



Delhi Business Review Vol. 27, No. 1 (January - June 2026)

DELHI BUSINESS REVIEW

An International Journal of SHTR

Journal Homepage: <https://www.delhibusinessreview.org/Index.htm>
<https://www.journalpressindia.com/delhi-business-review>

DELHI BUSINESS REVIEW	
Vol. 26, No. 2, December, 2021	
Editorial Board	1-2
Editorial Note	3-4
Editorial Board	5-6
Editorial Board	7-8
Editorial Board	9-10
Editorial Board	11-12
Editorial Board	13-14
Editorial Board	15-16
Editorial Board	17-18
Editorial Board	19-20
Editorial Board	21-22
Editorial Board	23-24
Editorial Board	25-26
Editorial Board	27-28
Editorial Board	29-30
Editorial Board	31-32
Editorial Board	33-34
Editorial Board	35-36
Editorial Board	37-38
Editorial Board	39-40
Editorial Board	41-42
Editorial Board	43-44
Editorial Board	45-46
Editorial Board	47-48
Editorial Board	49-50
Editorial Board	51-52
Editorial Board	53-54
Editorial Board	55-56
Editorial Board	57-58
Editorial Board	59-60
Editorial Board	61-62
Editorial Board	63-64
Editorial Board	65-66
Editorial Board	67-68
Editorial Board	69-70
Editorial Board	71-72
Editorial Board	73-74
Editorial Board	75-76
Editorial Board	77-78
Editorial Board	79-80
Editorial Board	81-82
Editorial Board	83-84
Editorial Board	85-86
Editorial Board	87-88
Editorial Board	89-90
Editorial Board	91-92
Editorial Board	93-94
Editorial Board	95-96
Editorial Board	97-98
Editorial Board	99-100
Editorial Board	101-102
Editorial Board	103-104
Editorial Board	105-106
Editorial Board	107-108
Editorial Board	109-110
Editorial Board	111-112
Editorial Board	113-114
Editorial Board	115-116
Editorial Board	117-118
Editorial Board	119-120
Editorial Board	121-122
Editorial Board	123-124
Editorial Board	125-126
Editorial Board	127-128
Editorial Board	129-130
Editorial Board	131-132
Editorial Board	133-134
Editorial Board	135-136
Editorial Board	137-138
Editorial Board	139-140
Editorial Board	141-142
Editorial Board	143-144
Editorial Board	145-146
Editorial Board	147-148
Editorial Board	149-150
Editorial Board	151-152
Editorial Board	153-154
Editorial Board	155-156
Editorial Board	157-158
Editorial Board	159-160
Editorial Board	161-162
Editorial Board	163-164
Editorial Board	165-166
Editorial Board	167-168
Editorial Board	169-170
Editorial Board	171-172
Editorial Board	173-174
Editorial Board	175-176
Editorial Board	177-178
Editorial Board	179-180
Editorial Board	181-182
Editorial Board	183-184
Editorial Board	185-186
Editorial Board	187-188
Editorial Board	189-190
Editorial Board	191-192
Editorial Board	193-194
Editorial Board	195-196
Editorial Board	197-198
Editorial Board	199-200
Editorial Board	201-202
Editorial Board	203-204
Editorial Board	205-206
Editorial Board	207-208
Editorial Board	209-210
Editorial Board	211-212
Editorial Board	213-214
Editorial Board	215-216
Editorial Board	217-218
Editorial Board	219-220
Editorial Board	221-222
Editorial Board	223-224
Editorial Board	225-226
Editorial Board	227-228
Editorial Board	229-230
Editorial Board	231-232
Editorial Board	233-234
Editorial Board	235-236
Editorial Board	237-238
Editorial Board	239-240
Editorial Board	241-242
Editorial Board	243-244
Editorial Board	245-246
Editorial Board	247-248
Editorial Board	249-250
Editorial Board	251-252
Editorial Board	253-254
Editorial Board	255-256
Editorial Board	257-258
Editorial Board	259-260
Editorial Board	261-262
Editorial Board	263-264
Editorial Board	265-266
Editorial Board	267-268
Editorial Board	269-270
Editorial Board	271-272
Editorial Board	273-274
Editorial Board	275-276
Editorial Board	277-278
Editorial Board	279-280
Editorial Board	281-282
Editorial Board	283-284
Editorial Board	285-286
Editorial Board	287-288
Editorial Board	289-290
Editorial Board	291-292
Editorial Board	293-294
Editorial Board	295-296
Editorial Board	297-298
Editorial Board	299-300
Editorial Board	301-302
Editorial Board	303-304
Editorial Board	305-306
Editorial Board	307-308
Editorial Board	309-310
Editorial Board	311-312
Editorial Board	313-314
Editorial Board	315-316
Editorial Board	317-318
Editorial Board	319-320
Editorial Board	321-322
Editorial Board	323-324
Editorial Board	325-326
Editorial Board	327-328
Editorial Board	329-330
Editorial Board	331-332
Editorial Board	333-334
Editorial Board	335-336
Editorial Board	337-338
Editorial Board	339-340
Editorial Board	341-342
Editorial Board	343-344
Editorial Board	345-346
Editorial Board	347-348
Editorial Board	349-350
Editorial Board	351-352
Editorial Board	353-354
Editorial Board	355-356
Editorial Board	357-358
Editorial Board	359-360
Editorial Board	361-362
Editorial Board	363-364
Editorial Board	365-366
Editorial Board	367-368
Editorial Board	369-370
Editorial Board	371-372
Editorial Board	373-374
Editorial Board	375-376
Editorial Board	377-378
Editorial Board	379-380
Editorial Board	381-382
Editorial Board	383-384
Editorial Board	385-386
Editorial Board	387-388
Editorial Board	389-390
Editorial Board	391-392
Editorial Board	393-394
Editorial Board	395-396
Editorial Board	397-398
Editorial Board	399-400
Editorial Board	401-402
Editorial Board	403-404
Editorial Board	405-406
Editorial Board	407-408
Editorial Board	409-410
Editorial Board	411-412
Editorial Board	413-414
Editorial Board	415-416
Editorial Board	417-418
Editorial Board	419-420
Editorial Board	421-422
Editorial Board	423-424
Editorial Board	425-426
Editorial Board	427-428
Editorial Board	429-430
Editorial Board	431-432
Editorial Board	433-434
Editorial Board	435-436
Editorial Board	437-438
Editorial Board	439-440
Editorial Board	441-442
Editorial Board	443-444
Editorial Board	445-446
Editorial Board	447-448
Editorial Board	449-450
Editorial Board	451-452
Editorial Board	453-454
Editorial Board	455-456
Editorial Board	457-458
Editorial Board	459-460
Editorial Board	461-462
Editorial Board	463-464
Editorial Board	465-466
Editorial Board	467-468
Editorial Board	469-470
Editorial Board	471-472
Editorial Board	473-474
Editorial Board	475-476
Editorial Board	477-478
Editorial Board	479-480
Editorial Board	481-482
Editorial Board	483-484
Editorial Board	485-486
Editorial Board	487-488
Editorial Board	489-490
Editorial Board	491-492
Editorial Board	493-494
Editorial Board	495-496
Editorial Board	497-498
Editorial Board	499-500
Editorial Board	501-502
Editorial Board	503-504
Editorial Board	505-506
Editorial Board	507-508
Editorial Board	509-510
Editorial Board	511-512
Editorial Board	513-514
Editorial Board	515-516
Editorial Board	517-518
Editorial Board	519-520
Editorial Board	521-522
Editorial Board	523-524
Editorial Board	525-526
Editorial Board	527-528
Editorial Board	529-530
Editorial Board	531-532
Editorial Board	533-534
Editorial Board	535-536
Editorial Board	537-538
Editorial Board	539-540
Editorial Board	541-542
Editorial Board	543-544
Editorial Board	545-546
Editorial Board	547-548
Editorial Board	549-550
Editorial Board	551-552
Editorial Board	553-554
Editorial Board	555-556
Editorial Board	557-558
Editorial Board	559-560
Editorial Board	561-562
Editorial Board	563-564
Editorial Board	565-566
Editorial Board	567-568
Editorial Board	569-570
Editorial Board	571-572
Editorial Board	573-574
Editorial Board	575-576
Editorial Board	577-578
Editorial Board	579-580
Editorial Board	581-582
Editorial Board	583-584
Editorial Board	585-586
Editorial Board	587-588
Editorial Board	589-590
Editorial Board	591-592
Editorial Board	593-594
Editorial Board	595-596
Editorial Board	597-598
Editorial Board	599-600
Editorial Board	601-602
Editorial Board	603-604
Editorial Board	605-606
Editorial Board	607-608
Editorial Board	609-610
Editorial Board	611-612
Editorial Board	613-614
Editorial Board	615-616
Editorial Board	617-618
Editorial Board	619-620
Editorial Board	621-622
Editorial Board	623-624
Editorial Board	625-626
Editorial Board	627-628
Editorial Board	629-630
Editorial Board	631-632
Editorial Board	633-634
Editorial Board	635-636
Editorial Board	637-638
Editorial Board	639-640
Editorial Board	641-642
Editorial Board	643-644
Editorial Board	645-646
Editorial Board	647-648
Editorial Board	649-650
Editorial Board	651-652
Editorial Board	653-654
Editorial Board	655-656
Editorial Board	657-658
Editorial Board	659-660
Editorial Board	661-662
Editorial Board	663-664
Editorial Board	665-666
Editorial Board	667-668
Editorial Board	669-670
Editorial Board	671-672
Editorial Board	673-674
Editorial Board	675-676
Editorial Board	677-678
Editorial Board	679-680
Editorial Board	681-682
Editorial Board	683-684
Editorial Board	685-686
Editorial Board	687-688
Editorial Board	689-690
Editorial Board	691-692
Editorial Board	693-694
Editorial Board	695-696
Editorial Board	697-698
Editorial Board	699-700
Editorial Board	701-702
Editorial Board	703-704
Editorial Board	705-706
Editorial Board	707-708
Editorial Board	709-710
Editorial Board	711-712
Editorial Board	713-714
Editorial Board	715-716
Editorial Board	717-718
Editorial Board	719-720
Editorial Board	721-722
Editorial Board	723-724
Editorial Board	725-726
Editorial Board	727-728
Editorial Board	729-730
Editorial Board	731-732
Editorial Board	733-734
Editorial Board	735-736
Editorial Board	737-738
Editorial Board	739-740
Editorial Board	741-742
Editorial Board	743-744
Editorial Board	745-746
Editorial Board	747-748
Editorial Board	749-750
Editorial Board	751-752
Editorial Board	753-754
Editorial Board	755-756
Editorial Board	757-758
Editorial Board	759-760
Editorial Board	761-762
Editorial Board	763-764
Editorial Board	765-766
Editorial Board	767-768
Editorial Board	769-770
Editorial Board	771-772
Editorial Board	773-774
Editorial Board	775-776
Editorial Board	777-778
Editorial Board	779-780
Editorial Board	781-782
Editorial Board	783-784
Editorial Board	785-786
Editorial Board	787-788
Editorial Board	789-790
Editorial Board	791-792
Editorial Board	793-794
Editorial Board	795-796
Editorial Board	797-798
Editorial Board	799-800
Editorial Board	801-802
Editorial Board	803-804
Editorial Board	805-806
Editorial Board	807-808
Editorial Board	809-810
Editorial Board	811-812
Editorial Board	813-814
Editorial Board	815-816
Editorial Board	817-818
Editorial Board	819-820
Editorial Board	821-822
Editorial Board	823-824
Editorial Board	825-826
Editorial Board	827-828
Editorial Board	829-830
Editorial Board	831-832
Editorial Board	833-834
Editorial Board	835-836
Editorial Board	837-838
Editorial Board	839-840
Editorial Board	841-842
Editorial Board	843-844
Editorial Board	845-846
Editorial Board	847-848
Editorial Board	849-850
Editorial Board	851-852
Editorial Board	853-854
Editorial Board	855-856
Editorial Board	857-858
Editorial Board	859-860
Editorial Board	861-862
Editorial Board	863-864
Editorial Board	865-866
Editorial Board	867-868
Editorial Board	869-870
Editorial Board	871-872
Editorial Board	873-874
Editorial Board	875-876
Editorial Board	877-878
Editorial Board	879-880
Editorial Board	881-882
Editorial Board	883-884
Editorial Board	885-886
Editorial Board	887-888
Editorial Board	889-890
Editorial Board	891-892
Editorial Board	893-894
Editorial Board	895-896
Editorial Board	897-898
Editorial Board	899-900
Editorial Board	901-902
Editorial Board	903-904
Editorial Board	905-906
Editorial Board	907-908
Editorial Board	909-910
Editorial Board	911-912
Editorial Board	913-914
Editorial Board	915-916
Editorial Board	917-918
Editorial Board	919-920
Editorial Board	921-922
Editorial Board	923-924
Editorial Board	925-926
Editorial Board	927-928
Editorial Board	929-930
Editorial Board	931-932
Editorial Board	933-934
Editorial Board	935-936
Editorial Board	937-938
Editorial Board	939-940
Editorial Board	941-942
Editorial Board	943-944
Editorial Board	945-946
Editorial Board	947-948
Editorial Board	949-950
Editorial Board	951-952
Editorial Board	953-954
Editorial Board	955-956
Editorial Board	957-958
Editorial Board	959-960
Editorial Board	961-962
Editorial Board	963-964
Editorial Board	965-966
Editorial Board	967-968
Editorial Board	969-970
Editorial Board	971-972
Editorial Board	973-974
Editorial Board	975-976
Editorial Board	977-978
Editorial Board	979-980
Editorial Board	981-982
Editorial Board	983-984
Editorial Board	985-986
Editorial Board	987-988
Editorial Board	989-990
Editorial Board	991-992
Editorial Board	993-994
Editorial Board	995-996
Editorial Board	997-998
Editorial Board	999-1000

Trends and Research Frontiers in Healthcare Service Quality and Patient Satisfaction: A Bibliometric Perspective

Introduction

Hospitals account for a large share of health expenditures worldwide and are experiencing increasing pressure to improve the efficiency and quality of their services. Healthcare is one of the job sectors with the highest levels of complexity in business models, given the heterogeneity of patients and care processes ([Nepomuceno et al., 2022](#)). Within this context, healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction are widely used indicators of performance because of their close association with treatment adherence, service utilization, and improved health outcomes. Patient satisfaction, in particular, has gained prominence as a key performance indicator of healthcare services and an important determinant of care-seeking behaviour ([Ferreira et al., 2023](#)). Patient satisfaction is a patient's reaction to several aspects of their service experience. Assessing patient satisfaction provides valuable insights about daily hospital care and quality. It is an independent dimension of care quality that includes internal aspects of hospital care as well as dimensions such as communication, empathy, accessibility, and responsiveness ([Bleich et al., 2009](#)). Hospitals consume several inputs (human resources, pharmaceuticals, equipment) to produce high-value outputs (outpatient visits, surgical operations). Hence, hospital efficiency analysis is about measuring the competence with which inputs are converted into valuable outputs ([Hoehn et al., 2016](#)). Over the past three decades, a growing body of literature has addressed various dimensions of service quality, measurement tools such as SERVQUAL, Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS), and patient-reported experience measures (PREMs). These tools assess key dimensions such as tangibility, reliability, assurance, responsiveness, and empathy ([Bernardo et al., 2022](#)). At the same time, the rapid evolution of healthcare delivery models, including the expansion of telemedicine and digital health platforms, has reshaped both the concept and assessment of service quality ([Persis, 2025](#)).

Bibliometric analysis offers a powerful approach to systematically map and synthesize this expanding body of literature and helps to analyse large volumes of published data to provide insights into research productivity, collaboration networks, and knowledge structures, as well as helps in under-

standing global research trends and emerging research frontiers in the field of healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction. Unlike narrative reviews, bibliometric studies apply quantitative methods to publication metadata, enabling the identification of influential authors, journals, and countries as well as the detection of intellectual structures and thematic clusters within a field. Mapping not only provides a retrospective overview but also reveals knowledge gaps and future directions. Previous bibliometric investigations in healthcare have demonstrated the value of this approach in clarifying research landscapes ([Sweileh, 2022](#)). But there are relatively few literatures and are most often constrained by narrower time windows, sub-domain focus, or limited network analyses.

This study examines trends and research frontiers in healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction, providing an up-to-date bibliometric perspective. The primary objective of this research is to map global research trends and emerging research frontiers in healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction. The secondary objectives are to characterize the intellectual structures and thematic evolution, and the collaboration networks among researchers and institutions.

Materials and Methods

Data Source

Web of Science (WoS) core collection (SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, and ESCI) was chosen as the sole data source for analysis. WoS is a platform owned by Clarivate Analytics and is the largest and most comprehensive core journal citation index data service platform covering a wide range of disciplines and studies. WoS was selected because of its rigorous indexing standards, extensive coverage of high-impact journals, and compatibility with bibliometric software tools such as VOSviewer. The selected period was from 01 January 1990 to 24 September 2025. Records were exported on 24 Sep 2025 as plain-text files with full records and cited references. The search targeted research on healthcare service quality and patient/patient-experience satisfaction (the complete Boolean string and export fields are provided in Appendix A. No human subjects or personal data were involved.

Study Scope and Screening

For this review, four types of analyses were performed: First, a co-authorship analysis to identify influential researchers and collaborative networks in the field. Second, keyword co-occurrence analysis to determine research hotspots and emerging themes. Third, citation analysis to assess the most cited articles and journals. Fourth, co-citation and bibliographic coupling analysis to reveal intellectual structures and research frontiers.

Document types were limited to articles and reviews in English. Before analysis, we removed retracted publications and non-relevant records identified during screening. Screening proceeded in two passes: (1) Automated de-duplication (exact): Duplicates by WoS UT, DOI, and exact title were removed; and (2) Near-duplicate and relevance review (manual and rule-based): we inspected the duplicates review file and applied a hand-curated exclusion list. After de-duplication and exclusions, the final corpus comprised 1306 records (articles and reviews) spanning 1994-2025. A PRISMA-style flow diagram and the exclusion list are provided in Appendix B.

Software Environment

All preprocessing and bibliometric computations were performed in RStudio 4.4.0 using the following packages: *bibliometrix* (core parsing and networks) ([Aria & Cuccurullo, 2017](#)), *dplyr*, *tidyr*, *stringr*, *readr* (data wrangling I/O), *ggplot2* (plots), *igraph* (graph operations and metrics), *SnowballC* (optional stemming for overlap checks), and *purrr* (iterative utilities). Visualization-ready maps were then built in VOSviewer version 1.6.20 for publication figures. VOSviewer enables the creation of network maps based on co-authorship, keyword co-occurrence, co-citation, and bibliographic coupling.

Data Preparation in R

WoS Core Collection records were merged and parsed in R (*bibliometrix*) using *bibliometrix::convert2df*. Author Keywords (DE) were used as the primary term field; where DE was missing, we mapped to Keywords Plus (ID). Keyword strings were lower-cased and stripped of punctuation and excess spaces, and a light,

rule-based harmonization aligned close synonyms without altering meaning (client satisfaction to patient satisfaction; tele-health/tele health to telemedicine; perceived service quality/SERVQUAL model to service quality). The same synonym table was also supplied to VOSviewer via the thesaurus file. Descriptive performance statistics, including annual output and growth, document types, citation averages, prolific sources and authors, and corresponding-author countries, were computed with *bibliometrix* and *tidyverse* functions. To keep maps interpretable, a data-driven minimum frequency was tuned to retain approximately 60-120 terms (capped near 200 in dense cases). Trend-topic trajectories were derived by counting yearly occurrences, computing recent activity (2019-2025), CAGR, and linear slope since 2019, ranking a composite growth score, and plotting time series after removing country names and generic labels to emphasize interpretable concepts.

VOSviewer maps

Clean WoS text and the same thesaurus were imported into VOSviewer using association-strength normalization. Author-keyword co-occurrence used fractional counting with a minimum of five occurrences (124 terms retained after harmonization). Co-authorship networks were mapped for countries with fractional counting and a nine-document minimum (final map of 42 countries), and for authors with a stricter document threshold; when prompted, only the largest connected set was displayed. Co-citation of references used a 45-citation minimum (37 items retained). Overlay visualizations colored nodes by average publication year are used to highlight recent themes over the years. Further, bibliographic coupling of documents used 39 minimum citations with 157 items retained. All PNG/SVG figures and cluster/item CSVs were archived. “Anonymous” labels in co-citation reflect WoS entries lacking identifiable first authors and were retained as exported.

Reproducibility

Scripts are organized sequentially with every intermediate dataset and all parameters and thresholds recorded in filenames or companion CSVs to ensure full reproducibility.

Results

A total of 1,306 publications on patient satisfaction were retrieved from the WoS database, contributed by 4,951 unique authors affiliated with 84 countries. The number of articles increased markedly from 69 in 1994-2004 to 981 in 2015-2025, indicating a substantial rise in research output over time. Similarly, the mean number of authors per article (AU/A) rose from 2.9 to 4.02, reflecting a steady growth in collaborative authorship. The number of contributing countries also expanded from 14 in the early period to 82 in the most recent decade, suggesting increasing global participation in the field. However, citation impact shows a declining trend. The mean citations per article (TC/A) decreased from 78.7 in 1990-2004 to 12.6 in 2015-2025, while citations per unique author (TC/AU_unique) fell from 27.15 to 3.12, possibly reflecting the recency of recent publications and the dilution effect of expanding research output. Table 1 summarizes the publication output, authorship patterns, country participation, and citation impact of research on patient satisfaction across three custom periods (1990-2004, 2005-2014, and 2015-2025).

Publication Trend (Annual Output)

The annual number of publications on healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction showed a steady increase from 1994 through 2025, as depicted in Figure 1, with a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 11.90% over the entire 31-year period. During the early years, research activity remained limited, with fewer than ten publications per year until the early 2000s, followed by a gradual increase in output after 2010. A marked rise in publication activity was observed after 2015 (CAGR:10.7% between 2015-2025), indicating growing

academic engagement with patient-centered quality research. The highest annual output to date was recorded in 2025 ($n = 130$) as of the data extraction date (September 24, 2025), with sustained high productivity in recent years (2019 = 91; 2020 = 91; 2021 = 105; 2022 = 125; 2023 = 96; 2024 = 116). The most recent period (2019-2025) showed a CAGR of 6.10%, reflecting continued expansion at a moderated pace compared to earlier growth phases.

Top Universities/Hospitals by Publication Output and Citation Impact

Institutional contributions to patient satisfaction research indicate divergent patterns in output versus impact. Table 2 shows Johns Hopkins University leads in publication volume (21 articles, h-index = 18), followed by the University of London (19 articles) and the University of California System (14 articles). However, citation impact rankings reveal different leaders. The University of Sannio achieves the highest average citations per article (370.0) from 3 publications, followed by Temple University (346.0, 2 articles) and Mongolian National University of Medical Sciences (307.5, 2 articles). This divergence suggests two institutional strategies: Sustained high-volume output (Johns Hopkins, University of London, with 20-27 year span) versus concentrated high-impact collaboration (University of Sannio, Temple University). Geographic diversity spans North America, Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa, indicating global engagement with patient satisfaction scholarship. The Pennsylvania Commonwealth System serves exceptional efficiency with 134.0 average citations across 12 publications.

Table 1: Summary of Bibliometric Indicators of Patient Satisfaction Research, 1990-2025

Period	A	AU_unique	AU/A (unique/A)	C_unique	TC	TC/A	TC/AU_unique
1990-2004	69	200	2.90	14	5,430	78.70	27.15
2005-2014	256	868	3.39	41	10,180	39.77	11.73
2015-2025	981	3,947	4.02	82	12,323	12.56	3.12
Total Period	1,306	4,951	3.79	84	27,933	21.39	5.64

Note. A = number of articles; AU_unique = number of unique authors; AU/A = mean number of unique authors per article; C_unique = number of countries; TC = total citations; TC/A = mean citations per article; TC/AU_unique = mean citations per unique author.




Figure 1: Annual Number of Publications on Healthcare Service Quality and Patient Satisfaction, 1994-2025.

Note. Data represent records retrieved from the WoS database as of September 24, 2025 (n = 1,306).

Table 2: Top 10 Institutions by Publication Output and Citation Impact in Patient Satisfaction Research

Rank	Institution	Articles	Total Citations	Avg Cit/ Art	h-index Span	Years
By Publication Output						
1	Johns Hopkins University	21	1,005	47.9	18	20
2	University of London	19	930	49.0	16	27
3	University of California System	14	679	48.5	12	31
4	National Institute of Technology (NIT System)	13	361	27.8	11	15
5	Pennsylvania Commonwealth System (PCSHE)	12	1,608	134.0	10	27
6	King Abdulaziz University	12	368	30.7	5	13
7	University of Sydney	12	364	30.3	8	17
8	University of Texas System	12	161	13.4	7	13
9	University of Gondar	11	302	27.5	9	9
10	Jimma University	11	67	6.1	5	9

Contd...

Rank	Institution	Articles	Total Citations	Avg Cit/ Art	h-index Span	Years
By Citation Impact (Average Citations per Article)						
1	University of Sannio	3	1,110	370.0	4	8
2	Temple University	2	692	346.0	2	20
3	Mongolian National University of Medical Sciences	2	615	307.5	2	3
4	Ulaanbaatar State University	2	615	307.5	2	3
5	Northwestern University	3	810	270.0	3	21
6	University of Western Australia	2	486	243.0	2	10
7	University of York - UK	2	432	216.0	4	6
8	University of Eastern Finland	3	621	207.0	3	12
9	Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) - Madras	2	397	198.5	4	12
10	Tampere University	2	387	193.5	6	5

Note. Cit/Art = citations per article. Institutional affiliations extracted using bibliometrix's metaTagExtraction function (AU_UN field). Full counting methodology applied: each institution receives credit for each unique document. Institutions with fewer than 2 articles were excluded. Years Span indicates publication activity range within the corpus (1995–2025). h-index calculated at the institution level within the corpus.

Citation Trends (1994-2025)

The temporal distribution of citation impact is presented in Figure 2. A comparison of raw and normalized citation trends revealed an overall decline in citation rates over time.

Spearman's rank correlation indicated a significant negative association between publication year and normalized mean citations per article ($\rho = 0.42$, $p = 0.016$), suggesting a moderate reduction in citation velocity in more recent years. The correlation between publication year and raw mean citations per article was considerably stronger ($\rho = -0.89$, $p < 0.001$), indicating the expected citation-window bias favoring older publications. The divergence between rising output and declining mean citations per article likely reflects both shorter citation windows for recent studies and thematic dispersion as the field broadens post-2015.

Top Contributing Authors (Authorship Impact)

Across the dataset ($n = 1,306$), the 20 most prolific authors each published 4-6 papers

(median = 4; mean = 4.25) and held h-indices ranging from 2 to 4 (median = 3) as depicted in Table 3. Together, they contribute 6.51% of the corpus. The most productive contributor was Hussain A (NP = 6; h = 4; TC = 127; span 2019-2025). Among the NP ≥ 5 group, Yu Y (NP = 5; h = 4; TC = 160; span 2018-2025) and Cudney Ea (NP = 5; h = 3; TC = 149; span 2019-2024) showed the highest overall citation totals. The highest total citations within the top-20 list were observed for Andaleeb Ss (TC = 500; NP = 4; h = 3; 2000-2014), who also showed the highest citations per paper (125.00). These data indicate concentrated productivity in a small group of authors with heterogeneous citation visibility across portfolios.

Geographic Distribution and Collaboration Patterns

The top 10 countries by fractional publication count, along with their collaboration patterns measured through MCP (Multi-Country Publications) and SCP (Single-Country Publications), are shown in Table 4. The United States leads with 201 fractional publications, followed by China (113) and India (109). The MCP rate




Figure 2: Raw and normalized citation trends by publication year, 1994–2025.

Note. The left panel shows the normalized mean citations per article (to date). The right panel shows raw mean citations per article per year (citations divided by years since publication). Spearman's $\tilde{r} = "0.42$ ($p = 0.016$) for normalized citations and $\tilde{r} = "0.89$ ($p < 0.001$) for raw citations.

Table 3: Top 20 Contributing Authors: Productivity and Impact Indicators

Author	NP	h-index	Total citations	Citations/article	Span (yrs)	Years active
HUSSAIN A	6	4	127	21.17	2019–2025	7
YU Y	5	4	160	32.00	2018–2025	8
CUDNEY EA	5	3	149	29.80	2019–2024	6
SINGH D	5	2	18	3.60	2020–2022	3
ANDALEEB SS	4	3	500	125.00	2000–2014	15
LEE H	4	4	433	108.25	2004–2021	18
MALIK SA	4	4	317	79.25	2016–2018	3
MOGHAVVEMIS	4	4	158	39.50	2016–2022	7
HWANG J	4	4	122	30.50	2019–2019	1
BOSS EF	4	4	105	26.25	2012–2014	3
JAMEEL A	4	3	91	22.75	2019–2025	7
GUPTA D	4	4	80	20.00	2011–2015	5
LIS CG	4	4	80	20.00	2011–2015	5
JAIN AK	4	3	64	16.00	2019–2023	5
GROOT W	4	2	63	15.75	2016–2025	10
PAVLOVA M	4	2	63	15.75	2016–2025	10
PRYBUTOK VR	4	4	57	14.25	2012–2017	6
SWAIN S	4	3	55	13.75	2017–2021	5
BAHADORI M	4	3	45	11.25	2015–2019	5
KENNEDY DM	4	3	40	10.00	2011–2019	9

Note. NP = number of publications (full counting). h-index computed for each author within the study corpus. "Citations/article" is $TC_{total} \div NP$. "Span (yrs)" is the first-last publication year for the author in this corpus; "Years active" = span length.

Table 4: Top Producing Countries: Full Vs. Fractional Output and Collaboration (1994-2025)

Country	Documents (full)	Share (fractional, %)	MCP	SCP	MCP rate (%)
United States	257	201 (15.4)	102	155	39.69
China	142	113 (8.6)	54	88	38.03
India	122	109 (8.3)	24	98	19.67
United Kingdom	102	76 (5.8)	44	58	43.14
Australia	67	49 (3.7)	33	34	49.25
Malaysia	62	46 (3.5)	30	32	48.39
Iran	60	50 (3.8)	18	42	30.0
Turkey	60	51 (3.9)	16	44	26.67
Ethiopia	52	47 (3.6)	10	42	19.23
Taiwan	42	35 (2.7)	13	29	30.95

Note. Full counting credits each country once per paper; totals across countries can exceed the number of papers. Fractional counting credits $1/k$ to each of the k countries on paper; shares therefore sum to 100% of the corpus. MCP rate = multi-country publications $\div$ documents (full counting).

reveals distinct collaboration behaviours across countries. Australia (49.25%), Malaysia (48.39%), and the United Kingdom (43.14%) demonstrate high international collaboration intensity, while India (19.67%) and Ethiopia (19.23%) show more domestically-focused research output.

The country co-authorship network (VOSviewer) shows a multi-hub structure led by the United States, with strong regional hubs in China, England, and India (Figure 3). A dense European cluster (Italy - Spain - Germany - France - Netherlands) and an Asia-Pacific cluster (China, Malaysia, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam) present robust internal ties, while the United Kingdom and Australia act as bridges between clusters. Overlay coloring indicates that recent growth is concentrated in Asia and Africa (China, Malaysia, India, Ethiopia), whereas North America and Western Europe dominated earlier years.

Journals and Sources

Table 5 presents the top 10 most productive journals in patient satisfaction research. The International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance leads with 62 articles (2,007 citations, h-index = 22, m-index = 1.158), followed by BMC Health Services Research (55 articles,

1,219 citations) and PLOS ONE (30 articles, 694 citations). While the International Journal for Quality in Health Care achieves the highest mean citations per article (56.75) across its 30-year span, the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health exhibits the most accelerated impact trajectory (m-index = 1.571) within only 7 active years. Publication output concentrates in specialized health services and quality management journals alongside open-access multidisciplinary platforms, with h-index values ranging from 4 to 22, reflecting varied journal positioning strategies and selective publication practices in patient satisfaction research.

Keyword and Co-occurrence Analysis

After normalization and conceptual filtering, the most frequently occurring author keywords were patient satisfaction (n = 419) and service quality (n = 288), reflecting the field's strong emphasis on patient-centered outcomes and service evaluation, as shown in Table 6. Secondary clusters included quality of care (n = 108), patient experience (n = 62), and the measurement construct SERVQUAL (n = 62). Terms such as customer satisfaction (n = 49), patient loyalty (n = 47), and quality improvement (n = 36) focused attention to consumer perspectives and improvement science. Emer-




Figure 3

Layout Produced in VOS Viewer Using Fractional Counting with a Threshold of 9 documents (42 countries). Node size = publication volume; link thickness = collaboration strength; color = mean publication year.

ging yet focused concepts like patient-centered care ($n = 22$) and healthcare services ($n = 20$) extended the literature toward integrated care and system-level quality.

Further, the co-occurrence analysis of keywords was performed with all keywords as the unit of analysis, as depicted in Figure 4. A minimum occurrence threshold of 5 was applied, which reduced the dataset from 4156 keywords to 315 that met the criteria. The resulting network displays clusters of frequently co-occurring keywords with node size indicating frequency of use and colors representing distinct thematic clusters over time. This structure demonstrates the conceptual organization of the field, where foundational themes such as patient satisfaction, service quality, and care are central while newer clusters point to emerging topics and methodological approaches.

Temporal Evolution of Emerging Themes

Figure 5 illustrates the temporal trajectory of emerging keywords in patient satisfaction research from 1994 to 2025. The analysis reveals three distinct evolutionary phases.

The foundational phase (pre-2010) was dominated by service quality and SERVQUAL constructs, establishing core measurement frameworks. Between 2010 and 2019, the field expanded toward patient-centered care, nursing care, and quality improvement, reflecting a paradigm shift from provider-centric to experiential satisfaction metrics.

A sharp thematic inflection occurred post-2020, marked by the rapid emergence of COVID-19 (100% recent publications) and telemedicine (80% recent share, 20.1% CAGR), demonstrating the pandemic's transformative impact on healthcare delivery models. Concurrently, patient experience (18.4% CAGR)

Table 5: Top 10 Journals by Number of Articles (1994-2025)

Rank	Journal	Articles	Total citations	Mean citations/article	h-index	g-index	m-index	First year	Last year
1	International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance	62	2,007	32.37	22	43	1.158	2005	2023
2	BMC Health Services Research	55	1,219	22.16	19	34	0.950	2006	2025
3	PLOS ONE	30	694	23.13	11	26	0.786	2012	2025
4	International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Healthcare Marketing	28	331	11.82	10	17	0.909	2015	2025
5	Healthcare	25	73	2.92	4	6	0.667	2020	2025
6	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health	21	320	15.24	11	17	1.571	2016	2022
7	International Journal for Quality in Health Care	20	1,135	56.75	14	20	0.452	1995	2025
8	International Journal of Healthcare Management	20	376	18.80	9	19	0.692	2013	2025
9	International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management	17	379	22.29	10	17	0.714	2012	2025
10	Journal of Health Management	17	208	12.24	7	14	0.467	2011	2025

Note. Journal counts are based on WoS “SO” (Source). h/g/m indices are computed within this corpus; m-index = h-index ÷ years active in the corpus (Last Year - First Year + 1).

and patient loyalty (16.5% CAGR) exhibited accelerated growth, signaling heightened emphasis on continuity of care and consumer-driven expectations. These patterns indicate a field evolution from measurement standardization (1990s-2000s) through experiential enrichment (2010s) to digital transformation and personalization (2020s).

Most Influential Publications

Table 7 identifies the 10 most influential publications in patient satisfaction research. [Mittal et al., \(1998\)](#) lead with 689 citations, followed

by [Batbaatar et al., \(2017\)](#) systematic review (490 citations) and [Dagger et al., \(2007\)](#) service quality model (481 citations). The highly cited corpus spans 23 years (1995-2018), with five pre-2000 publications demonstrating foundational influence, including A. G. [Thompson & Suñol \(1995\)](#) expectations framework (374 citations). Citation counts range from 294 to 689, indicating relatively distributed intellectual impact compared to fields with extreme citation concentration. Journal diversity is notable, including marketing, public health, service research, and healthcare-specific out-

Table 6: Core Conceptual Author Keywords and Domains (1994-2025)

Rank	Keyword	Conceptual domain	Count
1	Patient satisfaction	Patient-centered outcomes	419
2	Service quality	Service evaluation/measurement	288
3	Quality of care	Clinical/care quality	108
4	Patient experience	Experience measurement	62
5	SERVQUAL	Measurement instrument/model	62
6	Customer satisfaction	Consumer perspective	49
7	Patient loyalty	Loyalty/retention	47
8	Quality improvement	Improvement science / QI	36
9	Patient-centered care	Care model/approach	22
10	Healthcare services	Health services context	20

Note. Author keywords (DE) were normalized and filtered to retain conceptual descriptors; generic terms like “model,” “impact,” “hospital,” “quality,” and “satisfaction” were excluded. Variants were collapsed (healthcare quality/quality of healthcare to quality of care; healthcare service quality to service quality).




Figure 4

Overlay Visualization co-occurrence network of keywords (minimum occurrence ≥ 5)




Figure 5

Temporal evolution of emerging themes in patient satisfaction research (1994-2025)

lets, reflecting patient satisfaction research's interdisciplinary character. Entries, such as (Meesala & Paul, 2018), 295 citations, suggest continued field vitality and theoretical evolution.

Co-authorship mapping analysis

The co-authorship analysis was conducted with authors as the unit of analysis using bibliographic data from the dataset, as represented in Figure 6. The author co-authorship network (fractional counting; min. 2 documents; 120 authors) is highly fragmented (57 clusters; 95 links; total link strength = 125). Most collaborations occur in small, localized teams (pairs/triads). This suggests limited cross-team integration, site-specific survey, and an opportunity for multi-center collaborations.

Journal Citations and Publications Mapping Analysis

We mapped the intellectual structure using VOSviewer (bibliographic coupling, unit of analysis: documents; association-strength normalization; fractional counting). To ensure interpretability, we set a minimum of 39 citations per document, retaining 157 items in the largest connected component (links = 5,793, total link strength = 1,758, 8 clusters). The map reveals two central streams: (i) service-quality measurement and scale development/validation (Dagger et al., 2007; Mittal et al., 1998; Thompson & Suñol, 1995; Thompson et al., 1996; Naidu, 2009), and (ii) patient experience/satisfaction syntheses and determinants (Batbaatar et al., 2017; De Simone et al., 2018; Young et al., 2000). Peripheral but well-connected clusters relate

Table 7: Top 10 Most Cited Articles in Patient Satisfaction Research

Sr. No.	Year	Title	Authors	Source	Citations	Citations Per Year
1	1998	The asymmetric impact of negative and positive attribute level performance on overall satisfaction and repurchase intentions	Mittal, V	Journal of Marketing	689	24.61
2	2017	Determinants of patient satisfaction: A systematic review	Batbaatar, E	Perspectives in Public Health	490	54.44
3	2007	A hierarchical model of health service quality: Scale development and investigation of an integrated model	Dagger, TS	Journal of Service Research	481	25.32
4	2001	Service quality perceptions and patient satisfaction: A study of hospitals in a developing country	Andaleeb, SS	Social Science & Medicine	390	15.6
5	1995	Expectations as determinants of patient satisfaction: Concepts, theory, and evidence	Thompson, AGH	International Journal for Quality in Health Care	374	12.06
6	1996	Effects of actual waiting time, perceived waiting time, information delivery, and expressive quality on patient satisfaction in the emergency department	Thompson Da et al.	Annals of Emergency Medicine	344	11.47
7	2009	Factors affecting patient satisfaction and healthcare quality	Naidu, A	International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance	299	17.59
8	2002	The factor structure of customer satisfaction: An empirical test of the importance grid and the penalty–reward–contrast analysis	Matzler, K	International Journal of Service Industry Management	299	12.46
9	2018	Service quality, consumer satisfaction and loyalty in hospitals: Thinking for the future	Meesala, A., and Paul, J	Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services	295	36.88
10	2000	Patient satisfaction with hospital care: Effects of demographic and institutional characteristics	Young, GJ	Medical Care	295	11.35




Figure 6

Co-authorship network visualization (minimum documents ≥ 2 ; minimum citations ≥ 1).

to implementation and hospital/ED performance (Eitel et al., 2010; Yeh & Lin, 2007) that bridge measurement traditions with quality-improvement research. The dense coupling and extensive cross-links indicate a cohesive literature in which measurement, experience, and operational quality increasingly co-evolve. The tight web of inter-cluster edges and the absence of large isolated components suggest a mature integrated field rather than fragmented subdomains.

The co-citation analysis, as depicted in Figure 8, was further conducted with cited references as the unit of analysis. A minimum threshold of 45 citations per reference was applied. Out of a total of cited references in the dataset, 37 met the inclusion threshold. The map shows that contemporary patient-satisfaction studies are intellectually grounded in classic marketing service-quality theory, operationalized

through psychometric rigor, and translated to clinical settings via healthcare-tailored scales. The high centrality of Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988) and Cronin & Taylor (1992) indicates these works remain the primary links across clusters, while Donabedian (1966, 1988) links the service-quality canon to healthcare quality-of-care traditions.

Discussion

This bibliometric analysis of 1,306 WoS-indexed articles on healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction (1994-2025) shows a sustained and accelerating growth of research activity, particularly in the last five years (peak in 2025). As evidenced by the prominence of terms like patient satisfaction and service quality in author keywords, the topical focus is still on measurement, perceptions, and service quality models. Our findings indicate a significant rise in research and publication output, from 69 articles during 1994-2004 to 981 articles




Figure 7

Bibliographic coupling network of documents

in 2015-2025, reflecting an increase in academic interest. Similar results were reported by [Ferreira et al., \(2023\)](#), who noted a steady rise in the number of publications and articles regarding patient satisfaction since 2000. A bibliometric analysis of health policies predicated on patient satisfaction revealed a rise in publications during the 2000-2020 timeframe ([Grasso et al., 2021](#)). The CAGR of about 11.9% over the 31 years also backs up this trend. This is in line with the larger trend of quality and satisfaction research becoming more important in healthcare as service delivery becomes more patient centric ([Grasso et al., 2021](#)). The increasing mean number of authors per article (from 2.90 to 4.02) also suggests growing team based collaboration. Our results indicate that, despite the increase in the number of articles and publications, the average citations per article and per author have declined. The mean citations per article dropped from 78.7 in 1990-2004 to 12.6 in 2015-2025. While an increase in publication volume

is an important indicator of field maturity, our observed decline in mean citations per article (from 78.7 to 12.6) suggests two phenomena. First, recently published studies are too new to get as many citations as older papers, and the growing number of publications could render the citation density. Previous bibliometric research in analogous fields indicates that citation window bias and thematic dispersion influence these trends ([Grasso et al., 2021](#); [Man et al., 2024](#)). The negative Spearman correlation between publication year and normalized citations ($\tilde{r} = -0.42$, $p = 0.016$) further supports this interpretation.

Our results show that the top 20 authors published only 4-6 papers each (median = 4) and that h indices within this corpus ranged from 2 to 4. The most productive author, Hussain A (NP = 6, h = 4) spans 2019-2025, whereas older authors such as Andaleeb SS (NP = 4, h = 3, span 2000-2014) carry higher citation totals (~500), albeit on fewer papers. This

References

strategies for authors seeking visibility. At the same time, the higher mean citations in IJQHC suggest that fewer but more highly cited articles appear in that journal, which may reflect a higher selectivity or a higher impact audience.

The keyword count in our study shows that “patient satisfaction” (419 occurrences) and “service quality” (288) dominate. Other frequent terms include perceptions, model, quality, care, health-care, impact, and customer satisfaction. These core terms align with the foundational body of literature on SERVQUAL, HCAHPS, and patient experience metrics (Bernardo et al., 2022). Co occurrence mapping identified clusters around measurement, experience/loyalty, and digital/telemedicine themes, which mirror the domain’s transition from structural/service quality measurement to experiential and digital paradigms. This is consistent with earlier reviews on Service quality in the healthcare sector (Darzi et al., 2023). Our study further documents three phases: Foundational (pre-2010), dominated by service quality and SERVQUAL constructs, expansion (2010-2019) toward patient-centered care and quality improvement, and a post-2020 inflection driven by COVID-19, telemedicine, patient experience, loyalty (with high CAGR for telemedicine ~20.1%). This three-phase pattern is consistent with other bibliometric findings, such as the infusion of telehealth research in home health services (Güdük, 2025) and the surge of telemedicine during COVID-19 (Lan et al., 2022).

Bibliographic coupling and co citation analyses show that the field rests on two main streams. First, service-quality measurement/scale development (Mittal et al., 1998; Dagger et al., 2007; Thompson & Suñol, 1995) and second, patient experience/satisfaction determinants (Batbaatar et al., 2017; Young et al., 2000). The centrality of classic marketing/service-quality work (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Cronin & Taylor, 1992) in the co-citation map confirms the theoretical roots of this literature.

In comparison to previous bibliometric or systematic reviews, our study covers a longer period (1990-2025) compared with other studies. A study by Ferreira et al., (2023) included studies from 2000 to 2021 and ended up with 157 articles. Our review captures the surge post-2020 (telemedicine,

COVID), which many earlier reviews did not yet fully examine. Some earlier reviews, for example, Health Policies Based on Patient Satisfaction, emphasised policy making and economic/management scarcity in the domain, that is, fewer studies on the economics of patient satisfaction (Grasso et al., 2021). Our study extends prior work by providing an up to date bibliometric mapping including digital health/telemedicine themes, broader co author/network analyses, and detailed metrics (country fractional counts, MCP rates).

Implications

For researchers, the dispersion of topics alongside a fragmented author network argues for multi-institutional collaborations, shared instrument libraries, and comparative designs (cross-country or cross-setting analyses) to consolidate evidence and enhance generalizability. For policymakers and managers, the growth of experience/loyalty themes suggests prioritizing communication quality, continuity, and digital touchpoints in quality strategies.

Limitations & Future Directions

Because we analyzed only the WoS core collection and English language documents, the field’s footprint in Scopus and PubMed may not be fully captured. Author name disambiguation was limited; some author metrics may conflate individuals. Keyword harmonization and threshold choices (for co-occurrence and networks) can influence map granularity. Citation-based indicators are subject to time-window bias and field norms; all h/ g/m indices were computed within this corpus and should not be compared directly with global journal metrics.

Conclusion

This bibliometric review shows that research on healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction has expanded considerably over the past three decades, with a marked rise in output after 2015. The analysis reveals that most contributions originate from the USA, China, and India. A limited set of journals led by the International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance and BMC Health Services Research have served as central outlets for this body of work, while highly cited publications continue to shape its theoretical and methodological foundations. The thematic structure of the field remains centered on patient satisfaction, service

quality, and measurement models, though the post-COVID-19 pandemic years have seen greater attention to digital health and telemedicine. The decreasing citation averages of recent publications reflect shorter exposure times rather than reduced relevance. The findings indicate a maturing research area characterized by steady international collaboration, diversification of methods, and the evolution of patient-centered quality assessment frameworks. Hence, the field of healthcare service quality and patient satisfaction appears cohesive conceptually yet operationally fragmented in collaboration, indicating a timely opportunity for integrative projects that connect measurement, experience, and outcomes across settings and regions.

References

- Andaleeb, S. S. (2001). Service quality perceptions and patient satisfaction: a study of hospitals in a developing country. *Social Science & Medicine*, 52(9), 1359-1370. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00235-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00235-5)
- Aria, M., & Cuccurullo, C. (2017). bibliometrix/: An R-tool for comprehensive science mapping analysis. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(4), 959-975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.08.007>
- Batbaatar, E., Dorjdagva, J., Luvsannyam, A., Savino, M. M., & Amenta, P. (2017). Determinants of patient satisfaction: a systematic review. *Perspectives in Public Health*, 137(2), 89-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757913916634136>
- Bernardo, J. M. S., Mendes, G. H. de S., Lizarelli, F. L., & Roscani, M. G. (2022). Instruments to measure patient experience in hospitals: a scoping review. *Gestão & Produção*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9649-2022v29e0821>
- Bleich, S. N., Ozaltin, E., & Murray, C. K. L. (2009). How does satisfaction with the health-care system relate to patient experience? *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 87(4), 271-278. <https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.07.050401>
- Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252296>
- Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & Johnson, L. W. (2007). A Hierarchical Model of Health Service Quality: Scale development and investigation of an integrated model. *Journal of Service Research*, 10(2), 123-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670507309594>
- Darzi, M. A., Islam, S. B., Khursheed, S. O., & Bhat, S. A. (2023). Service quality in the healthcare sector: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *LBS Journal of Management & Research*, 21(1), 13-29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LBSJMR-06-2022-0025>
- De Simone, S., Planta, A., & Cicotto, G. (2018). The role of job satisfaction, work engagement, self-efficacy and agentic capacities on nurses' turnover intention and patient satisfaction. *Applied Nursing Research*, 39, 130-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2017.11.004>
- Donabedian, A. (1966). Evaluating the Quality of Medical Care. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 44(3), 166. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3348969>
- Donabedian, A. (1988). The quality of care. How can it be assessed? *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 260(12), 1743-1748. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.260.12.1743>
- Eitel, D. R., Rudkin, S. E., Malvey, M. A., Killeen, J. P., & Pines, J. M. (2010). Improving Service Quality by Understanding Emergency Department Flow: A White Paper and Position Statement Prepared for the American Academy of Emergency Medicine. *The Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 38(1), 70-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemermed.2008.03.038>
- Ferreira, D. C., Vieira, I., Pedro, M. I., Caldas, P., & Varela, M. (2023). Patient Satisfaction with Healthcare Services and the Techniques Used for its Assessment: A Systematic Literature Review and a Bibliometric Analysis. *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, 11(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11050639>
- Grasso, M. S., Del Carmen Valls Martínez, M., & Ramírez-Orellana, A. (2021). Health Policies Based on Patient Satisfaction: A Bibliometric Study. *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, 9(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9111520>
- Güdü, Ö. (2025). Telehealth applications in home health services: A bibliometric analysis. *Turkish Journal of Family Practice*, 29(1), 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.54308/turkfampract.2025.811>
- Hoehn, R. S., Hanseman, D. J., Go, D., Wima, K., Chang, A., Ertel, A. E., Shah, S. A., & Abbott, D. E. (2016). Hospital resources are associated with value-based surgical performance. *The Journal of Surgical Research*, 204(1), 15-21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230210445078>
- Lan, X., Yu, H., & Cui, L. (2022). Application of Telemedicine in COVID-19: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.908756>
- Man, C., Liu, T., Yan, S., Xie, Q., & Liu, H. (2024). Research status and hotspots of patient engagement: A bibliometric analysis. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 125, 108306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2024.108306>
- Matzler, K., & Sauerwein, E. (2002). The factor structure of customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 13(4), 314-332. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230210445078>
- Meesala, A., & Paul, J. (2018). Service quality, consumer satisfaction and loyalty in hospitals: Thinking for the future. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 40, 261-269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.10.011>

- Mittal, V., Ross, W. T., & Baldasare, P. M. (1998). The Asymmetric Impact of Negative and Positive Attribute-Level Performance on Overall Satisfaction and Repurchase Intentions. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251801>
- Naidu, A. (2009). Factors affecting patient satisfaction and healthcare quality. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 22(4), 366-381. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526860910964834>
- Nepomuceno, T. C. C., Piubello Orsini, L., de Carvalho, V. D. H., Poletto, T., & Leardini, C. (2022). The Core of Healthcare Efficiency: A Comprehensive Bibliometric Review on Frontier Analysis of Hospitals. *Healthcare*, 10(7), 1316. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10071316>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1251430>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/200827786_SERVQUAL_A_Multiple-item_Scale_for_Measuring_Consumer_Perceptions_of_Service_Quality
- Persis, J. (2025). Perceived healthcare quality via digital health platforms – evidence from Indian hospitals. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 42(4), 1081-1109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJORM-11-2023-0363>
- Sweileh, W. M. (2022). Patient satisfaction with nursing care: A bibliometric and visualization analysis (1950-2021). *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 28(5), e13076. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.13076>
- Thompson, A. G., & Suñol, R. (1995). Expectations as determinants of patient satisfaction: concepts, theory and evidence. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care/ : Journal of the International Society for Quality in Health Care*, 7(2), 127-141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/7.2.127>
- Thompson, D. A., Yarnold, P. R., Williams, D. R., & Adams, S. L. (1996). Effects of Actual Waiting Time, Perceived Waiting Time, Information Delivery, and Expressive Quality on Patient Satisfaction in the Emergency Department. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 28(6), 657-665. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0644\(96\)70090-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0644(96)70090-2)
- Yeh, J., & Lin, W. (2007). Using simulation technique and genetic algorithm to improve the quality care of a hospital emergency department. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 32(4), 1073-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2006.02.017>
- Young, G. J., Meterko, M., & Desai, K. R. (2000). Patient satisfaction with hospital care: effects of demographic and institutional characteristics. *Medical Care*, 38(3), 325-334. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005650-200003000-00009>

Appendix – A: WoS Search Query

TS={

("patient satisf*" OR "patient experience*" OR "experience of care"

OR "consumer satisf*" OR "client satisf*"

OR "HCAHPS" OR "CAHPS" OR "Press Ganey" OR "patient-reported experience"

OR "patient reported experience" OR "patient-reported experience measure*" OR PREM*

OR "Picker Patient Experience" OR "Picker Patient Experience Questionnaire" OR "PPE-15"

OR "Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire" OR "PSQ-18")

AND

("service quality" OR "quality of service" OR SERVQUAL OR healthqual

OR "perceived service quality" OR "service excellence")

AND

(healthcare OR "health care" OR hospital* OR clinic* OR "primary care"

OR "emergency department*" OR "intensive care" OR ICU

OR inpatient* OR outpatient* OR "medical service*" OR "health service*")

)


NOT TS=(hospitality)

AND PY=1990-2025

AND DT=(ARTICLE OR REVIEW)

AND LA=(English)

Appendix – B: PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram



(No additional sources, registers, or manual records were used.)

Source: Page MJ, et al. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.