

1 ***The responsiveness of health service provider and quality of services when provided at***  
2 ***three selected urban primary health care sites in Dhaka city, Bangladesh: A cross–***  
3 ***sectional study***

4 Abhiyan Gautam<sup>1¶#a\*</sup>, Bandana Bhandari<sup>1¶#a</sup>, Chungano Hassan<sup>1&#a</sup>, Fatiha Hassan<sup>1&#a</sup>,  
5 Saima Mehjabeen<sup>1&</sup>

6 Syed Masud Ahmed<sup>2&</sup>, Kuhel Faizul Islam<sup>2&</sup>, Dr. Nahitun Naher<sup>2&</sup>, Roksana Haque<sup>2&</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> BRAC James P Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, 68 Shaheed Tajuddin  
8 Ahmed Sarani, Mohakhali, Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh

9 <sup>2</sup> Centre of Excellence for Health Systems and Universal Health Coverage, BRAC James P.  
10 Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, 68 Shaheed Tajuddin Ahmed Sarani,  
11 Mohakhali Dhaka 1212, Bangladesh

12

13 \* Corresponding author:

14 E-mail: [xaviyan77@gmail.com](mailto:xaviyan77@gmail.com)

15 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

16 & These authors also contributed equally to this work.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 24 **1. Abstract**

### 25 **Introduction**

26 Responsiveness of Health Service Provider (HSP) and quality of services when provided  
27 resembles basic professional and social duties of HSP towards their clients. Because of poor  
28 responsiveness and quality of services when provided, clients lose their trust towards HSP.  
29 These factors are very important to improve relationship between HSP and clients, clients'  
30 satisfaction, quality of care and finally increase utilization of Urban Primary Health Care  
31 Centre services (UPHC).

### 32 **Objectives**

33 This study was done to determine the responsiveness of health service provider and quality of  
34 services when provided at selected UPHCs in Dhaka city.

### 35 **Methodology**

36 A cross sectional quantitative study was conducted in three UPHCs in Dhaka city from  
37 November to December 2017. 257 exit interviews were conducted by systematic random  
38 sampling for responsiveness and quality of services when provided. 49 observations of client-  
39 provider interactions were conducted using Responsiveness of Physician (ROP) scale. For  
40 exit interview, dichotomous variable was used. Descriptive analysis was done using Stata v  
41 12.1.

### 42 **Findings**

43 Majority (90%) of HSP listen carefully, explained about the diseases, facilitated about  
44 follow-up, and client understood information clearly. More than 70% of the clients found the  
45 providers approach were friendly though only 37% had social talk with the clients. 41% of  
46 the clients reported that the providers shared emergency contact number. Around 67% of  
47 clients were not asked allergic history and in 47% case consent was not taken before  
48 procedure. Being urban area, for more than 39% clients services were not given similar in  
49 terms of social status like gender, ethnicity, economic and social status.

50 For tangible items like gloves (80%) and thermometer (55%) were mostly missing in all  
51 UPHCs. 88% of the HSP were reliable, 93% assured the client and 91% showed empathy in  
52 all facilities. Clients were mostly satisfied with doctor's behaviour and dissatisfied about the  
53 long waiting time (average 37 minutes) in all UPHCs.

### 54 **Conclusion:**

55 This study has highlighted some important gaps in responsiveness of HSP which translate  
56 into the quality of care being provided to clients seeking care from UPHC. Friendliness of  
57 HSP should be increased and services should be provided with respect.

58

## 59 **2. Introduction**

60 Responsiveness of HSP and quality of services when provided resembles basic ethical and  
61 social duties of HSP towards their clients. It has inter relation with WHO health system  
62 building [1, 2, 3].

63 Responsiveness is related with protection and continuation of clients' rights to quality,  
64 adequate, and timely care [4]. It is a combination of human rights, medical ethics, and human  
65 development [5].

66 Poor responsiveness can discourage clients to take interest on health related issues and early  
67 consultation. Lack of information, confidentiality, privacy, female attendants for female  
68 clients, friendly behavior, safety, equitable services, delay in treatment, trust, dignity, respect,  
69 clear communication, and high expectation, service charge etc. from can influence perception  
70 towards HSP [6, 7]. On other hand, high patient flow, health system limitation, lack of  
71 communication skills of providers and disrespect by patient influence responsiveness from  
72 HSP side [8]. Health services resources such as high coverage area, poor governance,  
73 coordination and information sharing mechanism, lack of infrastructure, equipment, drugs,  
74 and less staffs were the major responsible factors which indirectly influence responsiveness.  
75 Loss of trust between providers and clients can leads to low utilization of services [9]. Every  
76 unit were responsible for responsiveness and quality of services when provided.

77 Quality of services when provided refers to affordable, effective, safe and standard services  
78 by skilled HSP which satisfy clients [10]. Technical competence, client care, management,  
79 environment safety, tangibles, reliable, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and clients'  
80 satisfactions influence quality of services [10, 11, 12]. Reliability of HSP has the highest  
81 value where tangibles has the lowest values [6]. Lack of these integrated package influences  
82 on utilization of services.

83 LGD has mentioned that there is low finance allocation for health. With compromised budget  
84 in UPHC, manpower, equipment, and services can be compromised which in turn, will affect

85 service delivery. Lack of regular refresher training and supervision from higher authority has  
86 raised questions on quality of services. Since there is no regular coordination between  
87 MoHFW and MoLGRDC, there is gap in technical advice to improve quality of services  
88 when provided [13, 14, 15].

89 In Bangladesh, conflicts between doctors and clients is increasing because patient claims that  
90 doctors neglect patient while doctors claim back that they are assaulted by clients [8]. Factors  
91 like behaviour, friendliness, respecting, informing and guiding, gaining trust and optimizing  
92 benefit etc. which influence responsiveness and this directly affect the quality of services  
93 when provided at health facilities [7, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21].

94

## 95 **Justification**

96 Despite establishment of UPHC services mechanism and having national urban health  
97 strategy and guidelines health indicators of urban population remain still poor in the country.  
98 Due to lack of coordination between MoHFW, NGOs and MoLGRDC; the monitoring and  
99 evaluation of the services remain constrained [13, 22, 23]. HSP are key persons to guide and  
100 satisfy their clients, and to improve quality of care. Though clients visiting health facilities  
101 have high expectations, but level of satisfaction is found to be low [6, 24]. There are limited  
102 studies on stated aspects. Since responsiveness and quality of services both influence the  
103 service access and utilization, hence exploring responsiveness and quality is crucial to ensure  
104 service use and promote country achieve sustainable development goals. Therefore, this study  
105 will help to give evidence to improve policy and fill the knowledge gaps.

106

## 107 **Conceptual Framework**

108 In UPHCs, organizational structure, facilities and provider's perspectives can influence on  
109 responsiveness of HSP towards clients and quality of services when provided at UPHC.  
110 Responsiveness is determined by information, friendliness, trustworthiness, non-maleficence  
111 and respect for dignity of person. Similarly, quality of services when provided is determined  
112 by tangible items, reliability, assurance, empathy, and client satisfaction. These factors jointly  
113 influence on utilization of the services (Fig 1).



## 114 **Objective**

### 115 **Specific Objectives**

- 116 a. To measure responsiveness of health service provider towards clients in UPHC.
- 117 b. To find level of quality of services when provided by HSP in UPHC.

## 118 **3. Methodology**

### 119 **Study Design and Approach**

120 The study had cross-sectional design with a quantitative approach. Quantitative approach was  
121 preferred to collect detailed description on responsiveness of HSP and quality of care when  
122 provided at UPHC.

123

### 124 **Study Site**

125 We reviewed list of partner NGOs of MoLGRDC, UPHC project. There are 25 NGOs who  
126 are providing UPHC services on behalf of LGB. Among them, 10 organizations are providing  
127 UPHC services within Dhaka City Corporation areas. Out of them, three partners NGOs are  
128 selected. KMSS and Nari Maitree from DNCC and BAPSA from DSCC. We selected them  
129 according to our convenience. UPHCs were selected both from Dhaka North and South City  
130 Corporation to have rich picture of Dhaka.

131 These UPHCs provide low cost primary health care services to 3 to 4 lakhs of urban people.  
132 Their services are mainly focused to poor and vulnerable population of slum area. It gives  
133 more subsidies to poor people in the form of red card.

134 UPHC has three types of services delivery centers; CRHCC, PHCC and satellite clinic.  
135 Catchment area of each UPHC ranges from 4 to 7 wards. One UPHC has a CRHCC which  
136 mainly focuses on maternal and child health services. Under a CRHCC there are 4 to 7  
137 PHCCs one in each ward. There are around 80 satellite clinic pockets in each UPHC. It  
138 provides services from 15 sites in each day (Fig 2).

### 139 **Study participants**

140 We selected service users for exit interview and service providers for observation as study  
141 participants in CRHCC and PHCC of the selected UPHCs.

142 Study participants were service users of selected UPHCs. For client-provider interaction,  
143 service providers were observed.

## 144 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

145 Clients, 18 years and above utilizing UPHC of the selected centres were included in the  
146 study. For below 18 years clients, consent were taken with their parents. Intellectually  
147 challenged and clients in critical condition were excluded from the study.

## 148 **Sampling Technique and Sample Size**

149 In this research, systematic random sampling technique was used where sampling unit was  
150 clients of UPHC. Study was done in three different UPHCs. Every 4<sup>th</sup> outdoor patient of  
151 clients UPHC was selected randomly for the exit interview. Sample size of our study was 384  
152 by using proportionate sampling methods but we were able to collect only 257. We did 49  
153 observation of 7 HSP.

154 Proportionate Sample Size Formula:  $n = z^2 * v (1-v) / d^2$  where  $v = p_1 (1-p_1) + p_2 (1-p_2)$

155 Here, Utilization rate of Nari Maitree, DNCC ( $P_1$ ) = 54%

156 Utilization rate of BAPSA, DSCC  $P_2$  = 44%

157 By keeping  $Z = 1.96$  and level of error ( $d$ ) = 0.05,

158 Hence, Sample size ( $N$ ) = 384

159

## 160 **Study Tools**

### 161 **Tool development**

162 The study was done by using structured questionnaire and observation checklist (ROP scale)  
163 for responsiveness and quality of services when provided. The tools were adopted from a  
164 study done by Joarder et al. in 2017 using ROP scale for responsiveness component [20]. We  
165 developed preliminary set of questionnaire in English. We did validation followed by  
166 multiple discussion with supervisors and expert in the same field. Since ROP scale tool was  
167 validated for rural part, our tool was modified according to the context of Dhaka. Elements of  
168 ROP scale was kept as a variable for exit interview. Score of ROP scale (0 to 4) was modified  
169 to dichotomous scale (Yes or No). In place of financial sensitivity, we added non-

170 maleficence. But for observation, same ROP-scale tool was used which was developed by  
171 Joarder et al. It was done for content validity.

172 Similarly, we also adapted SERVQUAL tool for quality of services when provided [25, 26]. It  
173 was also modified to dichotomous scale (Yes or No). We used same domains and variables  
174 from the adopted tool, we added client satisfaction and dissatisfaction domains to know what  
175 kind of services clients get satisfy from.

176

### 177 **Pre-testing and finalizing tool**

178 Preliminary questionnaire was pre-tested to ensure intelligibility, length, organization and  
179 structure of proposed questionnaire to the clients of Nari Maitree. After getting feedback of  
180 pre tested questionnaire, we again modified to give fine-tune in the questions of various  
181 domains of two objectives. To make same level of understanding among the researchers and  
182 research assistants, we made Bengali version of the same questionnaire. However, we  
183 collected data on English version.

184

### 185 **Data collection**

186 We collected data by interviewing service users and observing when service was provided by  
187 using the tools from 19 November to 3 December 2017.

188 Structured questionnaire was used during exit interview to collect clients' experiences on  
189 responsiveness and quality of services provided by HSP because it will give immediate  
190 feedback after utilizing the services. The tool was interviewer assisted. Side by side,  
191 observation was done to triangulate the data. ROP scale was used to observe the  
192 responsiveness. Five variables for each responsiveness of HSP and quality of services when  
193 provided have been selected. (Annex 1 & 2)

194 For exit interview, Bengali speaking research assistant was assisting because researcher was  
195 non-Bengali speaking international student.

196

### 197 **Data Entry and Analysis**

#### 198 **Ensuring data quality**

199 We explained to our research assistants and researchers about our questionnaire in detail. We  
200 translated our tool in Bangla version and in each question, we gave examples so that all  
201 researchers' have same level of understanding. We also checked data collection methods and  
202 integrity by searching missing values (completeness) in data. We have followed systematic  
203 random sampling method to collect data to reduce selection bias.

204

205

## 206 **Data entry and analysis**

207 Data were entered in google form and imported into MS excel where data cleaning was done.  
208 Missing values were imputed by using multiple imputation in Stata version 12.1. Univariate  
209 analysis was also done.

210 Data of three UPHCs were separated. Again, domains of each specific objectives were  
211 segregated. Variables under each domain were put together to make it easy to calculate total  
212 scores. In exit interview, we asked service users regarding their perception regarding HSP. It  
213 was dichotomous variable with yes or no answer. (Table 2 & 3) Positive and negative  
214 answers were calculated separately. We used descriptive analysis method [12, 26].  
215 Frequencies and percentages were calculated and differences among the UPHCs were  
216 calculated. For some variables (e.g. waiting time and consultation time) of quality of services,  
217 range was identified and plotted in graphs to see the differences among the three UPHCs. For  
218 variables like satisfaction and dissatisfaction, we merge similar answer into three subtopic  
219 and plotted graphs and compare among three facilities.

220 Similarly, during observation we score from 0 to 4 according to the example we had in  
221 observation checklist, then we find mean score of each variable under respective domains of  
222 responsiveness. Then mean value was calculated.

## 223 **Ethical consideration**

224 Ethical authorization was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), JPGSPH on  
225 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017. As an enlisted organization to provide UPHC services, prior approval  
226 from MoLGRDC was obtained to collect data from the selected UPHC centres. For every  
227 participant, informed consent was taken. Purpose of study, risk and benefit was explained  
228 before proceeding for the interviews. Participants could withdraw questions and skip the  
229 study at any time during the study if they wanted. We assured that participants name would

230 not be revealed, privacy and confidentiality would maintain. Then we took written informed  
231 consent before interview. Similarly, for observation, we took consent of HSP. (Annex 3)

232

## 233 **4. Findings**

### 234 **Sociodemographic of respondents**

235 Our research was aimed to find the quality of services when provided and responsiveness of  
236 HSP by using exit interview. Out of 257 exit interviews, 114 were from BAPSA, 92 from  
237 KMSS and 51 were from Nari Maitree. In our study, 98.8% respondents were female and  
238 1.2% were Male. Around 5% participants were below 18 years, more than 50% were from 18  
239 to 24 age group, 33% were from 25 to 34, rest of them were above 35 years. About 98% were  
240 married. In total, 95% follow Islam religion. Only, 10% were employed. Around 82% clients  
241 came from catchment area of respective UPHCs. Only 7.3% were uneducated. We did  
242 descriptive analysis. Our findings are divided into two main parts according to the objectives.

### 243 **Findings related to responsiveness of HSP and quality of care** 244 **when provided**

245 The study findings are presented as per variables used under each domains of responsiveness  
246 of HSP and quality of service when provided. (Table 1)

### 247 **Responsiveness of HSP**

248 ROP scale findings of exit interview and observations under five domains have been  
249 explained below simultaneously. (Table 2 and 3)

### 250 **Information**

251 On this domain, 98% clients in exit interview said that HSP listen them carefully and explain  
252 about the diseases. It was highest in Nari Maitree where 100% clients said HSP listen them  
253 carefully. From the observation, the average score on listen to patient was 2.7 out of 4 and  
254 score for HSP writing after listening to patient was 2.4 while explain about diseases was 2.2.  
255 HSP also suggested patient regarding preventive measures and its average score from ROP  
256 scale was 2.2. These observation score means HSP showed attentiveness to listen patient  
257 queries but after some stage, HSP stopped the patient and gone into the next step. HSP

258 explained at least one of the things among name of diseases or treatment. Observation also  
259 showed that, HSP indirectly explained about preventive and health promotive measures.

260 100% of clients understood information clearly in all UPHCs. In contrast to that, our  
261 observation showed average score of clients understanding suggestion was only 1.8 out of 4.  
262 Here, in many cases HSP did not ask the patient about his understanding after explaining the  
263 information. For 7% of clients, facilitation was not given for follow up. From observation  
264 average ROP-scale score was 2 out of 4. That means, HSP gave minimum follow-up plans,  
265 date when to come again or what would be the cost of follow-up etc.

266 For 5%, patients were not able to access medical record for future use. From our observation,  
267 they HSP only wrote prescription in 100% cases but findings from their examination was not  
268 written in all cases. However, for ANC cases, some examination findings were written.

## 269 **Friendliness**

270 Only 70% clients said HSP asked their name and only 37% engaged in social talks to build  
271 rapport. In BAPSA, 37% of clients were not asked their name and for 68% social talks was  
272 not done as a part of rapport building. According to observation, the average score for asking  
273 patient's name was 1.9, social talks was 2 out of 4. It means that, HSP asked the name but did  
274 not care about it or used it. There was a minimum social talk.

275 In few cases, HSP asked about the family during the talks. Its score was 1.5 out of 4. That  
276 means, HSP was not interested to know about family during their conversation.

277 Around 94% clients said that conversation was socio-cultural friendly and two-way  
278 conversation with eye contact in all facilities. Observation showed that average score of  
279 friendly was 2, use of patient friendly language was 2.7 and sense of humor was 1.7 out of 4.  
280 Friendliness scores showed that, HSP were friendly in minimum level. HSP used some  
281 medical terminologies and explained some of it. It also showed that, HSP had some humor or  
282 smiling during the conversation.

## 283 **Trustworthiness**

284 Nearly 98% patient gain confidence after communication and 41% clients got an emergency  
285 contact number of HSP at the end of communication in all UPHCs. In KMSS, 71% clients  
286 said that, emergency number was not given. Although, our observation showed that,  
287 emergency contact number was not given in any of the facilities. However, 32% clients found

288 that HSP were not service oriented. Observation showed, average score of service orientation  
289 service was 3.2 out of 4. Observation showed that HSP services were not business oriented  
290 but was not even service oriented also.

291 In 18% cases HSP misbehaved with patient during communication. Height misbehave from  
292 HSP was perceived in BAPSA (26%). Observation score was 2.6 out of 4. It suggested that,  
293 HSP showed minimum respect to the patient.

294 Observation average score in HSP involving in ethical and legal activities was 3.9 out of 4. It  
295 showed HSP was not involve in any illegal activities, which increase trust among the clients.

## 296 **Non-maleficence**

297 Patient found that 84% were given immediate attention during emergency. Only for 33%  
298 clients, drug allergic history was asked before prescribing medicine. For 20% client sterile or  
299 new equipment was not used during procedure. After the treatment, 95% got benefit from the  
300 treatment but 25% get the side effect. In Nari Maitree 47% clients perceived side effect after  
301 the treatment. From our observation, in all UPHCs, drug allergic history was not asked.

## 302 **Respect for dignity of person**

303 During interaction, in 96% cases HSP greeted or replied greetings. Average score from  
304 observation was 2.1 out of 4. It suggested that, HSP expressed slight greeting before the  
305 conversation.

306 For 98%, privacy and confidentiality were maintained and for 91% female attendant was  
307 present for the female patient. However, in 47% cases, consent was not taken before  
308 procedure. Average score from observation was 2.1 out of 4. Score suggested that HSP  
309 examined patient at least for once.

310 96% clients said that examination was done with care. Similarly, for 95% non-stigmatizing  
311 treatment was given. ROP scale score for behavior of HSP was 2.2 out of 4. Observation  
312 suggested that, HSP slightly discouraged clients to ask question.

313 After the treatment in 82% cases, closing salute was given. ROP scale score was 1.8 out of 4  
314 on closing salute. It means HSP did not greeted but replied back by gesture.

315 Services were not similar in terms of gender, ethnicity, religion, caste, social status and  
316 economic status. In terms of gender, ethnicity and religion, 39% felt services was not similar.



317 Similarly, for social status and economic status, more than 50% felt services were not similar.  
318 Around 42% patient felt dissimilar services in terms of caste.

### 319 **Quality of services when provided**

320 In exit interviews, we asked quality of services to service users (clients) regarding their  
321 perception when service was provided. They were dichotomous variables with yes or no  
322 answer. Findings on five domains are described below. (Table 4)

#### 323 **Tangibility**

324 Among the seven basic items of examination room, 95% clients find the doctors room  
325 visually attractive. Sphygmomanometer (82%) and stethoscope (77%) was mostly available  
326 during examination in all UPHCs. Observation finding showed that stethoscope was available  
327 (100%) in all places but sphygmomanometer was not available in counselor and pediatrician  
328 room. Availability of thermometer and measuring tape was only around 40% in all UPHC  
329 while observation showed that, they were available but used occasionally. Finding showed  
330 that, availability of gloves was only 20%, being lowest at KMSS (13%). Our observation  
331 finds that, gloves was available in 80% of our observation but HSP did not use gloves during  
332 examination in all three UPHCs. Among the clients who had already used the services before,  
333 said all the UPHCs' standard of services was improved (more than 62%), but around 25% of  
334 clients said it was not improved and more than 12% clients said it was degrading. Services  
335 were degrading more in KMSS and Nari Maitree (15% each).

#### 336 **Reliability**

337 Majority of the clients said HSP were reliable when they provide services. UPHCs responded  
338 timely (96%) and HSP was dependable (98%). However, in 12% cases, they did not write in  
339 OPD records, more in KMSS (22%). Our observation showed that, HSP wrote drug  
340 prescriptions in OPD records. However, for ANC checkups HSP wrote examination findings.  
341 Full history was not written for the future records.

342

#### 343 **Assurance**

344 In all three UPHCs, HSP gave courage and assurance to clients (96%), there was someone to  
345 give assistance (93%) and hence clients felt safe to share their problems (97%). Observation



346 showed, for older physician, courage and assurance was the part of their suggestion whereas  
347 for middle aged physician, assurance was not common.

### 348 **Empathy**

349 Out of total responses, 98% said HSP provided dedicated attention during consultation. 91%  
350 clients have said that they got enough time to share problems, 96% said HSP were  
351 compassionate and 93% clients' health needs were identified. Consultation time ranges from  
352 less than one minutes to 30 minutes with 9 minutes as an average time. It was highest in Nari  
353 Maitree (around 10 minutes) and lowest in KMSS (8 minutes). In contrast, our observation  
354 showed average consultation time was 5 minutes. (Graph 1)

### 355 **Client satisfaction**

356 According to the service users, rate of services was graded into five categories; poor,  
357 unsatisfactory, average, satisfactory and good. Since unsatisfactory and satisfactory had less  
358 responses, we merged into poor and average respectively. Quality of services was best in Nari  
359 Maitree (75%) followed by BAPSA and KMSS (each 66%). 84% users will go again for  
360 treatment and 83% will suggested their friends to go seek services in UPHCs. (Graph 2)

361 We asked regarding satisfaction in open ended question. In all the UPHCs, clients said that  
362 the behavior of HSP, services and management was satisfactory. In multiple answer question,  
363 at least 67% clients said behavior of HSP was good in all facilities where more were satisfied  
364 in Nari Maitree (88%). Services was satisfactory for 34% clients in both BAPSA and KMSS.  
365 But comparatively, management was more satisfactory in Nari Maitree (22%). Here service  
366 was experienced doctor, explanation of doctor and free medicine. Management was  
367 combined with satisfaction regarding cleanliness, environment and short waiting time. (Graph  
368 3)

### 369 **Client dissatisfaction**

370 Around 15% clients of KMSS said quality was poor but in BAPSA it was only 10%. (Graph  
371 2). Out of 257 responses, 61% did not find all services they wanted in UPHCs. In KMSS,  
372 67% did not find services they wanted where, 59% and 57% were in BAPSA and Nari  
373 Maitree. 19% did not get medicines from UPHCs, where KMSS had highest (27%). Around  
374 25% said that, there was no doctor and 63% could not choose service provider. Overall, 61%  
375 clients said they did not find the services they wanted.

376 In all UPHCs, clients described their experiences with services was high waiting time. It was  
377 mostly said in BAPSA (77%) and less time said at Nari Maitree (58%). In Nari Maitree, 40%  
378 had to explain several times to HSP regarding their problems. But 12% of clients in KMSS  
379 and 16% of clients in BAPSA had to ask other HSP about their problems. In KMSS 12% of  
380 clients said, HSP did not explain clearly to their clients, where BAPSA and Nari Maitree had  
381 only 4% and 0% respectively.

382 We asked about dissatisfaction of UPHC services. More than 59% clients were dissatisfied  
383 with high waiting time in all facilities, highest being in BAPSA (65%). Management was  
384 more dissatisfactory for 36% of clients of Nari Maitree. Similarly, behavior of HSP was most  
385 dissatisfactory for KMSS (13%). Here, we included “buying medicine from outside”, “HSP  
386 are not enough”, “less consultation time”, “services” etc. in “management” category (Graph  
387 4).

### 388 **Waiting time**

389 Average waiting time was 36 minutes where range was from 0 to 200 minutes. Highest  
390 average waiting time was in KMSS (41 minutes) where BAPSA had least (38 minutes).  
391 However, from our observation, average waiting time of three UPHCs was 61 minutes.  
392 (Graph 5)

393 However, more than 45% of clients in all UPHCs said, their all of their needs were met. It  
394 was most clients were satisfied in BAPSA (54%). In Nari Maitree, 45% clients said most of  
395 their needs were met which was lowest in KMSS (36%). Around 18% clients of KMSS said  
396 their only few needs were met where Nari Maitree was only 4%. Very few (1%) said that,  
397 their needs were not met.

398

399

400

401

402

## 403 **5. Discussion**

404 Discussion is divided into two parts; responsiveness of HSP and quality of services when  
405 provided. Client's sociodemographic status showed that 82% were from catchment area  
406 where almost all clients (99%) were female and married (98%). Most of their age lies  
407 between 18 to 24 years. Only, few (10%) were employed.

### 408 **Responsiveness of HSP**

#### 409 **Information**

410 In exit interview, under the information domains, all five individual variables (HSP listening  
411 carefully, explain about diseases, patient understanding HSP, facilitation about follow up and  
412 patient assessing medical record for future use) were indicating HSP as responsive with 90%  
413 score. Similar findings were observed in a study done in rural setting where private HSP were  
414 more responsive than public HSP [7, 27]. Our observation using same tool showed that, in the  
415 variables of information (patient understanding suggestions was 1.8 and advice for follow up  
416 was 2 out of 4), some were below 50% thus findings of exit interview and observations  
417 differs. It might be because of either client were satisfied by few information (reflection from  
418 exit interview findings) or sample size in our observation was low (49) to give significant  
419 result.

#### 420 **Friendliness**

421 In friendliness domain, according to result of exit interview, 86% of the respondents reported  
422 receiving two ways conversation and socio-cultural friendly conversation from the provider.  
423 In rapport building elements (asking client's name and engaging in social talks), they have  
424 only crossed 40% and 70%. Comparatively, HSP of BAPSA had low scores in rapport  
425 building. Though studies shows that HSP of private health facilities of rural area were  
426 responsive in friendliness domains [7, 8, 20, 28, 29] however in our study overall score of  
427 friendliness was observed less than 50% in all categories (rapport building, two way  
428 conversation with eye contact, socio-cultural friendly conversation) . Studies on client  
429 satisfaction reveals that, friendliness behavior of doctor and nurses increased client  
430 satisfaction in private hospitals of Dhaka city but comparatively low in public health facilities  
431 of same city [30].

432 Although our research did not compare between private and public, however UPHCs of north  
433 city corporations were better than south city corporation due to low patient flow which gives  
434 enough time to talk to the clients.

435

### 436 **Trustworthiness**

437 In gaining trust, clients did not feel HSP was good in providing emergency contact number  
438 and service orientation. Comparatively, HSP of KMSS got less score for providing  
439 emergency contact number but in terms of service orientation Nari maitree was poor. We did  
440 not find any research on providing emergency contact numbers to clients by HSP in  
441 Bangladesh.

442 In exit interview clients of all UPHCs reported HSP misbehave, highest being in BAPSA  
443 (26%). According to our observation, though the HSP in all three UPHCs were service  
444 oriented but showed minimum respect to patient. Similar study in rural setting showed that,  
445 HSP gain more trust in public doctors. In public sector HSP were more sensitive towards  
446 financial status of clients [7, 20, 28]. However, in our study, clients were not satisfied with  
447 these issues in UPHCs. In other researches done in similar settings showed that, service  
448 orientation was the strongest factors to influence clients' satisfaction. But it was not at  
449 satisfactory level in Bangladesh as physician were more oriented towards private hospitals to  
450 earn money [30]. Although HSP were service oriented, around 30% client had to pay out of  
451 pocket money for the medicine.

### 452 **Non-maleficence**

453 In non-maleficence domain, our finding revealed that people got benefit from treatment with  
454 some level of side effect from the treatment. Compare to other centers clients of Nari Maitree  
455 mostly reported that they suffer from side effects of prescribed drugs. It might be because  
456 HSPs did not ask history in detail or they were not using sterile or new equipment during  
457 their procedures. For example, 67% clients were not asked allergic history before prescribing  
458 drugs in all facilities which was more common in Nari Maitree and KMSS. Our quality of  
459 care findings (Table 4) also suggested that although clients got long consultation time,  
460 tangible items or sterile items were not used in many of the consultations in all facilities.  
461 From our study, there was no clear reason behind not using sterile equipment during

462 procedures. Lack of time, lack of motivation and ignorance might be the reasons behind this  
463 fact which needs further research to explore.

## 464 **Respect for dignity of person**

465 In this domain, it was good in “interaction with respect” subdomain while it was poor  
466 responses in “similar type of services in terms of social status”. BAPSA was not consistent in  
467 keeping female attendant for female patient. Finding also showed that, HSPs miss to take  
468 consent before examination in all facilities. Comparatively, it was poor in Nari Maitree.  
469 Component such as closing salutation was to be ignored in all the facilities. Despite being an  
470 urban healthcare facility, clients were not treated equally in terms of gender, ethnicity,  
471 religion, caste, social status and economic status. But more than 80% clients of Nari maitree  
472 said services were similar in all social status. However, in our study, 61% clients were from  
473 households whose monthly average income ranges from 10000 to 20000 BDT. In other  
474 studies also, discrimination was very common in terms of social and economic status in  
475 public hospitals [31]. Similar research in rural settings of Bangladesh showed that private  
476 doctors give more respect to clients than in public hospitals but HSP were not disrespectful in  
477 public as well [7]. Possible reason might be rich people go to seek service in private health  
478 facilities [31]. With high patient load and low salary in public hospitals, it could make  
479 different in their responses, which can be explored further. In India also, in urban settings,  
480 clients expects respect from HSP but get less respect in public hospitals than private hospitals  
481 [32].

## 482 **Quality of services when provided**

### 483 **Tangibility**

484 From our findings from exit interview, some of the basic tangible items (gloves, thermometer  
485 etc.) were not available all the times during examination of clients. If it was there, it was not  
486 used in all health facilities. WHO indicated that availability and use of tangible items had  
487 direct impact in quality of health services. Similar to our findings, studies had shown about  
488 50% items had no use in developing countries [4, 33]. It suggested to emphasize on use of  
489 long-term tangible items. Other studies also showed that private health facilities had more  
490 tangible items than public facilities [30, 34]. If we assumed UPHCs were a public facility, it  
491 cannot be ignored that tangible items were ignored in public institutions.

## 492 **Reliability**

493 Our finding from exit interview showed that, few HSP neglected to write on OPD records,  
494 which makes them less reliable. Similar study done in Bangladesh suggested that, people  
495 relied more on elder and experienced doctors. Satisfaction and reliability influence each other  
496 [30]. Other study suggested that, young doctor did not have interpersonal communication  
497 skills, exploring psychosocial history, showing empathy, giving courage and assurance,  
498 beginning and ending interviews etc [28, 29]. But our study did not explore on the experience  
499 of the doctors. Other factors determining reliability were providing service timely and  
500 dependability of HSP, which were more than 98% in all facilities.

## 501 **Assurance**

502 All three UPHCs quality of services were good in terms of assurance as HSP give courage  
503 and reassurance to clients and clients also felt safe to share their problems. It was contrast to  
504 the other studies done in Dhaka with same study tool which showed that HSP of Bangladesh  
505 were not good in terms of assurance [30, 34].

## 506 **Empathy**

507 Clients were satisfied with empathy as more than 90% clients got dedicated attention during  
508 consultation, enough consultation time and HSP were able to meet the need of clients. It was  
509 in contract to other study done in Dhaka, which showed clients did not get full attention and  
510 enough time to consult [30, 34]. From our finding, clients reported average waiting time was  
511 39 minutes and consultation time was around 9 minutes. It was contrast from other studies. In  
512 other studies, waiting time ranged from 80 minutes to 150 minutes in different researches  
513 [17]. Consultation time ranges from 48 seconds to 2-3 minutes in Bangladesh [35]. But other  
514 studies had shown that, consultation time goes up to 6.02 minutes in private hospitals [8, 17,  
515 28, 29, 30, 34]. In our study, most of the clients came for antenatal care check-up. Since it  
516 took time to take history and examine abdomen, consultation time came long in our study.  
517 Because of long consultation time, other people had to wait for longer time. Hence, there was  
518 long waiting time and consultation time in all three UPHCs.

## 519 **Client Satisfaction**

520 UPHCs did not have system to give option to choose HSP. Many of female clients returned  
521 back if they had to encounter male HSP. Moreover, around 60% did not find services they

522 wanted in all UPHCs. Findings also suggested that, even though UPHCs were supplying free  
523 medicine, clients were not getting it. Around 30% had to buy medicine from their out of  
524 pocket money. However, more than 65% of clients suggested that quality of services was  
525 good in all UPHCs, best being Nari Maitree (75%). In all categories (behavior of HSP,  
526 service and management), KMSS clients were less satisfied than other health facilities. Most  
527 satisfactory thing of three UPHCs was behavior of HSP, maximum being in Nari Maitree.

## 528 **Clients Dissatisfaction**

529 Similarly, most dissatisfactory thing was long waiting time in all facilities. Similar to our  
530 findings, other research also suggested that behavior and consultation time had significant  
531 relation with client satisfaction [7, 30]. Research done in India suggested that, clients prefer  
532 the facilities where they face less waiting time [37]. Other dissatisfactory things from our  
533 findings were cleanliness and management of UPHCs. Reason for poor in cleanliness might  
534 be scarcity of water in Dhaka city, which can be corrected as pilot study of Dhaka suggested  
535 [38].

## 536 **6. Conclusion**

537 Our study concludes that, all UPHC's HSP gave good informative except knowing whether  
538 patient understand or not the suggestions given by HSP during consultation. HSP were very  
539 friendly but poor in building rapport, which needs some improvement. Sometimes misbehave  
540 by HSP, business-oriented attitude, not providing emergency contact number had reduce trust  
541 on HSP. Improper use of tangible items and incomplete history taking had increase side  
542 effect during treatment. Though patient expect basic respect from HSP, they were not getting  
543 it but rather facing discrimination during provision of services.

544 Quality of services when provided to clients was very satisfactory in terms of reliability,  
545 assurance and empathy domains in all health facilities. Writing on OPD records was poor in  
546 KMSS. Use of gloves, thermometer, stethoscope, measuring tape and sterile instrument was  
547 very low in three facilities. Some services, medicine, diagnostic tests were not available in  
548 UPHCs. People had to pay out of pocket money to buy medicine and services. Clients were  
549 mostly satisfied with behavior of doctor. Services and management of UPHC satisfied them  
550 in some instance. Long waiting time was the most dissatisfactory experience for clients.  
551 Comparatively clients were highly satisfied with the services of Nari Maitree.



## 552 **7. Recommendation**

553 There are some places to improve the services. Some of the areas are discussed here.

- 554 • Number of HSP should be increased as per population coverage to ensure sufficient  
555 time for quality consultation, with options to choose male or female provider.
- 556 • Training on behavior change communication for HSP including paramedics, cleaners,  
557 office assistance should be initiated to increase clients' satisfaction.
- 558 • Clarity on clients understanding of instruction given during consultation should be  
559 ensured by HSP.
- 560 • An emergency contact number should be provided from the center to clients. That  
561 would be more useful for pregnant women [39].
- 562 • HSP must ensure proper procedure (e.g. use of sterile tangible items, taking detail  
563 history on OPD records) to reduce side effects from procedures. Clients consent  
564 should be obtained before procedure.
- 565 • Waiting time should be minimized by managing patients (e.g. making order/time table  
566 of patients).
- 567 • UPHC should find ways to reduce out of pocket expenditure for medicine and  
568 services ensuring delivery of all the required essential drugs timely.
- 569 • Overall environment of UPHC should be improved be clean and healthy by improving  
570 management UPHC, motivation of cleaners and strict governance in all UPHCs.
- 571 • Scope of expanding service package to include If it is feasible with the budget other  
572 services like nutrition, endemic diseases, adolescent health of primary health care  
573 should be emphasized to improve utilization of UPHCs.
- 574 • Though services for geriatrics and non-communicable diseases were enlisted in the  
575 service package, it was not provided actively [13].

576

## 577 **8. Strength and Limitation**

578 We used two data collection method (exit interview and observation) and triangulated it to  
579 find the similarities to capture as much as variability in responses. With the time constrains  
580 and feasibility of the study, we have some limitation in our study. We had planned to take  
581 two UPHCs from each DNCC and DSCC but since one UPHC took more time to give  
582 permission, we had to manage with one UPHC from South City Corporation. Since our



583 sample size was calculated to be 384, we could collect only 257. In UPHC, their services  
584 were focused to both gender but as community believe that the service were only for female,  
585 we were bound to select 98% of female in our exit interviews. During analysis, since we  
586 planned to analyses by multivariate methods, due to limited resources to do exploratory  
587 factorial analysis, we only presented descriptive analysis in our study. Since observation and  
588 exit interview clients were not same and were conducted in different time, criterion validity  
589 could not be ensured.

590

## 591 **9. Acknowledgement**

592 I would like to offer my special thanks to my supervisors Prof. Dr. Syed Masud Ahmed and  
593 Mr. Kuhel Faizul Islam, JPGSPH, BRAC University, who guided me through out my  
594 summative learning project. I also acknowledge my mentors Dr. Nahitun Naher and Ms.  
595 Roksana Haque, JPGSPH, BRAC University for their continuous support and guidance from  
596 the beginning of this project. I am grateful to the supports provided by Dr. Purabi Ahmed,  
597 BAPSA, Md Tauhidul Islam, KMSS and Rehana Akhter Mita, Nari Maitree who permitted us  
598 to do our study in their respective UPHCs. I am also thankful to Mr. Kousik Ahmed and the  
599 MPH team for logistic and technical support during SLP. At last but not least, I am thankful  
600 to my group mates and research assistant who supported me during this project.

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

## 612        **10.        References**

- 613        1.        World Health Organization. Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Health Cluster. A  
614        global review of primary health care : emerging messages : global report.  
615        2003;(WHO/MNC/OSD/03.01).
- 616        2.        World Health Organization RO for the EM. Primary health care: 25 years after Alma-  
617        Ata. 2003;(EM/RC50/R.12).
- 618        3.        World Health Organisation, editor. Primary health care: now more than ever. Geneva:  
619        World Health Organization; 2008. 119 p. (The world health report).
- 620        4.        Murray CJ, Frenk J. A WHO Framework for Health System Performance Assessment.  
621        Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2000 Feb 1;78:717–31.
- 622        5.        Valentine NB, Bonsel GJ, Murray CJL. Measuring quality of health care from the user’s  
623        perspective in 41 countries: psychometric properties of WHO’s questions on health  
624        systems responsiveness. Qual Life Res. 2007 Sep;16(7):1107–25.
- 625        6.        Papanikolaou V, Zygiaris S. Service quality perceptions in primary health care centres  
626        in Greece. Health Expect. 2014 Apr;17(2):197–207.
- 627        7.        Joarder T, George A, Sarker M, Ahmed S, Peters DH. Who are more responsive?  
628        Mixed-methods comparison of public and private sector physicians in rural Bangladesh.  
629        Health Policy Plan. 2017 Nov 1;32(suppl\_3):iii14–24.
- 630        8.        Joarder T, Cooper A, Zaman S. Meaning of death: an exploration of perception of  
631        elderly in a Bangladeshi village. J Cross Cult Gerontol. 2014 Sep;29(3):299–314.
- 632        9.        Cockcroft A, Milne D, Oelofsen M, Karim E, Andersson N. Health services reform in  
633        Bangladesh: hearing the views of health workers and their professional bodies. BMC  
634        Health Serv Res. 2011 Dec 21;11(Suppl 2):S8.
- 635        10.        USAID Health-Related Research and Development Progress Report. Issuu. [cited 2020  
636        Aug 1]. Available from: <https://issuu.com/usaiddocs/health-research-report-2016-508>
- 637        11.        Committee on Accounting for Socioeconomic Status in Medicare Payment Programs,  
638        Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Board on Health Care Services,  
639        Health and Medicine Division, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and  
640        Medicine. Accounting for Social Risk Factors in Medicare Payment: Data. Washington  
641        (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2016.
- 642        12.        Zeithaml V, Parasuraman AP, Berry L. Delivering quality service: Balancing customer  
643        perceptions and expectations. 1990 Jan 1;
- 644        13.        National Urban Health Strategy 2014. Local Government Division Ministry of Local  
645        Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives; 2014. Available from:  
646        <http://uphpc.gov.bd/cmsfiles/files/NUHS.pdf>
- 647        14.        Urban Primary Health Care Services Delivery Project. Ministry of Local Government,  
648        Rural Development & Cooperatives; 2017 Mar p. 121.

- 649 15. Bangladesh: Second Urban Primary Health Care Project. Asian Development Bank;  
650 2011 Jun.
- 651 16. Nu A, Mm A, F S, Sn S, Am P, Mb P. Reaching the unreachable: barriers of the poorest  
652 to accessing NGO healthcare services in Bangladesh [Internet]. *Journal of health,*  
653 *population, and nutrition.* 2006.
- 654 17. Mendoza Aldana J, Piechulek H, al-Sabir A. Client satisfaction and quality of health  
655 care in rural Bangladesh. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2001;79(6):512–7.
- 656 18. Ahmed SM, Islam K, Bhuiya A. Bangladesh Health Watch Report 2014 Urban Health  
657 Scenario: Looking beyond 2015. 2015.
- 658 19. Bangladesh Health Watch, editor. Bangladesh health watch report, 2011: moving  
659 towards universal health coverage. Dhaka: Bangladesh Health Watch; 2012. 127 p.
- 660 20. Joarder T, Mahmud I, Sarker M, George A, Rao KD. Development and validation of a  
661 structured observation scale to measure responsiveness of physicians in rural  
662 Bangladesh. *BMC Health Services Research.* 2017 Nov 21;17(1):753.
- 663 21. Ahmed SM, Evans TG, Standing H, Mahmud S. Harnessing pluralism for better health  
664 in Bangladesh. *Lancet.* 2013 Nov 23;382(9906):1746–55.
- 665 22. Leonard RK, Hardjanti K, Anabo A, Mongcopa CJ. Bangladesh: Urban Primary Health  
666 Care. Asian Development Bank; 2008 Jul p. 9.
- 667 23. Ahmad A. Provision of Primary Healthcare Services in Urban areas of Bangladesh – the  
668 Case of Urban Primary Health Care Project. :38.
- 669 24. Alfaqeeh G, Cook EJ, Randhawa G, Ali N. Access and utilisation of primary health care  
670 services comparing urban and rural areas of Riyadh Providence, Kingdom of Saudi  
671 Arabia. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2017 02;17(1):106.
- 672 25. Babakus E, Mangold WG. Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: an  
673 empirical investigation. *Health Serv Res.* 1992 Feb;26(6):767–86.
- 674 26. Nallusamy D, Hariharan S, Vijaykumar D. Development of SERVQUAL Model for  
675 Enhancing the Service Quality by Examining Retail Output Service Gaps. *International*  
676 *Journal of Research in Mechanical, Mechatronics and Automobile Engineering.* 2017  
677 Nov 1;3:01–12.
- 678 27. Pagaiya N, Kongkam L, Sriratana S. Rural retention of doctors graduating from the rural  
679 medical education project to increase rural doctors in Thailand: A cohort study. *Human*  
680 *resources for health.* 2015 Dec 1;13:1.
- 681 28. Joarder T, Sarker M. Achieving Universal Health Coverage Through Community  
682 Empowerment: A Proposition for Bangladesh. *Indian J Community Med.*  
683 2014;39(3):129–31.
- 684 29. Joarder T, Chaudhury TZ, Mannan I. Universal Health Coverage in Bangladesh:  
685 Activities, Challenges, and Suggestions [Internet]. *Advances in Public Health.* 2019.

- 686 30. Andaleeb SS, Siddiqui N, Khandakar S. Patient satisfaction with health services in  
687 Bangladesh. *Health Policy Plan*. 2007 Jul;22(4):263–73.
- 688 31. Mahmud M, Yeasmin B, Mandal S. Quality of life of schizophrenic patients in a tertiary  
689 care hospital in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Journal of Psychiatry*. 2017 Jun 7;29:30.
- 690 32. Duggirala M, Rajendran C, R.N A. Patient-perceived dimensions of total quality service  
691 in healthcare. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*. 2008 Aug 29;15:560–83.
- 692 33. Letkovicova H, Prasad A, Vallée RL, Valentine N, Adhikari P, Heide GW van der.  
693 WHO | The Health Systems Responsiveness Analytical Guidelines for Surveys in the  
694 MCSS. WHO. 2005. Available from: <https://www.who.int/responsiveness/mcss/en/>
- 695 34. Siddiqui N, Khandaker SA. Comparison of Services of Public, Private and Foreign  
696 Hospitals from the Perspective of Bangladeshi Patients. *J Health Popul Nutr*. 2007  
697 Jun;25(2):221–30.
- 698 35. Doctors in India see patients for just two minutes: Study. *The Financial Express*. 2017.  
699 Available from: <https://www.financialexpress.com/health-3/doctors-in-india-see-patients-for-just-two-minutes-study/926241/>
- 701 36. Assefa F, Mosse A, Hailemichael Y. Assessment of Clients’ Satisfaction with Health  
702 Service Deliveries at Jimma University Specialized Hospital. *Ethiop J Health Sci*. 2011  
703 Jul;21(2):101–9.
- 704 37. Patro BK, Kumar R, Goswami A, Nongkynrih B, Pandav CS, UG Study Group.  
705 Community Perception and Client Satisfaction about the Primary Health Care Services  
706 in an Urban Resettlement Colony of New Delhi. *Indian J Community Med*. 2008  
707 Oct;33(4):250–4.
- 708 38. Saxton RE, Yeasmin F, Alam M-U, Al-Masud A, Dutta NC, Yeasmin D, et al. If I do  
709 not have enough water, then how could I bring additional water for toilet cleaning?  
710 Addressing water scarcity to promote hygienic use of shared toilets in Dhaka,  
711 Bangladesh. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2017;22(9):1099–111.
- 712 39. Heard A, Nath DK, Loevinsohn B. Contracting urban primary healthcare services in  
713 Bangladesh - effect on use, efficiency, equity and quality of care. *Trop Med Int Health*.  
714 2013 Jul;18(7):861–70.

715

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework







Figure 2 Map showing study sites (order from top to bottom; KMSS, Nari Maitree and BAPSA)



## Study sites

### I. Dhaka South City Corporation:

- i. Bangladesh Association for Prevention of Septic Abortion (BAPSA), Hazaribag park, Hazaribag, Dhaka

### II. Dhaka North City Corporation:

- i. Nari Maitree, Baitul Aman Cooperative Housing Society Ltd, Ring Road, Dhaka
- ii. Khulna Mukti Sewa Sangstha, Mirpur, Dhaka

## **Annex 1: Operational Definition**

**Responsiveness of HSP:** It is defined as the activities which meet social, ethical and human rights of clients when services are being delivered at UPHC by HSP to meet genuine expectation of clients (Murray and Frenk, 1999; WHO, 2000).

**Quality of health care when provided:** It is defined as the services which meets minimum standards of care, safe services, affordable to the society, reliable, and ability to improve health outcomes which finally meet client expectation and satisfy them, when service is being delivered by HSP in UPHC (USAID, 2004).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

**Access:** It refers to means of approaching UPHC to utilize the available primary health care services.

**Utilization:** It is defined as the use of available primary health care services of UPHC by the beneficiary.

**Beneficiary:** It refers to a person who receives health services or advice from health service provider in UPHC. Is also known as patient or client.

### **Variables of responsiveness variables;**

**Information:** It is delivering understandable messages by HSP to the beneficiary to explain them about the procedure, medicines, consequences of treatment, and clarify all the queries they have.

**Friendliness:** A quality of HSP to be friendly with clients during service delivery.

**Trustworthiness:** It refers to become trustful towards clients by gaining trust in the treatment that HSP provides.

**Beneficence:** It refers to proper treatment following standards to provide medical, social and economic benefit to clients without harm to the clients.

**Respect for dignity of person:** It refers to the respect shown by HSP to beneficiary by protecting from potential abusive practices, physical, and mental harms to ensure rights and freedoms of clients.

### **Variables of quality of services when provided;**

**Technical competence:** It refers to services provided by the technical and skilled HSP.

**Reliable:** It is ability of HSP to perform promised services accurately.

**Assurance:** Ability of HSP to give confidence towards the services of UPHC during service provision.

**Empathy:** Ability of HSP to understand clients' problems and feelings during service delivery.

**Client satisfaction:** It refers to achievement of the quality of services as per the expectation and

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.  
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

needs of clients while delivering services in UPHC.



Graph 1 Box plot showing consultation time of three UPHCs




Table 1 Variables under each Domains

<b>Responsiveness of health service provider</b>	<b>Quality of services when provided</b>
a. Information	a. Tangibles
b. Friendliness	b. Reliable
c. Trustworthiness	c. Assurance
d. Non-maleficence	d. Empathy
e. Respect for dignity of person	e. Client Satisfaction

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**Note:**

For responsiveness medical ethics, human rights and human development components were modified and adopted from “Health and Human Rights Working Paper, 2003” and “Medical Ethics Manual, World Medical Association, 2015”.

For quality, domains were modified and adopted from “SERVQUAL factors” and “service availability and readiness assessment (SARA)” developed by Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry, and WHO respectively (Zeithaml, 2009; WHO, 2013; Nallusamy, Hariharan & Vijaykumar, 2017).

## Annex 2: Questionnaire tools

### Accessibility to and utilization of Urban Primary Health Care

This tool is divided into two parts: Interviews and Observation

Date of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_ Place: \_\_\_\_\_

#### I. Interviews

##### A. Socio-demographic profile

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

S.N.	Questions	Response
1.	Name of the respondent _____	
2.	Sex of the respondent	1. Male 2. Female 3. Other
3.	Age of respondent in years  What is your child's age in months/years (below 18)	
4.	Marital status of respondent	1. Single 2. Married 3. Separated 4. Divorced 5. Widowed
5.	Religious affiliation of respondent	1. Islam 2. Hindu 3. Christian 4. Buddhist 5. Other

6.	How many children do you have?	
7.	How many family members do you have including you? _____	
8.	<p>What is your present address?</p> <p>Since when you are living here? _____</p>	<p>1. City corporation (specify) .....</p> <p>2. District town (specify) .....</p> <p>3. Other town (specify).....</p> <p>4. Village (specify) .....</p>
9.	What is your permanent address?	<p>1. City corporation (specify) .....</p> <p>2. District town (specify) .....</p> <p>3. Other town (specify) .....</p> <p>4. Village (specify) .....</p>
10.	If you are not a permanent resident of this area, what was the main reason for moving to the current place?	<p>1. Looking for work</p> <p>2. More earning</p> <p>3. Own education</p> <p>4. Children's education</p> <p>5. Familial</p> <p>6. Marriage</p> <p>7. Buy new land/house</p> <p>8. Look after properties</p> <p>9. River erosion</p> <p>10. Eviction</p> <p>11. Security</p> <p>12. Other (specify) .....</p>

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

11.	Do you come from ____ wards (the catchment area) of UPHC?	1. Yes 2. No
12.	What is your educational level?	1. Illiterate 2. Primary 3. Secondary 4. Higher Secondary 5. Graduation 6. Post-graduation 7. No formal education 8. Technical training
13.	Are you employed...?	1. Yes 2. No , if no go to 16
14.	Employment status	1. Full time 2. Part time
15.	What is your occupation?	1. Service (Specify.....) 2. Small business 3. Large business 4. Farmer 5. Teacher 6. Others.....
16.	What is your average monthly household income?	
17.	Does your household possess these goods?	1. Refrigerator 2. TV 3. Mobile phone 4. Radio 5. Motor bike 6. Sewing machine 7. Bicycle

		8. IPS 9. Motor car
18.	What is your source of drinking water?	1. Wasa supply tap in home 2. Tube well 3. Wasa street tap 4. Pond 5. Deep tube well 6. Others.....
19.	What is the process of water purification you practice?	1. Boiling 2. Filter 3. Water purification tablet 4. Nothing 5. Others.....
20.	How is your household infrastructure made of?	1. Brick build 2. Kachha 3. Tin shed
21.	What type of toilet do you use?	1. Sanitary latrine 2. Drain 3. Pond 4. Hanging toilet
22.	From where do you take treatment if you are usually ill?	1. Traditional healer 2. Pharmacy 3. UPHC 4. Government hospital 5. Private hospital

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .



23.	What is the distance of the UPHC from your home?	___ kilometers/walking distance
24.	What time usually needed to reach to the UPHC?	1. 10-15 min 2. 30min 3. 1hour 5. More than 1 hour
25.	What transport do you need to reach to UPHC?	1. By walk 2. Rickshaw 3. CNG 4. Bus 5. Car
26.	What is the usual transport cost needed to reach UPHC?	1. 10 to 20tk 2. 50tk 3. 100tk 4. More than 100 tk
27.	Is this your first visit/ follow up visit? Skip to 32, if first visit	1. First visit(if 1, then go to 32) 2. Follow up
28.	How many times did you visit the health facility in last three months	1. 1-2 times 2. 3-4 times 3. More than 4 times 4. Cannot remember
29.	Why did you visit/what was your/your child's problem? What was the purpose of visit?	
30.	Was your problem being solved in this UPHC center?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Referred to other place

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

31.	What is the purpose of today's visit (your /your child's problem, the day of interview)? (Which department do you want to go?)	
32.	Has the physician given any diagnostic tests for your disease?	1. Yes 2. No
33.	Has the physician given any advice for your disease?	1. Yes 2. No
34.	Do you know what are the services available in the health center.....	1. Yes 2. No (if no skip to 37)
35.	Can you name the services available in this UPHC.	
36.	Do you know the prices of services....?	1. Yes (If no. go to 40) 2. No
37.	Can you mention the service prices.	
38.	Are these services reasonable in price/costly?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Costly
39.	Do you get medicines from this UPHC?	1. Yes 2. No
40.	Are these medicines free?	1. Yes 2. No
41.	Do you buy medicines from outside (Private pharmacy)?	1. Yes 2. No
42.	How did you manage the entire cost of your health problem	1. Out of pocket 2. loan 3. free

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.31.22281663>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



	4. Others
--	-----------

**B. Exit Interview with service users**

**I. Responsiveness of Health Service Provider (HSP)**

<b>S.N.</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Options/Code</b> <b>Yes: "1", No: "2"</b>	
1.	<b>Information</b>		
	1. Did HSP listen to you carefully?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did HSP explain about your disease?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Did you understand HSP information clearly?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Did HSP facilitate about follow-up?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Could you access the medical record for future reference/use?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<b>Friendliness</b>		
	1. Did HSP asked your social profile (Name and address) to build rapport?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did HSP engage you in social talks? (e.g. asking about family)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Was the conversation two way with eye contact?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Was HSP's conversation sociocultural friendly? (e.g. cultural acceptance)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<b>Trustworthiness</b>		
	1. Were you confident about the HSP after communication?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Was HSP service oriented (not showing attitude)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Did HSP become angry/misbehave with you?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Did HSP provide you emergency contact number?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<b>Non-maleficence</b>		

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

	1. Have you ever find any side effects during your treatment in this UPHC?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Do you get benefit from the treatment?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Did HSP ask about your drug allergic history before prescribing drugs?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. In case of emergency, does HSP give immediate attention to critical case and do the needful action?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Did HSP use sterile/new equipment during procedures?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
5.	<b>Respect for dignity of person</b>		
	1. Did HSP interact with you respectfully?		
	a. Greetings by physician	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Maintain privacy	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Confidentiality	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Female attendant for female patient	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Consent before procedure	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Examine patient with care	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	g. Non stigmatized examination		
	h. Closing salutation	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did HSP provide services similarly to all the patients on the basis of		
	a. Gender	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Ethnicity	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Religion	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Caste	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Social status	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	f. Economic status	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

## II. Quality of services when provided

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

S.N.	Questions	Options/Code Yes: "1", No: "2"
1.	<b>Tangibility</b>	
	1. Was the following equipment available when services were provided?	
	a. Blood pressure Instrument	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Gloves	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Thermometer	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. Stethoscope	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	e. Measurement tape	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did they replace gloves or clean thermometer after use?	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Was the UPHC/doctors room visually attractive (clean dress of HSP, cleanliness of hospital linens)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Compare to your previous visit/visits, how was the standard of the service? Skip for first time patients	1. Improved 2. Not improved 3. Degrading 4. Not applicable
2.	<b>Reliability:</b>	
	1. Do HSP provide service or respond timely?	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did HSP write in your OPD records?	1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/>

	3. Was HSP dependable?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<b>Assurance:</b>		
	1. Did HSP give courage and reassurance?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Did you feel safe to share your problems with HSP?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Does HSP have support to do their job well (Assistance)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<b>Empathy:</b>		
	1. Do HSP provide dedicated attention to you during consultation? <small>It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .</small>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	2. How long did you get time to consult?	_____	
	3. Was the time enough to share your problems and get treatment?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Was HSP able to identify your health needs?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Was the HSP compassionate?(e.g. showing sympathy)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
5.	<b>Client satisfaction</b>		
	1. Rate the quality of service you received:	1. Poor 2. Unsatisfactory 3. Average 4. Satisfactory 5. Good	
	2. For how long did you wait to receive care?		
	3. Did you find all the services you needed?		
	a. Availability of Medicine	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	b. Availability of Doctor	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
	c. Availability Diagnostic test	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273069>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

<p>d. Availability of services</p> <p>e. Choice of HSP</p> <p>f. Others: _____</p>	<p>1 <input type="checkbox"/>      2 <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/>    2 <input type="checkbox"/>    3 NA</p> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/>      2 <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>4. What would best describe your experience with HSP and facilities?</p>	<p>1. Kept me waiting</p> <p>2. Had to explain several times</p> <p>3. Did not know how to handle problem</p> <p>4. Had to ask other HSP</p> <p>5. Did not speak clearly</p> <p>6. other</p>
<p>5. To what extent did UPHC services meet your needs?</p>	<p>1. Almost all of my needs have been met</p> <p>2. Most of my needs have been met</p> <p>3. Only a few of my needs have been met</p> <p>4. None of my needs have been met</p>
<p>6. If a friend was in need of similar service, would you recommend UPHC services to him or her?</p>	<p>1. No, definitely not</p> <p>2. No, I don't think so</p> <p>3. Yes, I think so</p> <p>4. Yes, definitely</p>
<p>7. If you were to seek service again, would you come back to UPHC?</p> <p>8.</p>	<p>1. No, definitely not</p> <p>2. No, I don't think so</p> <p>3. Yes, think so</p> <p>4. Yes, definitely</p>

	9. What was most satisfactory thing you faced when you consulted?	
	10. What was the most dissatisfactory thing you faced when you consulted?	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.  
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

## C. Observation Tool

### ROP-Scale in the form of Structured Observation Tool

#### Understanding and Measuring Responsiveness of Health Service Provider (HSP) in UPHC in Dhaka City

##### 1. General Identification Questions

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

**Instruction to the observer:** Fill out these information's just before starting the interview with the HSP and structured observation.

2. Observation ID \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date of observation \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name of UPHC \_\_\_\_\_
5. Address of UPHC \_\_\_\_\_
6. Type of provider: Exclusively UPHC/ both UPHC and private
7. Starting time of observation \_\_\_\_\_
8. Ending time of observation \_\_\_\_\_

##### Questions for the HSP

##### **Instruction to the observer:**

9. ID of the HSP \_\_\_\_\_
10. Gender \_\_\_\_\_
11. Degrees [E.g., MBBS, FCPS (Medicine)] \_\_\_\_\_
12. Number of months in practice \_\_\_\_\_
13. Number of months working in this UPHC \_\_\_\_\_
14. Average patient examination per day \_\_\_\_\_

##### **Observation Items**



**Instruction to the observer:** Be present while consulting with 4<sup>th</sup> patients. First 3<sup>rd</sup> observations will not be recorded. Assess the role of the HSP in this regard by 1 to 4 where 1-completely unsatisfactory and 4-completely satisfactory. Following observation will be graded according to this scale.

**Beginning part**

**15. Greet and welcome to the patient by HSP and make the patient feel comfort.**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
<p>The HSP started writing the prescription without any greeting. If the patient greeted first, the HSP even did not respond to the greetings of the patient.</p>	<p>The HSP expressed minimum greetings to the patient. If the patient greeted first, HSP responded to the patient's greetings indirectly (by Shaking head, lifting eyes, shaking hand etc.).</p>	<p>The HSP greeted and welcomed the patient; however, it was not enough to make the patient easy or friendly. If the patient greeted first, HSP gave his answer in words when the patient gave salam.</p>	<p>The HSP greeted warmly and welcomed the patient friendly and became easy with him. If the patient greeted first, HSP cordially answered the patient's and also exchanged greeting.</p>

**16. Patients expect that the HSP will ask patient's name at least and will treat the patient as a person.**

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4
----------------------------

The HSP did not consider asking the name of the patient as necessary or just asked the name for writing in the prescription.	The HSP asked the name of the patient but it was not seemed that he listened to the patient by giving importance or attention.	The HSP asked the name of the patient and listened attentively. But did not call her/ him in that name.	The HSP asked the name of the patient, listened attentively and also called her/ him in that name.
--	--	---	--

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

17. The patient expects that the HSP will not only listen to his problem but also do some social talks and listen to the patient if he does any social talk.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not do any social talk with patient. Even he stopped the patient when the patient started to do some social talks.	The HSP did minimum social talk or responded when the patient started social talk.	The HSP did some social talk or responded when the patient started social talk.	The HSP got involved completely into social talk or if the patient started, he participated satisfactorily into social talks.

18. The patient expects that HSP will also ask about his family.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not ask anything about the family of the patient or there was	The HSP did not want to know anything about the family of the patient but there were some talking regarding this in his advice.	The HSP wanted to know about the family of the patient but not in details. That was not a part of the treatment rather a part of social talk.	The HSP wanted to know about the family of the patient in details cordially. That was not a part of the treatment rather a part of social talk.



nothing in this regard during his consultation.	That means it was a part of his treatment but not a social talk.	<b>For example:</b> how many members are there in his family, how many children, are they all well etc.	<b>For example:</b> how many members are there in his family, how many children, are they all well etc.
---	--	---	---

19. Patients expect that the **HSP will be friendly.**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273963>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

The HSP was not friendly.	The HSP was friendly at a minimum level.	The HSP was somewhat friendly.	The HSP was fully friendly.
The example of friendliness may be: remembering the name and face of the patient and calling him by name (here ‘calling by name’ means calling by name of the patient in a friendly manner); asking or making comment about an event of the patient’s family; praising the patient (about clothing or anything else); asking for an opinion of the patient about anything (weather, politics etc.)			

20. Patients do not **expect misbehave** rather **expect good behavior** from the HSP.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP misbehaved with the patient.	The HSP neither misbehaved nor behaved well with the patient.	The HSP showed least but not much respect. <b>As for example:</b> replying salam and good-bye, talking softly with the patient etc.	The HSP showed respect to the patient perfectly. <b>The example of showing respect to the patient perfectly may be:</b> giving honor to an aged patient by standing up, helping an aged patient to sit down, giving Salam or at least replying when patients give Salam, talking softly with the patient etc.
<b>Examples of behavior showing disrespect might be:</b> Bargaining for money, using bad words, denying to provide treatment etc.; stopping the patient in the middle; talking in an authoritative tone, misbehaving, scolding etc.; getting the patient out of			

the room; “Do you know more than me? Then why did not you become a HSP?” Telling such etc.		
--	--	--

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**History Taking**

21. Patients expect that the HSPs will **start writing the prescription after listening to the symptoms** in detail and completely.

NA-----1-----2-----3----- ---4			
The HSP did not listen to the patient attentively. The HSP stopped the patient while describing his complains.	The HSP listened to some of the patient's complaints, but at some stage HSP stopped the patient either by verbal or non-verbal cues. HSP had gone to the next step (examining, prescribing, etc.) before the patient finished describing his complaints.	The HSP listened to patient's complaints, did not stop the patient in the middle. But HSP had gone to the next step (examining, prescribing, etc.) before the patient finished describing his complaints.	The HSP heard the patient up to the end, did not interrupt (except necessary questions). He started next step only when the patient completed the description of the disease in details.

22. Patients expect that the **HSP will listen to them attentively** with patience and that would be expressed by his behavior.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4
----------------------------

The HSP did not show attentiveness and patience in his behavior and language.	The HSP showed at least minimum attentiveness and patience in his behavior and language (e.g., At least one of the following things, <b>but did not ask questions</b> )	The HSP showed attentiveness and patience in his behavior and language to some extent (e.g., <b>Asking questions to learn more</b> and any two of the following).	The HSP showed attentiveness and patience clearly and fully by his behavior and language (all or most of the following).
---	---	---	--

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

**Behaviors indicating attentiveness and patience may be:** shaking head while talking, looking at the patient, asking questions to learn more, variation in tone, smiling face, some interest expressing words (e.g., Ok, hm etc.)etc.

### Examination

23. Patients expect that the HSP would do the **necessary physical examination with care.**

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not examine the patient any more.	The HSP examined the patient at least once (only measured body temperature or pulse rate etc.).	The HSP measured the body temperature, blood pressure, pulse rate etc. (which were necessary) with some care.	The HSP measured the body temperature, blood pressure, pulse rate etc. and did all with care.
The example of examining the patient physically may be: telling the patient politely to fold up his sleeves, telling the patient that what he is going to do etc.			

### Prescription Writing

24. Patients expect that the HSP would not only treat the disease but also **suggest some preventive measures.**

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4
----------------------------







**Examples of service-oriented attitudes may be:** asking the patient's ability to bear the cost of treatment, if necessary assisting the patient in getting low-cost medical care and so on.

26. Patients expect that the **HSPs would facilitate post treatment follow-up** and give them a follow-up plan.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

The HSP did not give any follow-up plan to the patient.	The HSP gave <b>minimum</b> follow-up plan to the patient. <b>At least</b> he told when to come to the HSP again and what would be the cost of follow-up.	The HSP gave the patient a somewhat fair follow-up plan. At least he told when to come to the HSP again and what would be the cost of follow-up. Beside this, at least one of the following points	The HSP willingly gave the patient a complete follow-up plan. Almost all of the following points were
		was included.	included.

**Complete follow-up plan could be:** When the patient would meet the HSP again; in which case the patient should contact the HSP before; if necessary, how the patient can reach the HSP; providing mobile number to the patient; telling about follow-up costs; follow-up should be at free of cost; to write down what the patient should come up with at the time of follow-up (or at least tell); telling to inform the HSP immediately if any of the side effects of treatment arise etc.

**Note:** Often HSPs suggest the patients to meet them again after doing any test. It would not be regarded as follow-up because it is not a part of sensitivity but a part of the treatment process.

### Explanations and Questions

27. Patients expect the HSP would **explain everything to them**; cause of the disease, diagnosis, prognosis and severity, treatment, the side effects of the drugs, the result of diagnostic tests (if any), preventive measures of disease (Diet) etc.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not explain anything to the patient. He only wrote the prescription.	The HSP explained at least one thing to the patient. Such as: diagnosis (at least the name of the disease), treatment (at least explaining prescription) etc.	The HSP explained many issues to the patient. Such as: diagnosis (at least the name of the disease), treatment (at least explaining prescription), the result of diagnostic tests (if any), preventive measures of disease (Diet) etc.	The HSP explained everything to the patient. Such as: cause of the disease, diagnosis (at least the name of the disease), treatment (at least explaining prescription), the side effects of the drugs (if any), the result of diagnostic tests (if any), preventive measures of disease (Diet) etc.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

28. It is extremely important that the **patient understands all suggestions** or explanations given by the HSP. The HSP should be sure that the patient understands him.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not ask the patient about his understanding after explaining him the cause of the disease, diagnosis (name of the disease),	The HSP asked the patient about his understanding after explaining him at least one (especially name of the disease and/or treatment) of the following issues, such as, cause of the disease, diagnosis (name of the disease), prognosis, treatment etc.	The HSP asked the patient about his understanding after explaining him at least two or more of the following issues, such as, cause of the disease, diagnosis (name of the disease),	The HSP asked the patient about his understanding after explaining him each of the following issues, such as, cause of the disease, diagnosis (name of the disease),



prognosis, treatment etc.		prognosis, treatment etc.	prognosis, treatment etc.
------------------------------	--	------------------------------	------------------------------

29. Some of the **behaviour of the HSP discourages patients to ask questions.**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

<p>NA-----1-----2-----3-----</p> <p>4</p>			
<p>The patients were greatly discouraged to ask questions by the words or behavior of the HSP.</p> <p><b>Examples of discouraging behavior may be:</b></p> <p>repeatedly looking at the clock, giving reminder to the patient to be short, writing prescription while answering the question, ultraseriousness, answering very shortly (in one word), answering in nagging tone, remaining many patients together at the queue, "you understand more," or "you are the HSP" - telling such neglectful words etc.</p>	<p>The patients might be slightly discouraged to ask questions by the words or behavior of the HSP.</p> <p><b>Examples of such behavior could be:</b></p> <p>repeatedly looking at the clock, writing prescription while answering the question, answering very shortly (in one word), waiting many patients at the queue, etc.</p>	<p>The words or behavior of the HSP did not discourage patients to ask question. However, the HSP also did not behave in such way to provide courage or to encourage the patients for asking questions. <b>Example of encouraging conduct may be:</b> smile answered, carefully listening to the questions, etc.</p>	<p>The words or behavior of the HSP did not discourage patients to ask question; rather the HSP behaved in such way that provided courage or encouraged the patients for asking questions. <b>Example of encouraging conduct may be:</b> smile answered, carefully listening to the questions, etc.</p>

30. One of the most important impediments for patients to understand HSP's **advice is the medical terminology** (jargon), professional language etc. So, the HSP should avoid such

language or explain it if used. [If the HSP does not say any word to the patient, fill in the ‘Not Applicable’ field.]

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP used many medical terminologies, and did not explain it to the patient.	The HSP used many medical terminologies, and explained some of those to the patient.	The HSP used one or two medical terminologies, and also explained.	The HSP did not use any medical terminology.
<p><small>medRxiv preprint doi: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063">https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063</a>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">CC-BY 4.0 International license</a>.</small></p>			
<p><b>Example of medical terms:</b> Pus cell (puj), absorb (digestion), nebulize (providing gas)</p>			

### Leaving

31. **Saying good-bye** is also as important part of consultation as greetings. In this regard, HSP should tell the **summary of consultation**, verify whether the patient has understood everything properly, tell the patient how to communicate with the HSP if any problem arises later and say goodbye with smile.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP did not say good-bye; even when patient said goodbye he did not reply.	The HSP hardly said good-bye to the patient. When patient said goodbye to the HSP, he replied by using gesture (by nutation, eye contact, waving hand etc.).	The HSP said good-bye to the patient but it was not complete or enough. When patient said goodbye, the HSP replied him verbally. <b>Examples may be:</b> saying walaikumassalam; ok, you may go; be well etc.	The HSP said goodbye to the patient properly. When patients said good-bye, the HSP responded warmly. <b>As a good practice, following issues might be included:</b> summarizing the whole consultation; verifying whether the patient has understood everything properly or not; telling the patient how to communicate with the HSP if any problem arises later and saying goodbye with smile (assalamualaikum, khodahafez, be well, etc.)



## Throughout Consultation

32. Patients do not want to see the **HSP involved in illegal or unethical activity**, especially if it is related with their treatment. The HSP should remain away from such type of activity.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP was involved with various illegal activities.	The HSP was involved with at least one illegal activity.	The HSP was not directly involved with any illegal activity. However, such kind of activities happened in front of him and he remained silence that means he had tacit support. Examples: ignoring presence of brokers (inside the room), behavior with medical representatives seen to be over treated etc.	The HSP was not involved with any illegal activity and he was not seen to support any such activities either directly or indirectly.
<p><b>Examples of such illegal activities may be:</b> Taking money from patients against free services; bringing patients with the help of brokers; presence of brokers around the chamber (HSPs did not take any step to stop this); collusion with diagnostic centers. Accepting gift from medical representative (and prescribing medicine of that company); taking advantage from brokers (utilizing in hospital, utilizing for personal work) and so on.</p>			

33. Patients expect that the HSP would have **sense of humor** and would provide treatment by becoming easy with patients using his sense of humor.

NA-----1-----2-----3-----4			
The HSP was in serious mood. He did not have any kind of humor.	The HSP was smiling or he had some humor.	The HSP was smiling and he had some humor.	The HSP was smiling all the time and made the patient feel comfortable by joking.
<p>Examples of humor may be (<b>examples from my participant observation</b>): When a young lady asked for vitamin syrup, the HSP replied, "Leave these baby foods". After doing ultra-</p>			

sonogram the HSP told the child patient, “Go and run now”. During ultra-sonogram the HSP told a female patient, “I see that you have eaten very well at noon”.

34. Record the consultation time (in seconds) using a stop watch. \_\_\_\_\_

35. Age of the patient \_\_\_\_\_

36. Gender of the patient \_\_\_\_\_

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.  
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .



Graph 2 Quality of services (according to users) in three health facilities




Table 2 Responsiveness of Health Service Provider (HSP) in three UPHCs

UPHC	BAPSA		KMSS		Nari Maitree		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Domains	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	N (%)	(%)
Information								
Listening carefully	111(97)	3(3)	90(98)	2(2)	51(100)	0(0)	252(98)	5(2)
Explaining about the diseases	111(97)	3(3)	90(98)	2(2)	51(100)	0(0)	252(98)	5(2)
Patient understanding HSP's information clearly	114(100)	0(0)	91(99)	1(1)	51(100)	0(0)	256(100)	1(0)
Facilitation about follow-up	107(94)	7(6)	84(91)	8(9)	49(96)	2(4)	240(93)	17(7)
Patient accessing medical record for future use	109(96)	5(4)	89(97)	3(3)	47(92)	4(8)	245(95)	12(5)
Friendliness								
Asking patient's name to build rapport	72(63)	42(37)	65(71)	27(29)	42(82)	9(18)	179(70)	78(30)
Engaging in social talks	36(32)	78(68)	30(33)	62(67)	29(57)	22(43)	95(37)	162(63)
Two way conversation with eye contact	110(96)	4(4)	88(96)	4(4)	44(86)	7(14)	242(94)	15(6)

Socio-cultural friendly conversation	109(96)	5(4)	85(92)	7(8)	48(94)	3(6)	242(94)	15(6)
<b>Trustworthiness</b>								
Gaining confidence after communication	113(99)	1(1)	88(96)	4(4)	51(100)	0(0)	252(98)	5(2)
Service oriented	76(67)	38(33)	70(76)	22(24)	30(59)	21(41)	176(68)	81(32)
Misbehave with patient	30(26)	84(74)	13(14)	79(86)	4(8)	47(92)	47(18)	210(82)
Providing emergency contact number	57(50)	57(50)	27(29)	65(71)	22(43)	29(57)	106(41)	151(59)
<b>Non-maleficence</b>								
Side effects during treatment	24(21)	90(79)	15(16)	77(84)	24(47)	27(53)	63(25)	194(75)
Get benefit from the treatment	108(95)	6(5)	87(95)	5(5)	49(96)	2(4)	244(95)	13(5)
Asking about your drug allergic history before prescribing drugs	48(42)	66(58)	25(27)	67(73)	12(24)	39(76)	85(33)	172(67)
In case of emergency, giving immediate attention to critical case and do the needful action	101(89)	13(11)	78(85)	14(15)	37(73)	14(27)	216(84)	41(16)
Using sterile/new equipment during procedures	95(83)	19(17)	73(79)	19(21)	38(75)	13(25)	206(80)	51(20)

**Respect for dignity of person****Interact with respectfully**

Greetings	109(96)	5(4)	89(97)	3(3)	48(94)	3(6)	246(96)	11(4)
Maintain privacy	113(99)	1(1)	90(98)	2(2)	48(94)	3(6)	251(98)	6(2)
Confidentiality	112(98)	2(2)	90(98)	2(2)	50(98)	1(2)	252(98)	5(2)
Female attendant for female patient	98(86)	16(14)	87(95)	5(5)	48(94)	3(6)	233(91)	24(9)
Consent before procedure	71(62)	43(38)	48(52)	44(48)	16(31)	35(69)	135(53)	122(47)
Examine patient with care	113(99)	1(1)	88(96)	4(4)	47(92)	4(8)	248(96)	9(4)
Non-stigmatizing treatment	111(97)	3(3)	86(93)	6(7)	48(94)	3(6)	245(95)	12(5)
Closing salutation	93(82)	21(18)	72(78)	20(22)	47(92)	4(8)	212(82)	45(18)

**Similar services in terms of:**

Gender	65(57)	49(43)	51(55)	41(45)	42(82)	9(18)	158(61)	99(39)
Ethnicity	64(56)	50(44)	51(55)	41(45)	42(82)	9(18)	157(61)	100(39)
Religion	64(56)	50(44)	51(55)	41(45)	42(82)	9(18)	157(61)	100(39)
Caste	63(55)	51(45)	46(50)	46(50)	41(80)	10(20)	150(58)	107(42)
Social status	63(55)	51(45)	24(26)	68(74)	41(80)	10(20)	128(50)	129(50)

Economic status	60(53)	54(47)	26(28)	66(72)	41(80)	10(20)	127(49)	130(51)
-----------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------	---------

---

# Annex 3: Consent form

## Information and Consent Form for Exit interview

**Serial no:**

**Date:**

Interview Topic	Accessibility to and Utilization of Urban Primary Health Care Services in Dhaka City
Name of the group members	Abmijan Sultan, Bahadara Bhandari, Chungano Hassan, Fatiha Sultana, Saima Mehjabeen
Name of the Institution	James P Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University, Bangladesh

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Greetings,

We are students of 13<sup>th</sup> batch of MPH programme at James P. Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University. As a part of our summative learning project (study activities), we are conducting a study on accessibility and utilization of urban primary health care services. Objective of the study is to explore the current status, enabling factors, challenges towards accessibility and utilization of urban primary healthcare services in Dhaka city. To obtain the study objective we need to interview both the users, caretakers of the users (if age is below 18 years) and providers of UPHC services of this centre. Hence, we are interested to talk with you. We would like to take your permission before proceeding. Your valuable information is really important to us and will lead to better insights and knowledge about the access and utilization of UPHC in Dhaka city. The interview will take 25-30 minutes. There is no direct benefit for you in this study and you will not receive any monetary compensation or gifts. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous and will be used for purpose of the study only. The information collected from the study will be kept covert by the research group. In order to best understand, we need to ask some questions regarding access and utilization of UPHC services. Keep in mind that your participation will be completely voluntarily. You can withdraw from the interview/discussion at any moment if you want to, even after signing the consent or beginning the interview. Moreover, you are not obliged to answer any question that makes you feel uncomfortable. There are no restrictions and risks of answering our questions.

Would you be willing to participate in the study?

If yes, please give your signature below



I have read the foregoing information, or it has been read to me. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it and any questions I have been asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent voluntarily to be a participant in this study

Print Name of Participant \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Participant \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Day/month/year

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

*If illiterate* \* It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

I have witnessed the accurate reading of the consent form to the potential participant, and the individual has had the opportunity to ask questions. I confirm that the individual has given consent freely.

Print name of witness \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of witness \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Day/month/year

Thumb print of participant

Right	Left
-------	------

Statement by the researcher/person taking consent

I have accurately read out the information sheet to the potential participant, and to the best of my ability made sure that the participant understands

I confirm that the participant was given an opportunity to ask questions about the study, and all the questions asked by the participant have been answered correctly and to the best of my ability. I confirm that the individual has not been coerced into giving consent, and the consent has been given freely and voluntarily.

A copy of this ICF has been provided to the participant.

---

\* A literate witness must sign (if possible, this person should be selected by the participant and should have no connection to the research team). Participants who are illiterate should include their thumb print as well.

Print Name of Researcher/person taking the consent \_\_\_\_\_


Signature of Researcher /person taking the consent \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Day/month/year

Phone Number: +8801749308699 (Saima Mehjabeen)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.  
It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

Graph 3 Clients satisfaction in various categories in three health facilities



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 3 Average responsiveness scores according to ROP scale

Domains	Variables	Average Scores <sup>a</sup>
Friendliness	Ask Patient's Name	1.9
	Social Talks	2.0
	Ask about family	1.5
	Friendly	2.0
	Use of patient friendly language	2.7
	Sense of Humor	1.7
Information	Write after listening	2.4
	Listen to patient	2.7
	Suggestion for Prevention	2.2
	Follow up advice	2.0
	Explain about diseases	2.2
	Patient understand suggestion	1.8
Respect	Greet and welcome to patient	2.1
	Physical examination	2.1
	Behavior of HSP	2.2

---


	Saying good-bye	1.8
Trustworthiness	Misbehave	2.6
	Service oriented	3.2
	Illegal activities of HSP	3.9

---

\*Out of total score of 4



Graph 4 Client dissatisfaction about three health facilities



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Table 4 Quality of services when provided in three UPHCs

UPHCs	BAPSA		KMSS		Nari Maitree		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Domains	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	N (%)	N (%)
<b>Tangibility</b>								
Blood Pressure Measuring instrument	96(84)	18(16)	83(90)	9(10)	42(82)	9(18)	221(86)	36(14)
Gloves	31(27)	83(73)	12(13)	80(87)	9(18)	42(82)	52(20)	205(80)
Thermometer	57(50)	57(50)	36(39)	56(61)	22(43)	29(57)	115(45)	142(55)
Stethoscope	88(77)	26(23)	75(82)	15(16)	40(78)	11(22)	203(79)	52(20)
Measurement tape	48(42)	66(58)	34(37)	58(63)	25(49)	26(51)	107(42)	150(58)
Replacement of items after use	64(56)	50(44)	37(40)	55(60)	26(51)	25(49)	127(49)	130(51)
Doctors room visually attractive	111(97)	3(3)	86(93)	6(7)	48(94)	3(6)	245(95)	12(5)
<b>Reliability</b>								
Responded timely	107(94)	7(6)	89(97)	3(3)	51(100)	0(0)	247(96)	10(4)
Writing on OPD records	103(90)	11(10)	72(78)	20(22)	50(98)	1(2)	225(88)	32(12)
Dependable	113(99)	1(1)	88(96)	4(4)	50(98)	1(2)	251(98)	6(2)
<b>Assurance</b>								
Give reassurance	110(96)	4(4)	87(95)	5(5)	51(100)	0(0)	248(96)	9(4)

Safe to share problems	112(98)	2(2)	88(96)	4(4)	50(98)	1(2)	250(97)	7(3)
Assistance to help HSP	104(91)	10(9)	87(95)	5(5)	47(92)	4(8)	238(93)	19(7)
<b>Empathy</b>								
<hr/> Provide dedicated attention during consultation	112(98)	2(2)	90(98)	2(2)	51(100)	0(0)	253(98)	4(2)
Consultation time								
Enough time to share problems	104(91)	10(9)	82(89)	10(11)	47(92)	4(8)	233(91)	24(9)
Able to identify health needs	109(96)	5(4)	82(89)	10(11)	47(92)	4(8)	238(93)	19(7)
Compassionate	113(99)	1(1)	87(95)	5(5)	48(94)	3(6)	248(96)	9(4)
<b>Client satisfaction</b>								
<hr/> Find all service	47(41)	67(59)	30(33)	62(67)	22(43)	29(57)	99(39)	158(61)
Availability of medicine	99(87)	15(13)	67(73)	25(27)	41(80)	10(20)	207(81)	50(19)
Availability of doctor	83(73)	31(27)	65(71)	27(29)	44(86)	7(14)	192(75)	65(25)
Availability of diagnostic test	88(77)	26(23)	79(86)	13(14)	43(84)	8(16)	210(82)	47(18)
Availability of services	49(43)	65(57)	23(25)	66(72)	24(47)	25(49)	96(37)	156(61)
Choice of HSP	49(43)	65(57)	23(25)	69(75)	24(47)	27(53)	96(37)	161(63)
Patient suggesting other friends to come for treatment	97(85)	17(15)	75(82)	17(18)	42(82)	9(18)	214(83)	43(17)

Patient comes again for treatment	99(87)	15(13)	74(80)	18(20)	44(86)	7(14)	217(84)	40(16)
-----------------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-------	---------	--------

---

Graph 5 Box plot showing waiting time in three UPHCs.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.28.22273063>; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

