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Measuring patient satisfaction with urinary incontinence treatment

Abstract

Background: A number of patient satisfaction measures were trialed in a cross-sectional survey of women who had treatment for urinary incontinence (N=187). The psychometric properties of these measures were examined and a short measure for patient satisfaction was developed.

Methods: Participants completed a questionnaire comprising items covering incontinence status, treatment type and three generic patient satisfaction questionnaires: the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-18), the Consultation Satisfaction Questionnaire (Consult SQ), and the Patient Satisfaction Index (PSI).

Donabedian's model postulates that satisfaction is the patient's judgment on the quality of care. The seven dimensions in this model provide the conceptual framework against which the measures were reviewed.

Results: The instruments were examined by their descriptive systems, internal structures and responsiveness. The items from the instruments were examined through iterative Mokken and partial credit IRT analyses against Donabedian's model. Seven items were selected which formed a Short Assessment of Patient Satisfaction (SAPS) scale. Its internal psychometric properties were excellent (α = 0.86) and it provided a patient satisfaction perspective that was most consistent with Donabedian's model.

In summary, the internal structures of the instruments suggested that all SAPS items were responsive, but some items on the other measures were insensitive. Also, all measures were shown to be unidimensional. Tests of response bias suggested that this was present in the CSQ-18 and the PSI. Redundancy was observed in the Consult SQ, CSQ-18 and PSI.

Conclusions: This study has provided evidence that patient satisfaction can be assessed validly, reliably and sensitively using the much shorter SAPS instrument. This new short measure of patient satisfaction with treatment will be a useful tool for clinicians and evaluators as the population ages.
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Study aims
Comparison of four patient satisfaction instruments:
- CSQ-18 (Client Satisfaction Questionnaire; 18 items)
- Consult SQ (Consultation Satisfaction Questionnaire; 18 items)
- GUTSS (Genito-Urinary Treatment Satisfaction Scale; 10 items)
- PSI (Patient Satisfaction Inventory; 23 items)

Introduction

1. Incontinence affects ~38% of females and ~10% of males
2. Treatment outcomes are symptom relief, improved quality of life
3. Another outcome is satisfaction with health care
   - Expectation that clinicians will 'cure' or alleviate symptoms
   - Patients' rights sees patients as 'consumers' who need to be informed, consulted and involved in medical decision-making
   - Patients views help monitor health care quality

Review of the patient satisfaction literature

1. Most studies used a single-item measure
2. Only 1 incontinence-specific measure
3. Over 60% of papers fail to report any psychometric properties

Results 1: Comparison of instruments

- All 4 patient satisfaction instruments shown to have some psychometric properties
- SAPS more sensitive than CSQ-18 or PSI to satisfaction estimate
- Less sensitive than GUTSS

Participants

- Participation rate = 44% (N = 184)
- Treatment: Physiotherapy (27%), Surgery (40%), Both (33%)
- Then-test: Improved (82%), No change (12%), Worse (6%)

Results 2: Construction of the SAPS

- Preparing the data
  - Loevinger H exceeds value for strong unidimensional scale
- Mokken analysis for item fit and scale analysis
- Partial credit item response theory analysis for item examination
- Delete non-responsive & poorly worded items
- Collapse sparse data & inconsistent response categories

Results 3: Psychometric properties of SAPS

- Based on pooled items, can a comprehensive model be constructed?

Results 4: Responsiveness of SAPS

- SAPS more sensitive than Consult SQ, CSQ-18 or PSI to treatment type and treatment outcomes
- Less sensitive than GUTSS
- SAPS more sensitive than any instrument to pooled patient satisfaction estimate

Conclusions

1. All 4 patient satisfaction instruments shown to have some measurement problems
2. Pooling of items led to the construction of the SAPS
3. SAPS (7-items) shortest instrument and has excellent internal psychometric properties
4. SAPS more sensitive than any instrument to pooled patient satisfaction estimate
5. SAPS needs to be tested in other samples and populations
6. A single item measure has also been derived from the study
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(1) ρ = point biserial correlation, d = logits; e = standard error
(2) Standard deviation
(3) Value under P-matrix analysis
(4) Value under standard error
(5) Significance: * ≤ 0.05, ** ≤ 0.01

Interpretation:
- Excellent coverage of patient satisfaction theory areas
- No substantial violations of Guttman monotonicity
- Loewinger H exceeds value for strong unidimensional scale