Title Page

1-Title:

A Systematic Review: The Dimensions and Indicators utilized in the Performance Evaluation of Health Care Organizations- An Implication during COVID-19 Pandemic

2-Authors affiliations and qualifications:

Faten Amer*[1,2], Sahar Hammoud[1], Haitham Khatatbeh[1], Szimonetta Lohner[3], Imre Boncz[2], Dóra Endrei[2]

[1] Doctoral School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

[2] Institute for Health Insurance, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pécs, Hungary

[3] Cochrane Hungary, Clinical Center of the University of Pécs, Medical School, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

*** Corresponding Author:**
Email Address: amer.faten@etk.pte.hu
ORCID details: Faten Amer https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5214-3797

3-Acknowledgements

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

4- Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

5-Authors' contributions

This systematic review was planned and designed by all authors. Search and data extraction was performed by F.A & S.H. Interpretation of data analysis was made by F.A, S.H & H.K.

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

6-Availability of data and materials

The data underlying this article are available in the article, and its online supplementary material are going to be provided upon journal request.

7-Funding

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

8-Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abbreviations:

(AACI): American Accreditation Commission International
(AFT): Accelerated Failure Time
(ARDS): Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome
(BSC): Balanced Scorecard
(CDC): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
(COVID-19): Coronavirus Disease 2019
(CSR): Community Social Responsibility
(CSSD): Central Sterile Supply Department
(DEA): Data Envelopment Analysis
(DRG): Diagnostic Related Groups
(EFQM): European Foundation for Quality Management
(ER): Emergency Room
(GIS): Geographic Information System
(HAIs): Health-Associated Infections
(HCOs): Health Care Organizations
(HCQI): Health Care Quality Indicator
(HCWs): Health Care Workers
(HMIS) Health Management Information System
(HPC): High-Performance Computing
(HW): Health Waste
(IC): Infection Control
(ICU): Intensive Care Unit
(IoT): Internet of Things
(ISO): International Organization for Standardization
(JCI): Joint Commission International
(KAP): Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices
(KPIs): Key Performance Indicators
(LoS): Length of Stay
(MBNQA): Malcolm Baldrige National excellence model
(MBO): Management by Objectives
(MeSH): Medical Subject Headings
(MMA): multi-mechanism approach
(MS): multi-state
(NHS): National Health System
(OECD): Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
(PATH): Performance Assessment Tool for quality improvement in Hospital
(PE): Performance Evaluation
(PPC): Physician-Patient Communication
(PPE): personal protective equipment
(PRISMA): Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
(QOPI): Quality Oncology Practice Initiative
(ROA): Return on Assets

(RoB): The Risk of Bias
(ROI): Return On Investment
(SAQ): Safety Attitude Questionnaire
(SQA): Singapore Quality Award
(SSI): Social Sustainability Indicators
(TC): Truncation Corrected
(TI): Technology and information
(TOPSIS): Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution
(TQIP): Trauma Quality Improvement Program
(TQM): Total Quality Management
(UK): United Kingdom
(USA): United States of America
(USD): United States Dollar
(VR): Virtual Reality
(WT): Waiting Time

A Systematic Review: The Dimensions and Indicators utilized in the Performance Evaluation of Health Care Organizations- An Implication during COVID-19 Pandemic

Abstract

This systematic review aims to identify the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which are the most frequently used and important in the Performance Evaluation (PE) of Health Care Organizations (HCOs). Also, it aimed to analyze the resulted Balanced Scorecard (BSC) dimensions during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) era. This systematic review was prepared according to PRISMA guidelines. PubMed, Embase, Cochrane, and Google Scholar databases, as well as Google search engine, were inspected to find all implementations of BSC at HCOs until 20 September 2020. The Risk of Bias (RoB) was assessed for each included article. The eligible studies were 33, in which 36 BSC implementations were identified. The categorization and re-grouping of the 797 KPIs resulted in 13 major-dimensions: The financial, efficiency and effectiveness, availability and quality of supplies and services, managerial tasks, Health Care Workers (HCWs) scientific development error-free and safety, the time, HCW-centeredness, patient-centeredness, technology and information system, community care and reputation, HCO building, and the communication. Under them, 45 sub-dimension were identified. The high RoB in most implementations was due to the selection bias. None of the 36 BSC implementations was utilized during the COVID-19 pandemic. This review solves the dilemma of categorization differences among BSC implementations, which in turn will improve the data sharing and

comparability among studies. A modification for the BSC design to include external and managerial perspectives is required. However, a lack of a comprehensive PE for HCOs during the pandemic was observed, so the resulted dimensions and KPIs are recommended for planning, monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement of HCOs. Many dimensions were negatively influenced by the pandemic. However, some dimensions still need further investigation. BSC dimensions have an essential role in tackling the COVID-19 pandemic and will help the health care managers to mitigate its consequences on HCOs.

Keywords

Balanced scorecard; performance; indicators; health; hospital; evaluation; assessment; COVID-19

1. Introduction

Evaluating the health care sector is quite challenging and complex. The unsatisfactory performance can result from long Waiting Time (WT), in-efficiency, dissatisfied patients, and the burnout of Health Care Workers (HCWs) [1,2]. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) imposed further burdens on the health care system worldwide due to the limited capacity of hospital beds, and the increased psychological stress of HCWs during the COVID-19 pandemic [3,4]. There is still a lack of information that would help health care managers and policymakers in the era of COVID-19 to improve the delivery of health care quality and to learn for the future [5]. Higher pandemic burdens such as HCWs' burnout and stress are expected when the Health Care Organizations (HCOs) lack plans and preparedness to strengthen their surge capacity and HCWs' resilience [6,7].

1.1 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) before COVID-19 pandemic

HCOs employed different tools for the Performance Evaluation (PE) with a variety of KPIs. The most utilized PE tools were the International Organization for Standardization (ISO standards), Malcolm Baldrige National excellence model (MBNQA), European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM) excellence model, Singapore Quality Award (SQA), Six Sigma, Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), Pabon Lasso model, and Balanced Scorecard (BSC) [8–12].

Performance Assessment Tool for quality improvement in Hospital (PATH), was a project initiated by World Health Organizations (HCOs) in 2003. It aimed at developing a framework for the assessment of hospitals' performance. The resulted dimensions from this project were: clinical effectiveness, efficiency, HCWs' orientation, responsive governance, safety, patient-

centeredness. However, studies showed that there are still some gaps in this model, and issues concerning the dimensions investigated [13,14]. Also, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) launched Health Care Quality Indicator (HCQI) project in 2006, it aimed to develop KPIs to compare quality in health care at the international level and to achieve international benchmarking. This project concluded that health care has to be safe, effective, patient-centered, timely, efficient, equitable, acceptable, and accessible [15,16].

Most of the above-mentioned managerial tools mainly focused on the KPIs related to quality, efficiency, productivity, and timeliness dimensions [8–12,17]. Each of them can be considered as a dimension at the internal perspective of the BSC, which consists of 4 perspectives: the internal process, customer, innovation and growth perspectives, and financial perspectives [18]. Dimensions are collections of homogeneous or related KPIs which were also referred to as Diagnostic Related Groups (DRG) [19]. Dimensions allowed a comparison of performance across hospitals and had a positive impact on improving efficiency [19].

The use of KPIs in the health care system before the pandemic has been beneficial for many reasons. First, increasing the satisfaction rates of patients and HCWs. Second, they lead to better efficiency, effectiveness, and financial performance, as well as adapting to new technologies and ideas. Third, they lead to higher productivity and profitability [20–22]. In the pandemic, it is also important for the HCO to track the performance of KPIs, which could draw faster attention to the areas that require rapid responses and strengthening [6].

BSC was considered different from the other managerial tools for 2 reasons. First, it offers a holistic approach to PE, since it allows the managers to highlight both the financial and the non-financial metrics. The first generation of the BSC, unveiled by Kaplan and Norton in

1992, involved 4 perspectives: the financial, customer, internal process, and innovation and growth perspectives, steered by the organizational vision and strategy [18]. Second, the BSC is not only planning or a PE tool. It is also a strategic managerial tool, as it assigns KPIs which are compatible with the HCO strategy [23,24]. However, other PE tools such as Total Quality Management (TQM) tools lack these thorough properties [25]. Later on, the BSC second generation was developed to include strategic maps, in which cause-effect cascades between perspectives or KPIs were inspected. In the third generation of BSC, a destination statement was incorporated, which evokes where does the organization plan to go within a time horizon, and what are the action plans to achieve each targeted objective [26]. In health care, BSC was initially implemented in 1997 at Duke Children's Hospital in the United States of America (USA), and as a result of this use, the hospital was able to convert USD 11M of losses into USD 4M of profits after 4 years of implementation [27]. Since then, BSC has gained increasing attention, and many HCOs in high-income countries, as well as low- and middle-income countries, utilized BSC to strategically develop their organizations [28–32].

Most of the available PE models mainly focus on the internal perspective but lacks covering the other dimensions or perspectives that are also important according to the health care managers. Reviewing the previous BSC reviews, we noticed that they only focus on the general narration for which perspectives or KPIs were used [33–43]. However, they lack being systematic in the categorization of KPIs.

1.2 KPIs during COVID-19 pandemic

One of the first studies to assess the impact of COVID-19 on KPIs [44], analyzed the impact of COVID-19 on pancreato-biliary endoscopy-related KPIs. However, limited research was found to assess the HCOs -related KPIs at COVID-19 in general. Health policy experts stated that the current approach to quality measurement in the COVID-19 era is challenged by the

insufficient standardization of data for sharing purposes, so the comparison between the performance of the health care systems is disrupted [5]. It was considered that this is especially important in cases where the optimal performance is not fully understood as in pandemics, and a comparison with other health systems would be informative and necessary [5]. So, addressing the lack of data standardization was suggested to be established by quickly defining measures, which could allow health systems, at least in the short term, to use standardized methods to better understand their performance [5].

In correspondence with these requirements, this research aims at a) finding all the perspectives, dimensions, and KPIs which were employed in BSC implementations and re-categorizing them, b) ranking dimensions according to their frequency of use by HCOs across the world, and c) ranking dimensions according to their importance from the health care perspective d) analyzing the impact of COVID-19 on BSC's perspectives, dimensions, and sub-dimensions.

2. Materials and methods

This systematic review was conducted according to the 27-point checklist of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist [45], see Appendix (S1).

2.1. Eligibility Criteria

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

Table (1) to be placed here.

2.2. Data Sources, Search Strategy, and Study Selection

First, a search strategy was developed for the PubMed database, see Table (1). Then, the strategy was adapted for Embase, Cochrane CENTRAL, and Google Scholar databases. Furthermore, an additional search in the Google engine was performed to find grey literature or unpublished papers; including theses and conference abstracts. Additionally, the reference lists of all the eligible articles were checked by the 1st author. The databases were searched until September 20, 2020. The search strategy was developed by the 1st, 2nd, and 4th authors, the first 2 authors are experts in health care management and BSC, while the 4th author is an expert in systematic reviews and meta-analysis. To widen the search frame and get more results, the search strategy was developed to include both Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords. Then appropriate truncation and relevant indexing terms were used. See Appendix (S2) which shows all search strategies in all databases. Afterward, the 1st author conducted an electronic database search and removed the duplicates by using the EndNote X9.2 program.

The selection of eligible studies was done by the 1st and the 2nd authors independently in all the steps. Disagreements were resolved by discussion after each step or, if necessary, through arbitration by the 4th author. Firstly, the articles' titles and abstracts were examined to eliminate irrelevant papers. Then, full texts were carefully inspected to decide the final papers' inclusion list. If different KPIs were used in more than 1 implementation in the same study, each was counted as a different implementation. Whereas, implementations using the same KPIs in different locations or times in the same study were considered as 1 implementation. Authors of studies with no available full texts or with partially reported results were contacted for missing data.

2.3 Data Collection Process

Data extraction was done by the 1st and 2nd authors independently, then compared to discuss differences. The following data were extracted from the eligible studies: 1) author/s, 2) year of publication, 3) country of origin, 4) data collection duration, 5) data collection tool, 6) psychometric properties, 7) the number of perspectives, 8) the number of KPIs, 9) availability of weights for perspectives or KPIs, and 10) outcome which is represented in the KPIs that have been used and their weights. For that, the frequency of use for each KPI at each implementation was plotted on Microsoft Excel and the sum was calculated. In addition, weights assigned for each KPI at each implementation were reported on a scale of 100%. While in the case of studies that did not assign weights explicitly, each KPI weight was calculated by dividing 1 at the number of used KPIs in that study, to assign an equal weight for each KPI there. Consequently, an average of the weights assigned for each KPI has been computed by the 1st and 2nd authors independently. Next, re-grouping and coding for the KPIs were performed by the 1st author, to find the frequency of use and the assigned weights percentages for each dimension. Then the resulted major and sub-dimensions were listed and described.

2.4 The Risk of Bias (ROB)

The 1st and the 2nd authors evaluated the resulted 36 implementations separately to assess: the selection bias, performance bias, attrition bias, detection bias, and reporting bias for each implementation. Each Risk of Bias (RoB) was categorized into 3 categories according to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews: high risk, low risk, and unclear risk [46]. Then the total risk was categorized for each study as high risk, medium risk, or low risk. The assessments were compared; in case of disagreement, the 4th author was consulted. Summary of RoB was prepared using RevMan 5 [47].

3. Results/ Discussion

3.1 Study Selection

A total of 4028 records have resulted from running the search strategy in the 4 databases. In addition, another 3 records were identified through Google search. So, a total of 4031 records have resulted. Duplicates were removed (n=1046) using the EndNote program, then the remaining articles were screened based on their titles and abstracts (n=2985). Irrelevant papers were excluded (n=2794). Consequently, the remaining 191 studies were examined by reading the full texts. Among these papers, 22 papers were written in non-English languages including Spanish, German, French, Chinese, and Persian, for which a full-text translation was performed for each paper to decide whether to include or exclude any of them, see Appendix (S3). As a result of reading the full texts, 158 studies were excluded, and only 33 studies were eligible for this review in which 36 full implementations of different BSC designs were actually applied. Table (2) shows a summary of the 36 implementations. Details of the study selection process are shown in the PRISMA flow-chart [45]. See Fig. (1).

Fig. (1) to be placed here.

3.2 Study Characteristics

3.2.1 Implementation

After analysis of implementations, 2 studies [48,49] were found to include 3 and 2 implementations respectively with different KPIs per each. Thus, the 33 resulted studies contained 36 different implementations. No BSC implementation in the COVID-19 era was found.

3.2.2 Settings differences

21 of the implementations were performed in hospitals (2ry and 3ry HCOs) [41,49–67], and 15 in medical centers or health facilities (1ry HCOs) [30–32,48,68–76].

3.2.3 Study Design

All studies had a cross-sectional design, except 2 were retrospective longitudinal studies [65,70].

3.2.4 Language and Location

From the resulted 36 implementations, 1 was in Spanish, 1 was in Persian, and the rest were in English language. The 36 implementations were done in various countries; 19 in Asia [30–32,48,50–52,56–58,65,66,68,70,74,75,77], 7 in North America [55,60–62,64,67,71], 6 in Europe [49,53,54,59,63], 3 in Africa [69,72,76], and 1 without location information [73].

3.3 Perspectives Frequency of Use and Importance

A total of 797 KPIs were extracted from the resulted implementations. These KPIs were categorized in the studies under 15 perspectives. The average number of perspectives used per study was 4.5, and for the KPIs was 22. The top frequently used perspectives were: the internal, financial, patient, learning and growth, HCWs, managerial, community, and stakeholder perspectives. The total use frequency of these perspectives at the implementations were 29.6%, 17%, 12.6%, 12.6%, 9.4%, 6.3%, 5%, and 3.1% respectively. On the other hand, the topmost important perspectives from the health managers' view of point were: the internal, financial, learning and growth, patient, HCWs, community, managerial, and stakeholder perspectives with a total weight of 37.9%, 15.4%, 12%, 11.3%, 7.8%, 7.7%, 3.6%, and 2.8% respectively, see Appendix (S4).

Fig. (2) to be placed here.

3.4 Categorization and Re-grouping of KPIs

In the categorization process, the 797 extracted KPIs were plotted according to their frequencies and weights. After re-grouping of these KPIs into homogenous major dimensions and sub-dimensions, 13 major-dimensions resulted, with 45 sub-dimensions. The resulted major- and sub-dimensions were listed and described in Table (3).

3.5 Dimensions/Sub-dimensions Frequency of Use and Importance

The frequencies in which the KPIs were used and the weights that have been assigned to each of them at these implementations were plotted separately in Appendix (S4). Re-grouping and re-categorization of KPIs resulted in Fig. (2 & 3), which respectively show 13 major dimensions and the 45 sub-dimensions based on their frequency of use and importance.

3.6 Risk of Bias (ROB)

The RoB were found to be medium in 9 implementations at 9 studies [30–32,59,61,74,76,78,79], low in 6 implementation at 4 studies [48,69,72,77], while it was high for the rest. The reporting bias was low in all implementations. The selection bias was high in almost 70% of the implementations. For more details, see Appendix (S5).

3.7 Implications of the resulted dimensions in the COVID-19 era

Although this systematic review was updated to include 10 months after the initiation of the COVID-19 pandemic, no research for BSC utilization in COVID-19 was found. Since this topic was not yet analyzed in the literature, the authors pursued a further analysis based on separate researches per each resulted dimension during the COVID-19 era.

3.7.1 The Financial dimension in COVID-19

Due to COVID-19 hospitalizations at the beginning of the pandemic, health policy experts suggested that HCOs in some regions will have more significant revenue as well as greater costs related to additional HCW and resources. In contrast, other hospitals will experience mostly sharp reductions in elective and outpatient revenues, which will create unprecedented financial challenges for HCOs [80]. However, in addition to the greater costs of HCWs and resources, researchers found higher costs of treatment occurred as a result of extra diagnostic tests and isolation costs [81].

In the United Kingdom (UK), the total expenditure on National Health System (NHS) has increased significantly during the pandemic [82]. The NHS made funding upgrades to expand waiting areas and treatment cubicles [83]. Some researches focused on the cost-effectiveness calculations. A study in South Africa indicated that purchasing Intensive Care Unit (ICU) capacity from the private sector during COVID-19 surges may not be a cost-effective investment [84]. Up to now, there is still a lack of studies that handled the financial dimension or developed cost-saving strategies at the health organization level in COVID-19.

3.7.2 The error-free and safety dimension in COVID-19

This dimension includes monitoring, analysis, and comparability of mortality rates, as well as investigation of its determinants in HCOs. Although mortality may not be directly related to errors, higher mortality rates than the average of HCOs can reveal an underlying error. A cohort study in Mexico City [85] found that the mortality rates at the hospital's ICU and non-ICU departments were similar. The reason behind this finding was the ICU bed's unavailability. Around 45% of the patients who did not survive did not get an ICU bed, which raised the mortality rate in the non-ICU admitted patients. However, this study revealed that the main cause of the non-ICU admitted patients was the Acute Respiratory Distress

Syndrome (ARDS). Whereas, the main cause of mortality for admitted patients was due to septic shock, followed by ARDS and multi-organ failure.

The WHO has provided clear guidelines for Infection Control (IC) during health care when COVID-19 is suspected or confirmed [86]. Patient safety was investigated in a systematic review for Indian-related researches [87]. It found that patient safety was negatively impacted during the COVID-19 pandemic due to the inadequate preparation of the health care system, such as infrastructure, human and material resources. Also, researchers categorized diagnostic errors that could occur in the COVID-19 pandemic into 8 types and suggested how to reduce them [88].

However, many studies showed improvements in this dimension during the pandemic. A study in the UK [89] found a significant increase in the Safety Attitude Questionnaire (SAQ) scores of doctors and other clinical HCW, and no change in the nursing group. It also showed a significant decrease in error reporting after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Another study in Iran [90] found that the Health-Associated Infections (HAIs) during the pandemic were reduced, which could be referred to the proper implementation of IC protocols. This is supported by a study in Ghana [91] which found that the HCW compliance to IC measures was high during the pandemic.

Health Waste (HW) management sub-dimension was intensively investigated due to the tremendous increase of HW volume during the pandemic [92]. A study in Iran [93] indicated that the infectious waste increased by 121 % compared with earlier the pandemic. Direct exposure of HCWs to virus-contaminated waste with inadequate safety measures and mismanagement of the HW may lead to their infection and can facilitate the transmission of the COVID-19 [92,94]. The WHO has provided clear guidelines for managing health care waste during the pandemic [95]. Despite that, many studies all around the world [94,96,97]

illustrated the existence of gaps and a defective system for handling HW during the pandemic.

A mini-review [92] for HW during the pandemic showed that disinfecting the waste, followed by the proper segregation and on-site treatment of the waste, can also provide better and healthier HW management. It also revealed that surplus HW accommodation, mobile treatment, and temporary storage strategies might aid the sustainable management of health care waste without further spreading the virus. Another study in Brazil [96] proposed a model for the proper management of HW. It did not focus only on the operational management KPIs of the HW, but also on environmental management such as sustainable practices. Moreover, it highlighted the importance of employee training on HW guidelines since the HW management was not considered as an essential competence or a priority for all HCOs.

3.7.3 The efficiency and effectiveness dimension in COVID-19

Analyzing the number of patients' visits and admissions in the USA [98] revealed a decrease in ER visits, with an increase in hospital admissions. However, another study in Alberta [99] perceived decreased admissions and ER visits to the hospital, despite the low volume of COVID-19 hospital admissions.

Many studies were performed to analyze the efficiency, utilization, and productivity of HCOs during the pandemic. A study [100] indicated that hospitals that were efficient under normal conditions, lost their efficiency during the outbreak of COVID 19 and have to adapt to the new criteria. A systematic review [101] showed that health care utilization decreased by about a third during the pandemic, with greater reductions among people with less severe illness.

A study at an isolation hospital in Egypt [102] utilized the DEA tool to improve efficiency. It confirmed that the number of nurses and the number of beds impacted the operational

efficiency of COVID-19, while the number of physicians had no significant effect on the efficiency. These results are compatible with a study in Mauritius [19] which found that nurses and beds are the most important factors in hospital production; that is, a 1% increase in the number of beds and nurses, resulted in an increase in hospital outputs by 0.73 and 0.51%, respectively.

3.7.4 The availability and quality of supplies and services dimension in COVID-19

This dimension includes evaluating the availability and the quality of COVID-related medications, masks, personal protective equipment (PPE), detergents, medical services, supportive services, etc. Supplies and logistics management dimension was considered an important KPI in the tackling of COVID-19 [6]. Also, the availability of both clinical services and supportive services at hospitals was viewed as essential in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and flow of COVID-positive patients [103]. The spectrum of supportive services to a hospital encompasses linen and laundry, dietary, Central Sterile Supply Department (CSSD), transport, consumables in large quantities at hospital stores, mortuary, and engineering services [103]. Some of the most crucial items were the filtering face-piece respirators or N95 respirators and the PPE kits' availability [103]. The challenge during this pandemic in terms of inadequate availability of PPE in HCOs throughout the world highlighted the important role of the CSSD, a method of decontamination and re-use of filtering face respirators that has been suggested by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to overcome the shortage of these respirators is their extended use or re-use [103].

However, researchers referred to the lack of studies on the quality of supplies and services at HCOs in COVID-19 [5]. This can be referred to data lag in pandemics which is the time

between the provision of care and the quality measurements reporting [5]. To solve this, policymakers suggested that measures should be less reliant on claims data, which by nature have a time lag, and focus on measures that can be generated from the electronic health record (EHR) [5].

3.7.5 The time dimension in COVID-19

An “extra layer of processes” was added due to the donning and doffing protocols and cleaning requirements, which slowed all the operational processes down, and increased the time required to accomplish serving the medical care to patients [82]. The patients' WT was also influenced. In the UK, WT reached high records with a special impact on elective surgery. The number of patients who waited for more than a year to get NHS treatment in July 2020 was 81-fold more than the previous year's number [83].

Moreover, patients' Length of Stay (LoS) increased also for another 2–3 days. A reason for that was the delays in COVID-19 testing results [104]. LoS in the USA was found to be 2 days more than that in Italy and 5 days less than that in Germany [105]. A systematic review for patients LoS in COVID-19 [106] concluded that LoS in China was longer than any other country, which was referred to differences in criteria for admission and discharge, and different timing within the pandemic. In another study [105], a negative association between the LoS and the case fatality rate was found. Therefore, the estimation of the LoS can be introduced as a KPI to scale the success of the countries fighting the ongoing pandemic. Moreover, LoS provides insights as to when hospitals will reach capacity, as well as predicting associated HCWs or equipment requirements [106]. Discharge status should be taken into consideration when analyzing LoS, since the patients who were discharged alive have longer LoS than those who died during their admission [106]. Hospitals reported that

health insurance plans resisted paying for patients' additional days in the hospital while awaiting COVID-19 test results [104].

However, complying with the CDC guidance on testing and disposition of patients was suggested to reduce the patients' LoS, so freeing up hospital beds for incoming COVID-19 patients [104]. Another study in the UK [104] suggested that due to the complexity and partiality of different data sources and the rapidly evolving nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, it is most recommended to use multiple analysis method approaches of LoS on multiple datasets.

A combination of an Accelerated Failure Time (AFT) survival model and a Truncation Corrected (TC) method with the Multi-State (MS) survival model was found to be useful in epidemic planning and management. Finally, the finding of a cohort study [107] concluded that a Multi-Mechanism Approach (MMA) was effective in decreasing the average LoS in ICU by 5.4 days, and up to 9 days in older patients, which suggests that implementation of this treatment protocol could allow a health care system to manage 60% more COVID-19 patients with the same number of ICU beds.

3.7.6 The HCO building dimension in COVID-19

Design and infrastructure preparation was considered an important dimension in the PE of some HCOs at the pandemic [6]. Health care systems made adaptations in HCO buildings after the COVID-19 pandemic. Such as expanding the waiting areas, increasing ICU capacity, establishing isolation areas, and building new hospitals [83]. In the UK, the NHS temporarily used private hospitals to provide public care, leading to an increase in the number of beds, ventilators, and all HCW categories. Moreover, non-hospital sites were temporarily turned into hospitals [108]. However, the ease of access to HCOs in the pandemic was not sufficiently investigated in the research.

3.7.7 The responsiveness and communication dimension in COVID-19

The main goal of HCOs was considered to provide high-quality care to patients and meet their needs and expectations during an outbreak like COVID 19 [100]. Moreover, the importance of dialogue and listening to health demands in COVID-19-suspected patients was highlighted as the main step in the flows of care and guidance [109].

Communication among HCWs was also highlighted. A study [4] considered that HCWs' reception of family support, colleagues support, clear communication, and COVID-19 information as some of the most useful resources in the pandemic. It found that lower levels of HCW's psychological distress symptoms, burnout, and intentions to quit were perceived when these communication resources were more available. Another study [110] indicated that gratitude in communication could reduce depression in HCWs by promoting social support and hope, respectively.

Besides, the communication between HCWs and patients was also investigated during the pandemic. A study in Jordan [111] found that Physician-Patient Communication (PPC) positively affected the patients' psychological status in COVID-19. It recommended avoiding communication errors using jargon, not being available to patients, not showing empathy in communication. Also, it emphasized the benefit of the physicians to be a good listener to patients. However, HCWs-patients' communication faced few obstacles during the pandemic. The protective equipment used by the HCWs in the pandemic could have imposed a barrier on having effective communication or eye contact with them [112]. Some pediatricians reported a noticeable difficulty in communicating with families and following up with patients especially the newly discharged neonates and infants using the telephone [113].

However, more research is still needed to improve and evaluate the patient education programs, patient guidelines, counseling and consultation services, and the communication skills between HCWs and patients in the pandemic.

3.7.8 The patient-centeredness dimension in COVID-19

Many studies were conducted to evaluate patients' satisfaction. A study [114] indicated no difference in patients' satisfaction of the period spent in the emergency room before and during the pandemic. Another study [115] showed positive patient experience and satisfaction rates in one of Saudi Arabia's largest institutions during the pandemic. Moreover, many studies focused on the psychological assessment of COVID-19 impact on the population in general. However, few studies focused on assessing the psychological effects on patients in specific. For example, a study [79] found that COVID-19 patients with low education levels and females who have undergone divorce or bereavement tended to have a high prevalence of adverse psychological events. Another study [116] found that the psychological consequences of the pandemic were better handled by cancer patients of 65 years of age or older, while younger cancer patients were more psychologically affected. Early psychological status identification and intervention should be conducted to avoid extreme events such as self-mutilating or suicidal impulsivity for patients [79]. The patient complaints and loyalty assessment during the pandemic as well as the psychological impact of COVID-19 on non-COVID-19 patients still need more investigation.

3.7.9 The HCWs-centeredness dimension

Physicians referred to the importance of reliable acknowledgment and motivation both emotionally and financially, considering the sacrifices they provide every day [113]. Parallel to this, staffing and recruitment of an adequate number of medical and non-medical HCWs were considered an important KPI for the PE of HCOs at COVID-19 [6]. In the UK, the NHS

employed some strategies during the pandemic to facilitate the staffing process due to the shortage in HCWs. Firstly, deployment of newly qualified/final year medicine and nursing students. Secondly, the return of former HCWs was made [108].

HCW satisfaction rate and burnout were evaluated in many studies at the pandemic. A study [113] showed that the prevalence of burnout among physicians was found to be (57.7%) in the pandemic, which is considered so high. HCWs who lack PPE reported lower occupational satisfaction than those who did not [113,117]. To increase the HCWs' satisfaction rates, their accomplishments at the pandemic were found to be positively associated with higher occupational satisfaction rates [117]. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the better the performance of communication dimension, including the psychological support, will raise the HCWs' job satisfaction and lower the rates of burnout and stress [110,117]. Some HCWs felt stress and fear mainly due to the possibility of transmitting the virus to their family member and the elderly living in their house [113]. To reduce HCWs' stress, a study in Canada [4] showed that HCWs' training and counseling services were perceived as a useful tool, however, they were underutilized in HCOs.

On the other hand, despite that most nurses had to increase their workload as a result of staff shortages, a study [117] found that the elevation of the workload was not associated with lower occupational satisfaction. Also, another study in Singapore [118] found that HCWs' burnout was similar to the pre-pandemic rates. Nevertheless, HCWs' vaccination, engagement, motivation, teamwork, and loyalty sub-dimensions as well as their impact are still not well investigated during the pandemic.

3.7.10 The HCWs' scientific development dimension

Due to its importance, many studies aimed at evaluating the HCWs' Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) at the beginning of the pandemic [119]. HCWs' adherence to IC

measures is affected by their KAP towards COVID-19 [120]. Some studies referred to the insufficient knowledge about COVID-19 among nurses [121]. Surgeons were worried about losing their skills after months of lockdown due to the paused practice [113]. However, HCWs were obliged to learn digital health skills and effectively utilize them in communication with patients during the pandemic crisis [113].

A study [122] found that both COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 publication productivity correlates with epidemiologic factors, health care system-related factors, and pre-COVID publication expertise. So, countries with a stable scientific infrastructure appear to maintain non-COVID-19 publication productivity nearly at the pre-year level. More incentives have to be drawn by HCOs towards their HCWs, to encourage research and the scientific productivity related to COVID-19.

3.7.11 The technology and information system dimension

Experts emphasized the role of Technology and Information (TI) in tackling the COVID-19 as inevitable due to its importance in the response, prevention, preparedness, and recovery phases, [123,124]. TI systems application varies from allowing HCOs to maintain and share records between each other, to being able to produce different reports and to follow-up with pandemic analysis. Telehealth is another example that proved to be useful in the pandemic, as it allowed HCWs to provide care for patients without direct physical contact, especially to patients at quarantine while keeping safe [125].

Researchers summarized the emerging technologies used to mitigate the threats of COVID-19 in the following categories: artificial intelligence/ deep learning, big data analytics, High-Performance Computing (HPC) infrastructures, robots, 3D printing technology, digital contact tracing technology, blockchain [113], bioinformatics systems, telemedicine, mobile phone, decision support system, the IC system in HCO, online interactive dashboard/

Geographic Information System (GIS), Internet of Things (IoT), Virtual Reality (VR), surveillance systems, internet search queries [123,124]

Governments, health care systems, and HCO need to keep updated with the emerging technologies in this field, allocate resources to invest in them, and develop the required skills in HCWs to utilize them properly.

3.7.12 The community care and reputation (the external) dimension

Social Sustainability Indicators (SSI) for health care facilities facing a crisis can be ambiguous to define and apply, so SSI has been organized under the broad categorical concerns of well-being, values, agency, and inequality [126]. Despite the doctor-patient confidentiality clause and the protection law for the patients' data privacy, the Department of Health and Social Care for England has relaxed the rules on sharing patients' confidential data. It required from HCOs and the NHS to provide patient information to each other to help fight covid-19 [127]. Moreover, a leak of COVID-19 patients' data to society and the breaches of their privacy occurred in some countries [113,128], which may have led to the stigmatization of those patients [113].

As mentioned earlier, a study [96] emphasized the importance of sustainable environmental practices for better HW management. The political situation was also considered as an external influence during the pandemic. It was highlighted in a study [129] at the Palestinian territories, which referred to the COVID-19 situation in the presence of the Israeli military occupation to have a double epidemic effect, and which eventually impacted the performance of the Palestinian health system and HCOs during the pandemic.

However, the community role, such as exemptions offered by HCOs for poor patients and social responsibility, as well as patients' privacy concerns and HCOs market shares in COVID-19, are still poorly investigated.

3.7.13 The managerial tasks and assessment dimension

Standard policies, procedures, the availability of written standardized guidelines, and its delivery in full and on time were considered important in tackling COVID-19 [6]. Lack of standardization capability and conflicting or irrational managerial decisions were considered as dissatisfactory factors to HCWs in the pandemic [113].

Planning and preparedness are also important managerial task. The CDC developed a checklist to help hospitals assess and improve their preparedness for responding to COVID-19 [130]. Hospitals utilized a collection for some of the previously explained KPIs and dimensions to perform planning and internal assessment of their performance [126,131].

Centralized governance impact on HCOs during the pandemic was examined in few studies [132,133]. It was found to have a positive effect on the reactive strategies while learning from the past pandemics positively influences proactive and reactive strategies. However, the role of PE internally such as the utilization of BSC or MBNQA tools, or the external assessment such as Joint Commission International (JCI) accreditations, ISO certification, auditing, or peer-review on HCOs during the pandemic still require more investigation.

3.8 Discussion of the main results

In fulfillment of the research aims, all the perspectives, dimensions and KPIs employed in BSC implementations were collected. Categorization and re-grouping of the KPIs into major- and sub-dimensions were performed. Then the dimensions were ranked according to their frequency of use, as well as their importance. Finally, the resulted BSC dimensions were analyzed separately during the COVID-19 pandemic. The BSC tool can offer comprehensive planning, monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of the HCOs' KPIs. Hence, improving their performance in the short term as well as in the long term.

In general, the high risk of selection bias at most implementations can be referred to as why HCOs were chosen purposively instead of randomly in most of them, besides due to the non-randomly choice of HCWs and patients. On the other hand, the low risk of reporting bias for all resulted implementations can be referred to the inclusion and exclusion criteria that we set at the beginning of this review, which has a complete reporting of indicators' evaluation measures.

3.9 Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

Analyzing the results shows that BSC implementations had a typical utilization of the basic 4 perspectives; financial, customer, internal, and innovation and knowledge. However, the frequent employment of other perspectives shows the need for slight modifications of BSC design. For example, adding the sustainability, external, environmental, or community perspective that focused on the needs, perceptions, and reputation of the HCO among the community. This corresponds with a study [134] that referred to the sustainability perspective of the BSC as the fifth pillar. Also, there was a need for adding the managerial perspective, which did not only include the merge of the strategy with other perspectives but also included an evaluation for the managerial tasks and tools utilization at the HCO.

The variation among BSC implementations in the categorization of the same KPIs reflects the need for data standardization. HCWs' training-related KPIs, for example, were categorized under the learning and growth perspective in almost half of the resulted studies [30–32,48–50,56–59,64–70,74–77]. Meanwhile the rest of studies categorized them under the perspectives of HCWs [69,76], quality [71], capacity for service, provision/service capacity [30,31,50,68,69,75], and health care facility functionality [32]. These results are consistent with a study [5] that referred to the lack of defining measures and the lack of data standardization. The differences in categorization prove our assumptions of calculation

imprecision in the use frequency or the importance of the perspectives and KPIs at the previous reviews. Our systematic review has solved this calculation bias by uni-forming the 797 KPIs categorization. Re-grouping similar or semi-similar KPIs under the same category resulted in more precise results. Unification of dimensions can guide uniformed future implementations of PE or BSC at HCOs, allowing data sharing and comparability. This can be the reason why these findings are different from another systematic review [135] that did not consider unifying the classification of KPIs. It found that the average LoS, HAIs, patient satisfaction, bed occupancy, and bed turnover rate were the most useful KPIs according to the HCOs' management.

Analyzing the results also shows a lack of BSC utilization in HCOs during the pandemic. Also, there has been a lack of studies comprehensively examining the impact of COVID-19 on the KPIs. Our analysis reflects that most KPIs were negatively affected during the pandemic, except the IC and safety measures which improved in some cases. A comprehensive PE of HCOs during the COVID-19 pandemic all over the world is required. Some dimensions which are essential for PE are still poorly investigated. So, future researchers are recommended to perform a comprehensive PE for HCOs during COVID-19 using the resulted dimensions. This will provide a better understanding dimensions the causal relationships between them. It will also allow comparability of the interventions' outcomes, which will boost the performance and mitigate the consequences of the pandemic on HCOs. Moreover, researchers are encouraged to perform systematic reviews for each dimension, especially those dimensions that are already well investigated, as well as the investigation of dimensions that are still poorly investigated but essential for PE.

3.10 Strengths and weaknesses

We believe that this paper has several strengths. First, this systematic review includes all types of studies with BSC implementations, such as books, theses, conference papers, letters to the editor, etc. Second, this review includes all implementations despite the country, language, or HCO administrative type. This gives an advantage of being able to generalize the results on HCOs worldwide. Third, this review not only calculates the frequency of use of perspectives but also calculates the weights (importance) assigned to them. Fourth, it is the first review that has uniformed the KPIs in homogenous major dimensions and sub-dimensions despite the categorization differences among implementations, which yields more precise results. Finally, this study is the first to analyze the implication of BSC in HCOs during the pandemic. The resulted KPIs and dimensions at this review can be generalized or replicable to other HCOs and hospitals. However, an initial assessment needs to be done by top management to evaluate the importance of each according to the health organizations' strategy.

On the other hand, this systematic review has some limitations. First, unlike previous reviews, it excludes some HCOs such as laboratories, pharmacies, radiology departments, and biobanks as specified in the inclusion/exclusion criteria. However, this will allow better concentration on KPIs directly related to HCOs offering 1ry, 2ry, and 3ry medical services. It is recommended for future reviews to study the other excluded types separately. Second, it includes only articles that report the complete implementation of BSC while excluding articles that display only the BSC design without reporting full implementation results. Third, the KPIs were extracted from all resulted implementations despite their RoB. Future systematic reviews are encouraged to re-performed when the number of studies with low and medium RoB is higher.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, our review shows that the top frequently used perspectives in BSC papers were: the internal, the financial, the patient, the learning and growth, the HCW, the managerial, the community, and the stakeholder, respectively. While the perspectives which had the highest importance were: the internal, the financial, the learning and growth, the patient, the HCW, the community, the managerial, and the stakeholder, respectively.

Moreover, this review solves the dilemma of the KPIs categorization difference between BSC implementations. The 13 major dimensions that resulted after re-grouping the KPIs are the financial, efficiency and effectiveness, availability and the quality of supplies and services, managerial tasks, HCWs' scientific development, error-free and safety, time, HCW-centeredness, patient-centeredness, technology and information system, community care and reputation, HCO building, and communication. The proper utilization of the 13 major dimensions and the 45 sub-dimensions will serve as a planning, monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement tool for HCOs, resulting in performance augmentation.

This research showed a lack of BSC utilization and any holistic PE approach in HCOs during the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, some dimensions which are essential for PE are still poorly investigated. Future research for comprehensive PE of HCOs during COVID-19 is required. This will lead to performance enhancement and mitigate the consequences of the pandemic on HCOs.

5. References

1. Meena K, Thakkar J. Development of Balanced Scorecard for healthcare using Interpretive Structural Modeling and Analytic Network Process. J Adv Manag Res. 2014;11: 232–256. doi:10.1108/JAMR-12-2012-0051

2. Buathong S, Bangchokdee S. The use of the performance measures in Thai public hospitals. Asian Rev Account. 2017;25: 472–485. doi:10.1108/ARA-03-2017-0043

3. Amer F, Hammoud S, Farran B, Boncz I, Endrei D. Assessment of Countries' Preparedness and Lockdown Effectiveness in Fighting COVID-19. Disaster Med Public Health Prep. 2021;15: e15–e22. doi:10.1017/dmp.2020.217

4. Lou NM, Montreuil T, Feldman LS, Fried GM, Lavoie-Tremblay M, Bhanji F, et al. Evaluations of Healthcare Providers' Perceived Support From Personal, Hospital, and System Resources: Implications for Well-Being and Management in Healthcare in Montreal, Quebec, During COVID-19. Eval Heal Prof. 2021; 1–4. doi:10.1177/01632787211012742

5. Austin JM, Kachalia A. The State of Health Care Quality Measurement in the Era of COVID-19. JAMA. 2020;324: 333. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11461

6. Ali A, Owied MM, Virginia P, Ruth E, Abdulellah AT. Using Logic Model and Key Performance Indicators to Construct A Field Hospital for Coronavirus Pandemic Cases. In: BMC Emergency Medicine [Preprint]. 09 November 2020 [cited 25 Jun 2021]. available from [https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-102321/v1] doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-102321/v1

7. Afulani PA, Gyamerah AO, Nutor JJ, Laar A, Aborigo RA, Malechi H, et al. Inadequate preparedness for response to COVID-19 is associated with stress and burnout among healthcare workers in Ghana. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0250294

8. Andersen H V., Lawrie G, Savič N. Effective quality management through third generation balanced scorecard. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2004;53: 634–645. doi:10.1108/17410400410561259

9. Ruiz U, Simon J. Quality management in health care: a 20 year journey. Int J Health Care Qual Assur. 2004;17: 323–333. doi:10.1108/09526860410557570

10. Hojabri R, Manafi M, Eftekhar F, Ghassemzadeh H. Effective methods for health care organizations: An evaluation of excellence models. African J Bus Manag. 2013;7: 2665–2675. doi:10.5897/AJBM11.2747

11. Klassen A, Miller A, Anderson N, Shen J, Schiariti V, O'Donnell M. Performance measurement and improvement frameworks in health, education and social services systems: a systematic review. Int J Qual Heal Care. 2010;22: 44–69. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzp057

12. Sheykholeslam S, Sachin V. A study of performance evaluation models in health care sector with special reference to EFQM and BSC models. Int J Multidiscip Res Dev. 2015;2: 378–385.

13. Veillard J, Champagne F, Klazinga N, Kazandjian V, Arah OA, Guisset AL. A performance assessment framework for hospitals: The WHO regional office for Europe PATH project. Int J Qual Heal Care. 2005;17: 487–496. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzi072

14. Carini E, Gabutti I, Frisicale EM, Di Pilla A, Pezzullo AM, de Waure C, et al. Assessing hospital performance indicators. What dimensions? Evidence from an umbrella review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020;20: 1–13. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05879-y

15. Busse R, Klazinga N, Panteli D, Quentin W, World Health Organisation. Improving healthcare quality in Europe: Characteristics, effectiveness and implementation of different strategies. In: Improving Healthcare Quality in Europe [Internet]. 2019 [cited 25 Jun 2021] p. 419. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/327356/9789289051750-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

16. Kelley E, Hurst J. Health care quality indicators project: Conceptual framework paper. Oecd Heal Work Pap. 2006; 1–37.

17. Goshtasebi A, Vahdaninia M, Gorgipour R, Samanpour A, Maftoon F, Farzadi F, et al.

Assessing hospital performance by the Pabon Lasso model. Iran J Public Health. 2009;38: 119–124.

18. Kaplan R, Norton D. The balanced scorecard--measures that drive performance. Harv Bus Rev. 1992;70: 71–9.

19. Nundoochan A. Improving public hospital efficiency and fiscal space implications: The case of Mauritius. Int J Equity Health. 2020;19: 1–16. doi:10.1186/s12939-020-01262-9

20. Aghaei Hashjin A, Kringos DS, Manoochehri J, Aryankhesal A, Klazinga NS. Development and impact of the Iranian hospital performance measurement program. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;31: 280–8. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-14-448

21. De Vos M, Graafmans W, Kooistra M, Meijboom B, Van der Voort P, Westert G. Using quality indicators to improve hospital care: A review of the literature. Int J Qual Heal Care. 2009;21: 119–129. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzn059

22. Shaw C, Bruneau C, Baskia K, Jong DG, Sunol R. How can hospital performance be measured and monitored? Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe (Health Evidence Network report; http://www.euro.who.int/document/e82975.pdf, accessed 9 January 2021).

23. Perkins M, Grey A, Remmers H. What do we really mean by “Balanced Scorecard”?", International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2014;63: 148–169. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-11-2012-0127

24. Greiling D. Balanced scorecard implementation in German non-profit organisations. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2010;59: 534–554. doi:10.1108/17410401011063939

25. Hannula M, Kulmala H, Suomala P. Total Quality management and balanced scorecard-A comparative analysis. In: Werther WJ et. al., editor. Productivity & Quality Management Frontiers - VIII. Bradford, UK: MCB University Press; 1999.

26. Speckbacher G, Bischof J, Pfeiffer T. A descriptive analysis on the implementation of Balanced Scorecards in German-speaking countries. Manag Account Res. 2003;14: 361–388. doi:10.1016/j.mar.2003.10.001

27. Meliones J. Saving money, saving lives. Harv Bus Rev. 2000;78: 57-62,64, 66–7.

28. Baker GR, Pink GH. A Balanced Scorecard for Canadian Hospitals. Healthc Manag Forum. 1995;8: 7–13.

29. Fottler MD, Erickson E, Rivers PA. Bringing human resources to the table: Utilization of an HR balanced scorecard at Mayo Clinic. Health Care Manage Rev. 2006;31: 64–72.

30. Peters DH, Noor AA, Singh LP, Kakar FK, Hansen PM, Burnhama G. A balanced scorecard for health services in Afghanistan. Bull World Health Organ. 2007;85: 146–151. doi:10.2471/BLT.06.033746

31. Khan MM, Hotchkiss RD, Dmytraczenko T, Zunaid Ahsan K. Use of a Balanced Scorecard in strengthening health systems in developing countries: An analysis based on nationally representative Bangladesh Health Facility Survey. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2013;28: 202–215. doi:10.1002/hpm.2136

32. Rabbani F, Pradhan NA, Zaidi S, Azam SI, Yousuf F. Service quality in contracted facilities. Int J Health Care Qual Assur. 2015;28: 520–531. doi:10.1108/IJHCQA-05-2014-0066

33. Zelman WN, Pink GH, Matthias CB. Use of the balanced scorecard in health care. J

Health Care Finance. 2003;29: 1–16.

34. Rabbani F, Jafri SMW, Abbas F, Pappas G, Brommels M, Tomson G. Reviewing the application of the balanced scorecard with implications for low-income health settings. J Healthc Qual. 2007;29: 21–34. doi:10.1111/j.1945-1474.2007.tb00210.x

35. Colbran R, Ramsden R, Stagnitti K, Toumbourou JW. Advancing towards contemporary practice: A systematic review of organisational performance measures for non-acute health charities. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19: 132. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-3952-1

36. Gurd B, Gao T. Lives in the balance: An analysis of the balanced scorecard (BSC) in healthcare organizations. Int J Product Perform Manag. 2007;57: 6–21.

37. Mcdonald B. A review of the use of the balanced scorecard in healthcare. BMcD Consult. 2012; 1–32.

38. Trotta A, Cardamone E, Cavallaro G, Mauro M. Applying the Balanced Scorecard approach in teaching hospitals: A Literature review and conceptual framework. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2013;28: 181–201. doi:10.1002/hpm.2132

39. Behrouzi F, Shaharoun AM, Ma'Aram A. Applications of the balanced scorecard for strategic management and performance measurement in the health sector. Aust Heal Rev. 2014;38: 208–217. doi:10.1071/AH13170

40. Broccardo L. The Balance Scorecard Implementation in the Italian Health Care System: Some Evidences from Literature and a Case Study Analysis. J Health Manag. 2015;17: 25–41. doi:10.1177/0972063414560868

41. Gao T, Gurd B. Meeting the challenge in performance management: The diffusion and implementation of the balanced scorecard in Chinese hospitals. Health Policy Plan.

2014;30: 234–241. doi:10.1093/heapol/czu008

42. Gonzalez-Sanchez MB, Broccardo L, Martins Pires AM. The use and design of the BSC in the health care sector: A systematic literature review for Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2018;33: 6–30. doi:10.1002/hpm.2415

43. Rouis S, Abdelaziz AB, Nouira H, Khelil M, Zoghlami C, Abdelaziz AB. Elaboration d'un tableau de bord stratégique pour le monitorage de la performance hospitalière dans les pays du gran. Tunisie Medicale. 2018;96: 774–788.

44. Esmaily S, Yau CC, Dwarakanath D, Hancock J, Mitra V. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on key performance indicators in pancreatobiliary endoscopy: Prioritise, minimise risk, keep scoping and training. Frontline Gastroenterol. 2020; 8–13. doi:10.1136/flgastro-2020-101701

45. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. PLoS Med. 2009;6: e1000100. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100

46. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.1 (updated September 2020). Cochrane 2020. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook. Higgins.

47. Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.4, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2020.

48. Edward A, Osei-bonsu K, Branchini C, Yarghal T, Arwal SH, Naeem AJ. Enhancing governance and health system accountability for people centered healthcare: an

exploratory study of community scorecards in Afghanistan. BMC Health Serv Res. 2015;15: 1–15. doi:10.1186/s12913-015-0946-5

49. Lupi S, Verzola A, Carandina G, Salani M, Antonioli P, Gregorio P. Multidimensional evaluation of performance with experimental application of balanced scorecard: A two year experience. Cost Eff Resour Alloc. 2011;9: 1–5. doi:10.1186/1478-7547-9-7

50. Chang W-C, Tung Y-C, Huang C-H, Yang M-C. Performance improvement after implementing the Balanced Scorecard: A large hospital's experience in Taiwan. Total Qual Manag Bus Excell. 2008;19: 1143–1154. doi:10.1080/14783360802323560

51. Ebrahimpour A, Alimohammadzadeh K, Maher A. Evaluating the Health Reform Plan in Ayatollah Taleghani Hospital, Tehran in 2010 - 2017 Using the Balanced Scorecard. Hakim Heal Sys Res. 2019;22: 100–111.

52. Widyasari NLG, Adi NR. Balanced Scorecard Implementation in the Government Hospital. Russ J Agric Socio-Economic Sci. 2019;93: 285–291. doi:10.18551/rjoas.2019-09.30

53. Manolitzas P, Grigoroudis E, Christodoulou J, Matsatsinis N. S-MEDUTA: Combining Balanced Scorecard with Simulation and MCDA Techniques for the Evaluation of the Strategic Performance of an Emergency Department. In: Vlamos P, editor. GeNeDis 2018 Computational Biology and Bioinformatics. Switzerland: Springer; 2020. pp. 1–22. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-32622-7

54. Zbinden AM. Introducing a balanced scorecard management system in a university anesthesiology department. Anesth Analg. 2002;95: 1731–1738. doi:10.1213/01.ANE.0000033508.13342.B2

55. Smith H, Kim I. Balanced scorecard at Summa health system. J Corp Account Financ.

2005;16: 65–72. doi:10.1002/jcaf.20137 65

56. Chu H, Wang C. A Study of a Nursing Department Using the Balanced Scorecard and the Performance Measurement System: Analytic Hierarchy Process. Nurs Econ. 2009;27: 401–408.

57. Lin QL, Liu L, Liu HC, Wang DJ. Integrating hierarchical balanced scorecard with fuzzy linguistic for evaluating operating room performance in hospitals. Expert Syst Appl. 2013;40: 1917–1924. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2012.10.007

58. Ajami S, Ebadsichani A, Tofighi S, Tavakoli N. Medical records department and balanced scorecard approach. J Educ Health Promot. 2013;2: 1–6. doi:10.4103/2277-9531.107932

59. Catuogno S, Arena C, Saggese S, Sarto F. Balanced performance measurement in research hospitals: The participative case study of a haematology department. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017;17: 1–11. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2479-6

60. Pink GH, McKillop I, Schraa EG, Preyra C, Montgomery C, Baker GR. Creating a balanced scorecard for a hospital system. J Health Care Finance. 2001;27: 1–20.

61. Griffith RJ, Alexander AJ. Measuring comparative hospital performance. J Healthc Manag. 2002;47: 41–57.

62. Devitt R, Klassen W, Martalog J. Strategic management system in a healthcare setting--moving from strategy to results. Healthc Q. 2005;8: 58–65. doi:10.12927/hcq.2013.17693

63. Martínez-Pillado M, Seco JM, Suárez A, González-Sanjuán R, Vázquez C. Hacia el cuadro de mando integral por el cuadro de mando posible. Rev Calid Asist. 2006;21: 13–19. doi:10.1016/S1134-282X(06)70749-7

64. Goodspeed SW. Metrics help rural hospitals achieve world-class performance. J Healthc Qual. 2006;28: 28–33.

65. Yang M-C, Tung Y-C. Using Path Analysis to Examine Causal Relationships Among Balanced Scorecard Performance Indicators for General Hospitals. Health Care Manage Rev. 2006;31: 280–288. doi:10.1097/00004010-200610000-00003

66. Chen XY, Yamauchi K, Kato K, Nishimura A, Ito K. Using the balanced scorecard to measure Chinese and Japanese hospital performance. Int J Health Care Qual Assur. 2006;19: 339–350. doi:10.1108/09526860610671391

67. Josey C, Kim I. Implementation of the balanced scorecard at Barberton citizens hospital. J Corp Account Financ. 2008;19: 57–63. doi:10.1002/jcaf.20386

68. Rowe JS, Natiq K, Alonge O, Gupta S, Agarwal A, Peters DH. Evaluating the use of locally-based health facility assessments in Afghanistan: a pilot study of a novel research method. Confl Health. 2014;8: 1–9. doi:10.1186/1752-1505-8-24

69. Teklehaimanot HD, Teklehaimanot A, Tedella AA, Abdella M. Use of Balanced Scorecard Methodology for Performance Measurement of the Health Extension Program in Ethiopia. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2016;94: 1157–1169. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.15-0192

70. Chen HF, Hou YH, Chang RE. Application of the balanced scorecard to an academic medical center in Taiwan: The effect of warning systems on improvement of hospital performance. J Chinese Med Assoc. 2012;75: 530–535. doi:10.1016/j.jcma.2012.07.007

71. Biro LA, Moreland ME, Cowgill DE. Achieving excellence in veterans healthcare- a balanced scorecard approach. J Healthc Qual. 2003;25: 33–39. doi:10.1186/1472-

6963-14-448

72. Mabuchi S, Alonge O, Tsugawa Y, Bennett S, Bennett S. Measuring management practices in primary health care facilities – development and validation of management practices scorecard in Nigeria. Glob Health Action. 2020;13. doi:10.1080/16549716.2020.1763078

73. Gonzalez J, Jaber J, Barker PC, Markham MJ, Kittelson SM. Palliative Care Scorecard: An Update for the Outpatient Setting. J Palliat Med. 2020;23: 306–307. doi:10.1089/jpm.2019.0516

74. Hansen PM, Peters DH, Niayesh H, Singh LP, Dwivedi V, Burnham G. Measuring and managing progress in the establishment of basic health services: the Afghanistan Health Sector Balanced Scorecard. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2008;23: 107–117. doi:10.1002/hpm.931

75. Edward A, Kumar B, Kakar F, Salehi AS, Burnham G, Peters DH. Configuring balanced scorecards for measuring health system performance: Evidence from 5 years' evaluation in Afghanistan. PLoS Med. 2011;8. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001066

76. Mutale W, Godfrey-Fausset P, Mwanamwenge MT, Kasese N, Chintu N, Balabanova D, et al. Measuring Health System Strengthening: Application of the Balanced Scorecard Approach to Rank the Baseline Performance of Three Rural Districts in Zambia. Eisele T, editor. PLoS One. 2013;8: e58650. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0058650

77. Gao H, Chen H, Feng J, Qin X, Wang X, Liang S, et al. Balanced scorecard-based performance evaluation of Chinese county hospitals in underdeveloped areas. J Int Med Res. 2018;46: 1947–1962. doi:10.1177/0300060518757606

78. Chang W, Tung Y, Huang C. Performance improvement after implementing the Balanced Scorecard: A large hospital' s experience in Taiwan. Total Qual Manag Bus Excell. 2008;19: 1143–1154. doi:10.1080/14783360802323560

79. Wang M, Hu C, Zhao Q, Feng R, Wang Q, Cai H, et al. Acute psychological impact on COVID-19 patients in Hubei: a multicenter observational study. Transl Psychiatry. 2021;11. doi:10.1038/s41398-021-01259-0

80. Khullar D, Bond AM, Schpero WL. COVID-19 and the Financial Health of US Hospitals. JAMA. 2020;323: 2127–2128. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6269

81. Raghuvanshi VP, Raghuvanshi SP. Implications and future strategies on cost management for hospitals during and after COVID-19. Int J Community Med Public Heal. 2020;7: 2405. doi:10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20202507

82. Coyle D, Manley A. Productivity in UK healthcare during and after the Covid-19 pandemic. 2021.

83. Griffin S. Covid-19: Waiting times in England reach record highs. BMJ. 2020;370: m3557. doi:10.1136/bmj.m3557

84. Cleary SM, Wilkinson T, Tamandjou Tchuem CR, Docrat S, Solanki GC. Cost effectiveness of intensive care for hospitalized COVID-19 patients: experience from South Africa. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21: 1–10. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06081-4

85. Olivas-Martínez A, Cárdenas-Fragoso JL, Jiménez JV, Lozano-Cruz OA, Ortiz-Brizuela E, Tovar-Méndez VH, et al. In-hospital mortality from severe COVID-19 in a tertiary care center in Mexico City; causes of death, risk factors and the impact of hospital saturation. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0245772

86. WHO. Infection prevention and control during health care when COVID-19 is suspected or confirmed: Interim guidance. In: World Health Organization Interim Guidance [Internet]. 2020 [cited 25 Jun 2021] pp. 1–5. Available: https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1272420/retrieve

87. Narwal S, Jain S. Building Resilient Health Systems: Patient Safety during COVID-19 and Lessons for the Future. J Health Manag. 2021;23: 166–181. doi:10.1177/0972063421994935

88. Gandhi TK, Singh H. Reducing the risk of diagnostic error in the COVID-19 era. J Hosp Med. 2020;15: 363–366. doi:10.12788/jhm.3461

89. Denning M, Goh ET, Scott A, Martin G, Markar S, Flott K, et al. What has been the impact of COVID-19 on safety culture? A case study from a large metropolitan healthcare trust. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17: 1–12. doi:10.3390/ijerph17197034

90. Jabarpour M, Dehghan M, Afsharipour G, Hajipour Abaee E, Mangolian Shahrbabaki P, Ahmadinejad M, et al. The Impact of COVID-19 Outbreak on Nosocomial Infection Rate: A Case of Iran. Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol. 2021;2021. doi:10.1155/2021/6650920

91. Ashinyo ME, Dubik SD, Duti V, Amegah KE, Ashinyo A, Asare BA, et al. Infection prevention and control compliance among exposed healthcare workers in COVID-19 treatment centers in Ghana: A descriptive cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0248282

92. Das AK, Islam MN, Billah MM, Sarker A. COVID-19 pandemic and healthcare solid waste management strategy – A mini-review. Sci Total Environ. 2021;778: 146220. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146220

93. Kalantary RR, Jamshidi A, Mofrad MMG, Jafari AJ, Heidari N, Fallahizadeh S, et al. Effect of COVID-19 pandemic on medical waste management: a case study. J Environ Heal Sci Eng. 2021;19: 831–836. doi:10.1007/s40201-021-00650-9

94. Mekonnen B, Solomon N, Wondimu W. Healthcare Waste Status and Handling Practices during COVID-19 Pandemic in Tepi General Hospital, Ethiopia. J Environ Public Health. 2021;2021. doi:10.1155/2021/6614565

95. WHO. Water, sanitation, hygiene, and waste management for SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19. In: Interim guidance [Internet]. 2020 [cited 25 Jun 2021] pp. 1–11. Available: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/water-sanitation-hygiene-and-waste-management-for-the-covid-19-virus-interim-guidance

96. de Aguiar Hugo A, Lima R da S. Healthcare waste management assessment: Challenges for hospitals in COVID-19 pandemic times. Waste Manag Res J a Sustain Circ Econ. 2021; 0734242X2110103. doi:10.1177/0734242X211010362

97. Maalouf A, Maalouf H. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on medical waste management in Lebanon. Waste Manag Res. 2021; 831–836. doi:10.1177/0734242X211003970

98. Jeffery MM, D'Onofrio G, Paek H, Platts-Mills TF, Soares WE, Hoppe JA, et al. Trends in Emergency Department Visits and Hospital Admissions in Health Care Systems in 5 States in the First Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic in the US. JAMA Intern Med. 2020;180: 1328–1333. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3288

99. Rennert-May E, Leal J, Thanh NX, Lang E, Dowling S, Manns B, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on hospital admissions and emergency department visits: A population-based study. PLoS One. 2021;16: e0252441. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252441

100. Shirazi H, Kia R, Ghasemi P. Ranking of hospitals in the case of COVID-19 outbreak: A new integrated approach using patient satisfaction criteria. Int J Healthc Manag. 2020;13: 312–324. doi:10.1080/20479700.2020.1803622

101. Moynihan R, Sanders S, Michaleff ZA, Scott AM, Clark J, To EJ, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on utilisation of healthcare services: A systematic review. BMJ Open. 2021;11: 11–17. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045343

102. Kamel MA, Mousa ME-S. Measuring operational efficiency of isolation hospitals during COVID-19 pandemic using data envelopment analysis: a case of Egypt. Benchmarking An Int J. 2021;ahead-of-p. doi:10.1108/BIJ-09-2020-0481

103. Sodhi J, Satpathy S, Arora P. Role of hospital supportive services in COVID-19. Int J Infect Control. 2020;16: 19–20. doi:10.3396/ijic.v16i3.022.20

104. Olanipekun T. The impact of COVID-19 testing on length of hospital stay and patient flow in hospitals. J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect. 2021;11: 180–183. doi:10.1080/20009666.2020.1866249

105. Jamshidi B, Zargaran SJ, Bekrizadeh H, Rezaei M, Najafi F. Comparing length of hospital stay during COVID-19 pandemic in the USA, Italy and Germany. Int J Qual Heal Care. 2021;33: 1–11. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzab050

106. Rees EM, Nightingale ES, Jafari Y, Waterlow NR, Clifford S, Carl CA, et al. COVID-19 length of hospital stay: A systematic review and data synthesis. BMC Med. 2020;18. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01726-3

107. Pascua FV, Diaz O, Medina R, Contreras B, Mistroff J, Espinosa D, et al. A multi-mechanism approach reduces length of stay in the ICU for severe COVID-19 patients. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0245025

108. McCabe R, Schmit N, Christen P, D'Aeth JC, Løchen A, Rizmie D, et al. Adapting hospital capacity to meet changing demands during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMC Med. 2020;18: 1–12. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01781-w

109. Rodrigues MENG, Belarmino A da C, Lopes Custódio L, Lima Verde Gomes I, Rodrigues Ferreira Júnior A. Communication in health work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Investig y Educ en Enfermería. 2020;38: 1–12. doi:10.17533/udea.iee.v38n3e09

110. Feng L, Yin R. Social Support and Hope Mediate the Relationship Between Gratitude and Depression Among Front-Line Medical Staff During the Pandemic of COVID-19. Front Psychol. 2021;12: 1–7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.623873

111. Al-Zyoud W, Oweis T, Al-Thawabih H, Al-Saqqar F, Al-Kazwini A, Al-Hammouri F. The psychological effects of physicians' communication skills on covid-19 patients. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2021;15: 677–690. doi:10.2147/PPA.S303869

112. Samarasekara K. 'Masking' emotions: doctor–patient communication in the era of COVID-19. Postgrad Med J. 2021;97: 406. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2020-138444

113. Alrawashdeh HM, Al-Tammemi AB, Alzawahreh MK, Al-Tamimi A, Elkholy M, Al Sarireh F, et al. Occupational burnout and job satisfaction among physicians in times of COVID-19 crisis: a convergent parallel mixed-method study. BMC Public Health. 2021;21: 811. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10897-4

114. Abdelhadi A. Patients' satisfactions on the waiting period at the emergency units. Comparison study before and during covid-19 pandemic. J Public health Res. 2021;10: 15. doi:10.4081/jphr.2021.1956

115. Bin Traiki TA, AlShammari SA, AlAli MN, Aljomah NA, Alhassan NS, Alkhayal

KA, et al. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on patient satisfaction and surgical outcomes: A retrospective and cross sectional study. Ann Med Surg. 2020;58: 14–19. doi:10.1016/j.amsu.2020.08.020

116. Pigozzi E, Tregnago D, Costa L, Insolda J, Turati E, Rimondini M, et al. Psychological impact of Covid-19 pandemic on oncological patients: A survey in Northern Italy. PLoS One. 2021;16: 1–13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0248714

117. Savitsky B, Radomislensky I, Hendel T. Nurses' occupational satisfaction during Covid-19 pandemic. Appl Nurs Res. 2021;59: 151416. doi:10.1016/j.apnr.2021.151416

118. Ng KYY, Zhou S, Tan SH, Ishak NDB, Goh ZZS, Chua ZY, et al. Understanding the Psychological Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Patients With Cancer, Their Caregivers, and Health Care Workers in Singapore. JCO Glob Oncol. 2020; 1494–1509. doi:10.1200/GO.20.00374

119. Wen X, Wang F, Li X, Gu H. Study on the Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) of Nursing Staff and Influencing Factors on COVID-19. Front Public Heal. 2021;8: 1–6. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.560606

120. Limbu DK, Piryani RM, Sunny AK. Healthcare workers' knowledge, attitude and practices during the COVID-19 pandemic response in a tertiary care hospital of Nepal. PLoS One. 2020;15: 7–13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0242126

121. Huang H, Zhao WJ, Li GR. Knowledge and psychological stress related to COVID-19 among nursing staff in a hospital in China: Cross-sectional survey study. JMIR Form Res. 2020;4: 1–8. doi:10.2196/20606

122. Müller SM, Mueller GF, Navarini AA, Brandt O. National Publication Productivity

during the COVID-19 Pandemic—A Preliminary Exploratory Analysis of the 30 Countries Most Affected. Biology. 2020;9: 271. doi:10.3390/biology9090271

123. He W, Zhang Z (Justin), Li W. Information technology solutions, challenges, and suggestions for tackling the COVID-19 pandemic. Int J Inf Manage. 2021;57: 102287. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102287

124. Asadzadeh A, Pakkhoo S, Saeidabad MM, Khezri H, Ferdousi R. Information technology in emergency management of COVID-19 outbreak. Informatics Med Unlocked. 2020;21: 100475. doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100475

125. Monaghesh E, Hajizadeh A. The role of telehealth during COVID-19 outbreak: A systematic review based on current evidence. 2020;4: 1–9. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-23906/v1

126. Burlea-Schiopoiu A, Ferhati K. The managerial implications of the key performance indicators in healthcare sector: A cluster analysis. Healthc. 2021;9: 1–20. doi:10.3390/healthcare9010019

127. Dyer C. Covid-19: Rules on sharing confidential patient information are relaxed in England. BMJ. 2020;369: m1378. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1378

128. Zlobina A. Personal Data of Thousands of Covid-19 Patients Leaked in Moscow. In: Human Rights Watch [Internet]. [cited 25 Jun 2021]. Available: https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/12/15/personal-data-thousands-covid-19-patients-leaked-moscow

129. Hammoudeh W, Kienzler H, Meagher K, Giacaman R. Social and political determinants of health in the occupied Palestine territory (oPt) during the COVID-19 pandemic: Who is responsible? BMJ Glob Heal. 2020;5: 1–3. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-

2020-003683

130. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Comprehensive Hospital Preparedness Checklist for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). [cited 25 Jun 2021]. Available: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/hcp-hospital-checklist.html

131. Members in Action. Four stages of planning and implementation during Covid-19: One rural Hospital's preparations. In: American Hospital Association [Internet]. 2020 [cited 25 Jun 2021] pp. 1–3. Available: https://www.aha.org/system/files/media/file/2020/04/rural-members-in-action-case-study-four-stages-planning-implementation-during-covid-19-one-rural-hospital-preparations-marshall-medical-center.pdf

132. Martin N. Finding a New Normal: Hospital Governance Best Practices during COVID-19. Healthc Q. 2020;23: 24–28. doi:10.12927/hcq.2020.26337

133. Sharma A, Borah SB, Moses AC. Responses to COVID-19: The role of governance, healthcare infrastructure, and learning from past pandemics. J Bus Res. 2021;122: 597–607. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.011

134. Kalender ZT, Vayvay Ö. The Fifth Pillar of the Balanced Scorecard: Sustainability. Procedia - Soc Behav Sci. 2016;235: 76–83. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.027

135. Rahimi H, Khammar-nia M, Kavosi Z, Eslahi M. Indicators of Hospital Performance Evaluation□: A Systematic Review. Int J Hosp Res. 2014;3: 199–208.

6. Appendices

Appendix (S1): PRISMA checklist.

Appendix (S2): Search strategies in PubMed, Embase, Cochrane, Google scholar.

Appendix (S3): Screened articles by title-abstract and full texts, articles represent partial results, not available articles.

Appendix (S4): Extracted, classified and re-grouped perspectives and indicators.

Appendix (S5): Quality assessment and Risk of Bias (RoB).



Fig. (1): PRISMA Flow Diagram



Fig. (2): The resulted 45 sub-dimensions.

Figure legend: After re-grouping the 797 indicators, 45 sub-dimensions resulted. This figure shows the frequency and the weight for each sub-dimension independently.



Fig. (3): The resulted 13 major-dimensions.

Figure legend: Reassembling the 45 sub-dimensions resulted in 13 major-dimensions. This figure shows the frequency and the weight for each major dimension independently.