*. 2017;3:2055207617728186.
- 865 83. Ohashi J. Linguistic rituals for thanking in Japanese: Balancing obligations. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
866 2008;40(12):2150-74.
- 867 84. Wise J. Poor induction and lack of honest feedback is blamed for higher rate of GMC referrals among
868 BAME doctors. *BMJ*. 2019;365:l4391.
- 869 85. Edwards D, Burnard P, Hannigan B, Cooper L, Adams J, Juggessur T, et al. Clinical supervision and
870 burnout: the influence of clinical supervision for community mental health nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*.
871 2006;15(8):1007-15.
- 872 86. Fee A, Muldrew D, Slater P, Payne S, McIlpatrick S, McConnell T, et al. The roles, responsibilities and
873 practices of healthcare assistants in out-of-hours community palliative care: A systematic scoping review.
874 *Palliative Medicine*. 2020;34(8):976-88.


875 Supporting information captions

876 S1 File. Amendments to search strategy for CINAHL, ASSIA and the ACM Digital Library

- 877 S2 File. PRISMA checklist
- 878 S3 Table. Full data abstraction table



PRISMA flow diagram



Change model