

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Through the patients' eyes - Psychometric evaluation of the 64-item version of the Experienced Patient-Centeredness Questionnaire (EPAT-64)

Eva Christalle¹, Stefan Zeh¹, Hannah Führes¹, Alica Schellhorn¹, Pola Hahlweg¹, Jördis Zill¹, Martin Härter¹, Carsten Bokemeyer², Jürgen Gallinat³, Christoffer Gebhardt⁴, Christina Magnussen⁵, Volkmar Müller⁶, Katharina Schmalstieg-Bahr⁷, André Strahl⁸, Levente Kriston^{1*}, Isabelle Scholl^{1*}

* Levente Kriston and Isabelle Scholl contributed equally

¹ Department of Medical Psychology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

² Department of Internal Medicine II (Oncology / Hematology / BMT / Pneumology), University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

³ Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

⁴ Department of Dermatology and Venereology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

⁵ Department of Cardiology, University Heart & Vascular Center Hamburg, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; German Center for Cardiovascular Research (DZHK), partner site Hamburg/Kiel/Luebeck; Center for Population Health Innovation (POINT), University Heart and Vascular Center Hamburg, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

⁶ Department of Gynecology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

⁷ Department of General Practice and Primary Care, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

⁸ Department of Orthopedics, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany

Corresponding author information:

Prof. Dr. Isabelle Scholl, Dipl.-Psych.

i.scholl@uke.de

+49-040-7410-57135

Martinistr. 52

20246 Hamburg, Germany

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background**

3 Patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) are valuable tools for evaluating patient-centeredness
4 (PC) from the patients’ perspective. Despite their utility, a comprehensive PREM addressing PC has
5 been lacking. To bridge this gap, we developed the preliminary version of the Experienced Patient-
6 Centeredness Questionnaire (EPAT), a disease-generic tool based on the integrative model of PC
7 comprising 16 dimensions. It demonstrated content validity. The aim of this study was to test its
8 psychometric properties and to develop a final 64-items version (EPAT-64).

9 **Methods**

10 In this cross-sectional study, we included adult patients treated for cardiovascular diseases, cancer,
11 musculoskeletal diseases, and mental disorders in inpatient or outpatient settings in Germany. For
12 each dimension of PC, we selected four items based on item characteristics such as item difficulty and
13 corrected item-total correlation. We tested structural validity using confirmatory factor analysis,
14 examined reliability by McDonald’s Omega, and tested construct validity by examining correlations
15 with general health status and satisfaction with care.

16 **Results**

17 Analysis of data from 2,024 patients showed excellent acceptance and acceptable item-total-
18 correlations for all EPAT-64 items, with few items demonstrating ceiling effects. The confirmatory
19 factor analysis indicated the best fit of a bifactor model, where each item loaded on both a general
20 factor and a dimension-specific factor. Omega showed high reliability for the general factor while
21 varying for specific dimensions. Construct validity was confirmed by absence of strong correlations
22 with general health status and a strong correlation of the general factor with satisfaction with care.

23 **Conclusions**

24 The EPAT-64 demonstrated commendable psychometric properties. This tool allows comprehensive
25 assessment of PC, offering flexibility to users who can measure each dimension with a 4-item module
26 or choose modules based on their needs. The EPAT-64 serves multiple purposes, including quality
27 improvement initiatives and evaluation of interventions aiming to enhance PC. Its versatility empowers
28 users in diverse healthcare settings.

29

30

31 **What is already known on this topic** – Patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) can be used to
32 assess patient-centeredness (PC) from the patients’ perspective. The “Experienced Patient-
33 Centeredness Questionnaire” (EPAT) is the first PREM to comprehensively assess 16 dimensions of PC.

- 1 **What this study adds** – In this study, we tested the psychometric properties of all items developed for
- 2 the EPAT and developed the 64-item version of the EPAT (EPAT-64), which demonstrated good
- 3 psychometric properties.

- 4 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy** –The EPAT-64 can be used in research and
- 5 routine care, e.g. to evaluate interventions, provide feedback to healthcare professionals, support
- 6 quality improvement, set benchmarks, and, consequently improve PC.

1 BACKGROUND

2 Patient-centeredness (PC) is defined as one of the key elements of high quality healthcare worldwide.¹
3 ² It is positively associated with health-related outcomes, such as patient satisfaction, higher
4 knowledge, faster recovery, and better health behaviour.³⁻⁶ In Germany, as in many other countries⁷,
5 health policy,⁸⁻¹⁰ research,¹¹⁻¹⁴ and medical education¹⁵ have endorsed PC. To overcome ambiguities in
6 the definition of PC, Scholl et al. developed the integrative model of PC,¹⁶ which was evaluated and
7 extended in two Delphi studies.^{17,18} The model includes 16 dimensions: (1) essential characteristics of
8 the clinician, (2) clinician-patient relationship, (3) patient as a unique person, (4) biopsychosocial
9 perspective, (5) clinician-patient communication, (6) integration of medical and non-medical care, (7)
10 teamwork and teambuilding, (8) access to care, (9) coordination and continuity of care, (10) patient
11 safety, (11) patient information, (12) patient involvement in care, (13) involvement of family and
12 friends, (14) patient empowerment, (15) physical support, and (16) emotional support.

13 The effective management of PC relies on sound measurement to assess the effects of interventions.¹⁹
14 ²⁰ For such measurement, it is important to consider the target group of PC, i.e., the patients as
15 recipients of healthcare, e.g. by using patient-reported experience measures (PREMs). PREMs capture
16 patients' reports directly on whether or how often they have experienced specific processes or
17 behaviours in their healthcare.²¹ This allows the users to derive follow-up actions from the results, such
18 as specific interventions for healthcare professionals or patients. Results from PREMs can be used to
19 assess the quality of healthcare.²² Positive patient experiences are associated with patient safety and
20 clinical effectiveness²³, adherence, better clinical outcomes, and lower rates of healthcare utilization.²⁴
21 A range of PREMs have been developed already.^{21,25} While some of them assess only selective aspects
22 of PC, there is no PREM that considers all 16 dimensions of PC as defined by Scholl and colleagues.¹⁶ In
23 particular, a recent systematic review by Mihaljevic and colleagues²⁶ showed that, to date, there is no
24 German PREM that comprehensively assesses PC.

25 To bridge this research gap, we developed a preliminary version of the "Experienced Patient-
26 Centeredness Questionnaire" (EPAT), a PREM that assesses PC from the perspective of individuals
27 receiving care²⁷. It was developed using a multi-step process including item generation based on a
28 literature review, focus groups with patients, and key informant interviews with experts as well as item
29 selection based on a relevance rating with experts and cognitive interviews with patients. The
30 thorough development process, combining theory-driven approaches and the target groups'
31 perspective, ensured high content validity of the EPAT. It was developed as a disease-generic
32 questionnaire in German language with an outpatient and an inpatient version. Further, a reflective
33 measurement model was used (i.e., we assumed that specific aspects of patients experience are
34 causally determined by underlying latent dimensions of patient-centeredness). The preliminary
35 version of the EPAT comprised 120 items for outpatients and 121 items for inpatients. Full details of
36 item development and selection process are reported in Christalle et al.²⁷ So far, the preliminary
37 version of the EPAT was not psychometrically tested. In addition, a questionnaire of this length is
38 impractical as it consumes lots of resources and is tedious for respondents. Considering that the

1 minimum number of items to estimate and test measurement models is four, a reduction to 64 items
2 (four items for each of the 16 dimensions) would improve its feasibility.

3 Hence, in the present study, we psychometrically tested the preliminary version of the EPAT. Further,
4 we report on the item selection process for a final version consisting of 64 items (EPAT-64) and its
5 psychometric properties.

6 **METHODS**

7 **Study design**

8 The development and psychometric testing of the EPAT was part of the ASPIRED study (Assessment of
9 Patient-Centeredness Through Patient-Reported Experience Measures), a 6-year mixed-methods
10 study aiming to assess the patients' perspective on PC.^{27 28} Here, we report on the psychometric testing
11 of the EPAT. First, the preliminary version of the EPAT was psychometrically tested and item
12 characteristics were calculated. Second, we used those results to select items for the EPAT-64. Third,
13 we assessed structural validity, construct validity, and reliability of the EPAT-64. As there are no
14 guidelines for reporting psychometric evaluations for PREMs, we used the COSMIN guideline on
15 reporting patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) where applicable (see Appendix 1).²⁹

16 **The EPAT questionnaire**

17 For psychometric testing we used the preliminary version of the EPAT. It comprises of 16 domains.^{16 18}
18 and has two versions, one for inpatients and one for outpatients. All items are rated on a 6-point-
19 Likert-scale of agreement (1 = completely disagree, 2 = strongly disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 =
20 somewhat agree, 5 = strongly agree, 6 = completely agree). All items had an option to choose 'does
21 not concern me'. For most items, a high score implied high experienced PC, while 9 items were
22 reversed. The EPAT was developed and psychometrically tested in German. The final version (EPAT-
23 64) was translated into English using a team-based translation process consisting of translation, review,
24 adjudication, pretesting and documentation (TRAPD).³⁰

25 **Data collection and participants**

26 We recruited participants from June 2020 to February 2022. As planned in the protocol²⁸, we started
27 recruitment in inpatient and outpatient healthcare institutions (e.g. hospitals, primary care centres) in
28 the metropolitan area of Hamburg, Germany, using consecutive sampling. We used paper-and-pencil
29 questionnaires. Outpatients received the questionnaire on the day of their appointment and were
30 asked to report on their experience during the last four weeks within the respective outpatient clinic.
31 Inpatients received the questionnaire on day of discharge or the day before and were instructed to fill
32 in the questionnaire after discharge and to report on their whole stay. As the recruitment was slowed
33 down by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we increased the recruitment efforts by adding an online
34 survey using LimeSurvey (LimeSurvey GmbH, Hamburg, Germany) starting in December 2020. We
35 recruited participants of the online survey via community-based strategies (i.e., social media, postings
36 in supermarkets, and via notes shared by self-help groups and patient organizations). They were
37 instructed to refer to their last outpatient visit or inpatient stay that should have been no longer than

1 one months ago. Inclusion criteria were age of 18 years or older and being currently treated for at least
2 one disease from the following four disease groups: cardiovascular diseases, cancer, musculoskeletal
3 diseases, and mental disorders. Inclusion was based on self-report. We aimed to include 250 inpatients
4 and 250 outpatients for each of the four disease groups, respectively, resulting in a total target sample
5 size of 2000.²⁸

6 In addition to the preliminary version of the EPAT, participants were also asked to complete the first
7 item of the German version of the 12-item Short Form Survey, which assesses general health status.³¹
8 This item has an excellent item difficulty of 0.4 and high acceptability (less than 4 % missing values).
9 We assessed satisfaction with care with the German version of the 8-item Client Satisfaction
10 Questionnaire (ZUF-8),³² a unidimensional questionnaire with high internal consistency (Cronbach's
11 alpha = 0.9). We also administered the European Health Literacy Questionnaire (HLS-EU-Q16),³³ a short
12 version of the HLS-EU-Q47 with low ceiling effects and strong correlation with the long version ($r =$
13 0.82). Furthermore, we included questions on demographic factors (e.g., gender and age) and health
14 status (e.g., years since receiving the corresponding diagnosis). Finally, two control items were
15 introduced first in the online version and starting from June 2021 in the paper-pencil-version ('To show
16 that you are reading attentively, please check "somewhat disagree"/"somewhat agree".'). Data
17 collection was anonymous. All participants gave written consent. Paper questionnaires were sent back
18 with a return envelope free of charge. Participants had the possibility to receive an incentive of 10€
19 upon completion of the questionnaire.

20 **Data analyses**

21 First, we analysed all items of the preliminary version. Then, we selected items for the EPAT-64 in a
22 team discussion with five members (IS, LK, MH, JZ, EC). All members are experts in the field of PC.
23 Three of them (IS, JZ, EC) were part of the item development process and were familiar with the
24 qualitative data that the items were based on.²⁷ For each dimension, we chose four items resulting in
25 64 items covering 16 dimensions of PC. We considered the following psychometric properties during
26 item selection: (1) percentage of missing values as proxy for acceptance, (2) percentage of patients
27 replying 'does not concern me' as proxy for relevance, (3) item-difficulty calculated by standardising
28 the mean to range from 0 to 1 (recommended range 0.2 to 0.8),³⁴ (4) within-dimension inter-item-
29 correlations (recommended range >0.3)³⁵, (5) within-dimension corrected item-total correlation
30 (recommended range >0.3),³⁵ and (6) content validity (e.g., how important an item is to the definition
31 of the given dimension, how often an item showed up in the qualitative data used for item
32 development, or to which degree it covers a different aspect than other selected items).

33 After having selected the 64 items for the EPAT-64, we examined structural validity by confirmatory
34 factor analysis (CFA) using a robust version of maximum likelihood estimator (MLR).³⁶ Based on our
35 theory, we tested five different models: (1) unidimensional model, (2) correlated first-order dimension
36 model, (3) hierarchical model, (4) bifactor model with uncorrelated dimensions, and (5) bifactor model
37 with correlated dimensions. For detailed descriptions and depictions of all models, please refer to
38 Appendix 2. For examination of model fit and selection, we followed recommendations by using a

1 combination of model fit indices:³⁷ Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Standardized
2 Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI). For
3 comparison of models we used Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion
4 (BIC). Further, we report the chi-squared test statistic of model fit.³⁸ For the selected model, we report
5 standardised factor loadings. We planned to test this model in the four disease groups to examine
6 measure invariance between groups.³⁵ Further, we examined reliability by McDonald's Omega
7 hierarchical which allows to estimate reliability in models with a bifactor structure.³⁹

8 Construct validity was assessed by correlating the model-based factor scores of each dimension with
9 two other measures as described in the study protocol.²⁸ First, discriminant validity was tested by
10 examining the correlations with general health status, measured by the first item of the German
11 version of 12-Item Short Form Survey.³¹ We hypothesized, that the magnitude of these correlations
12 should be below 0.3.⁴⁰ Second, for convergent validity, we used correlations with satisfaction with care
13 measured by the German version of the 8-item Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (ZUF-8).³² Here, we
14 expected the correlations to exceed 0.5.⁴⁰

15 We used SPSS Version 27.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) to enter data from the paper-and-pencil
16 version, to check their validity by a second person, to import data from LimeSurvey, and to calculate
17 sample characteristics. All other data cleaning and analyses were done with R Version 4.3.2 (R Core
18 Team, Vienna, Austria). We excluded participants if they responded to less than 70 % of EPAT questions
19 or if they failed both control items. Where applicable, we used full information maximum likelihood to
20 deal with missing values.⁴¹ We analysed data separately for inpatient and outpatient settings. Here,
21 we report the results for all four disease groups combined.


22

23 **RESULTS**

24 **Sample**

25 For the paper-and-pencil version, we asked 4,788 outpatients if they wanted to participate, of whom
26 2,357 gave consent and 905 returned the questionnaire. Further, we asked 3,046 inpatients, of whom
27 1,799 gave their consent and 704 returned the questionnaire. For the online questionnaire, 1,042
28 patients consented. We have no information on patients that did not consent or did not finish the
29 questionnaire. Hence, we were not able to perform dropout analyses. In total, questionnaires from
30 1,092 outpatients and 931 inpatients were included in our analyses (see flowchart in Figure 1).

31 Figure 1: Participant flow chart



1

2

3 Of the outpatients included in psychometric analyses, 59.1 % were female, 38.5 % male, and 0.5 %
 4 chose the diverse option (e.g. trans, inter, non-binary). Their mean age was 52.8 years (standard
 5 deviation (SD) = 17.4, range 18-95) and mean time since they were first diagnosed with the respective
 6 disease was 11.4 years (SD = 11.0). Of the inpatients, 41.3 % were female, 55.5 % male, and 0.6 %
 7 identified as diverse. Their mean age was 55.5 years (SD = 17.4, range 18-92) and mean time since the
 8 respective diagnosis was 8.5 years (SD = 10.0). Further details on demographic and health-related
 9 variables are shown in Table 1. For subgroup sample characteristics refer to Appendix 3.

10 Table 1: Sample characteristics

Characteristics	Outpatients	Inpatients
Total sample size	n = 1092	n = 921
In treatment for		
Cardiovascular disease	n = 277	n = 286
Cancer	n = 296	n = 351
Musculoskeletal disease	n = 218	n = 92
Mental disorder	n = 272	n = 202
Age (in years)	M = 53.1 (SD = 17.5)	M = 56.0 (SD = 17.6)
Years since diagnosis	M = 11.4 (SD = 12.0)	M = 8.5 (SD = 10.0)
Years as patient in this outpatient clinic	M = 4.53 (SD = 6.5)	-
Length of stay (in days)	-	M = 18.1 (SD = 30.6)
Health literacy^a	M = 50.7 (SD = 7.7)	M = 50.6 (SD = 7.7)
Satisfaction^b	M = 27.5 (SD = 4.6)	M = 28.0 (SD = 4.9)
Health status^c	M = 3.4 (SD = 2.8)	M = 3.4 (SD = 4.1)
Comorbidity (Do you have any further diseases?)	n = 551 (55.0 %)	n = 467 (54.3 %)
Gender		
Female	n = 646 (60.3 %)	n = 384 (42.3 %)
Male	n = 420 (39.2 %)	n = 517 (57.0 %)
Diverse	n = 5 (0.5 %)	n = 6 (0.7 %)

Marital status

Unmarried and unpartnered	n = 343 (32.3 %)	n = 237 (26.5 %)
Married or partnered	n = 552 (51.9 %)	n = 524 (58.5 %)
Divorced	n = 107 (10.1 %)	n = 80 (8.9 %)
Widowed	n = 61 (5.7 %)	n = 54 (6 %)

Formal education

Low ^d	n = 10 (0.9 %)	n = 20 (2.2 %)
Intermediate ^e	n = 404 (37.8 %)	n = 383 (42.3 %)
High ^f	n = 267 (25.0 %)	n = 204 (22.6 %)
Very high ^g	n = 376 (35.2 %)	n = 279 (30.9 %)

Occupational status*

Employed	n = 447 (41.9 %)	n = 357 (39.1 %)
Unemployed	n = 66 (6.2 %)	n = 64 (7.0 %)
Student/trainee	n = 91 (8.5 %)	n = 50 (5.5 %)
Parental leave	n = 48 (4.5 %)	n = 7 (0.8 %)
Retired	n = 394 (37.0 %)	n = 392 (42.9 %)

Health insurance*

Statutory	n = 910 (83.7 %)	n = 721 (78.1 %)
Private	n = 164 (15.1 %)	n = 214 (23.2 %)

Migration background (Were you or your parents born in another country than Germany?) n = 167 (15.7 %) n = 150 (16.5 %)

Note: * multiple answers possible, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, ^a Health literacy measured by HLS-EU-Q16⁴², range 0-64, high value = high health literacy, ^b Satisfaction with care measured by ZUF-8³², range 8-32, high value = high satisfaction, ^c General health status measured by first item of SF-12³¹, range 0-5, high value = low health status, ^d low = no formal degree or graduation after less than 10years at school; ^e intermediate = graduation after 9 or 10years at school; ^f high = graduation after more than 10years at school; ^g very high = college or university degree

1 Item characteristics

2 For outpatients, all 64 selected items showed high acceptability (highest percentage of missing
3 responses was 2.7 %). Regarding relevance, 47 items had less than 30 % of participants answering 'does
4 not concern me' and seven items had a rate over 50 %. While 46 items showed excellent item difficulty
5 (between 0.2 and 0.8), 18 items showed ceiling effects (item difficulty >0.8). All but one item had an
6 item-total correlation greater than 0.3.

7 For inpatients, again, all 64 items had high acceptability (highest percentage of missing responses was
8 2.7 %). Regarding relevance, we included 55 items with a 'does not concern me' rate below 30 % and
9 two items above 50 %. Item difficulty was excellent for 42 items, and 22 items showed ceiling effects.
10 All items had item-total correlation greater than 0.3.

11 Item characteristics of all tested items are shown in Table 2. For item wording, please refer to the full
12 questionnaires at www.uke.de/epat.

1 Table 2: Items characteristics of the EPAT-64

Dimension	Item	Outpatient						Inpatient					
		M	SD	'does not concern me'	No reply	Item-difficulty	Item Total	M	SD	'does not concern me'	No reply	Item-difficulty	Item Total
Essential characteristics of the clinician	Item 1	5.5	0.9	0.7 %	0.7 %	0.91	0.63	5.5	0.9	0.2 %	0.9 %	0.90	0.65
	Item 2	5.1	1.2	4.2 %	1.2 %	0.82	0.73	5.1	1.2	3.9 %	0.8 %	0.82	0.73
	Item 3	5.2	1.1	4.5 %	0.8 %	0.85	0.71	5.3	1.0	2.9 %	1.1 %	0.85	0.65
	Item 4	4.8	1.5	32.8 %	1.1 %	0.77	0.73	4.7	1.5	30.3 %	1.0 %	0.75	0.68
Clinician-patient relationship	Item 1	4.9	1.4	12.8 %	1.0 %	0.78	0.73	4.9	1.3	12.9 %	0.8 %	0.79	0.73
	Item 2	5.2	1.1	1.8 %	1.2 %	0.85	0.71	5.3	1.1	1.2 %	0.4 %	0.86	0.70
	Item 3	5.1	1.2	3.8 %	0.5 %	0.82	0.57	4.8	1.6	12.6 %	0.6 %	0.75	0.53
	Item 4	5.0	1.3	23.0 %	0.7 %	0.79	0.69	5.2	1.0	1.3 %	0.5 %	0.84	0.62
Patient as a unique person	Item 1	5.1	1.2	2.0 %	0.5 %	0.82	0.73	5.1	1.2	1.6 %	0.6 %	0.82	0.71
	Item 2	4.8	1.4	8.3 %	0.8 %	0.75	0.78	4.8	1.3	5.5 %	0.9 %	0.76	0.78
	Item 3	4.1	1.8	12.5 %	0.8 %	0.62	0.72	4.1	1.7	12.8 %	0.9 %	0.62	0.68
	Item 4	3.7	1.8	17.7 %	0.7 %	0.55	0.71	3.7	1.7	14.5 %	0.9 %	0.54	0.64
Biopsychosocial perspective	Item 1	4.0	1.8	10.1 %	1.6 %	0.61	0.66	3.8	1.9	10.2 %	1.0 %	0.57	0.54
	Item 2	4.9	1.4	7.9 %	1.5 %	0.77	0.63	4.9	1.4	4.9 %	0.6 %	0.78	0.60
	Item 3	3.9	1.8	16.1 %	1.2 %	0.57	0.66	3.8	1.8	14.2 %	0.8 %	0.56	0.63
	Item 4	3.4	1.9	20.2 %	1.1 %	0.48	0.68	3.4	1.8	13.0 %	0.9 %	0.48	0.60
Clinician-patient communication	Item 1	5.3	1.1	2.6 %	1.0 %	0.86	0.69	5.2	1.1	2.8 %	0.5 %	0.85	0.71
	Item 2	5.4	1.0	0.8 %	0.8 %	0.87	0.48	5.2	1.1	0.5 %	0.5 %	0.84	0.55
	Item 3	5.5	0.9	0.4 %	0.5 %	0.90	0.64	5.5	0.9	0.2 %	0.4 %	0.90	0.64
	Item 4	5.0	1.3	5.2 %	0.9 %	0.80	0.71	5.0	1.2	2.3 %	0.9 %	0.80	0.71
Integration of medical and non-medical care	Item 1	3.1	2.0	30.4 %	1.1 %	0.42	0.54	3.4	2.0	25.8 %	1.5 %	0.49	0.57
	Item 2	4.5	1.8	57.5 %	1.7 %	0.71	0.52	4.3	1.8	56.7 %	2.6 %	0.66	0.63
	Item 3	3.1	1.9	43.3 %	1.7 %	0.42	0.62	3.3	1.9	40.9 %	2.4 %	0.46	0.61
	Item 4	3.3	2.1	46.1 %	1.9 %	0.45	0.60	3.6	2.0	42.3 %	2.7 %	0.52	0.62
Teamwork and teambuilding	Item 1	5.1	1.0	7.1 %	0.8 %	0.83	0.41	5.1	1.1	1.2 %	1.0 %	0.82	0.64
	Item 2	5.0	1.2	12.4 %	1.4 %	0.80	0.50	5.1	1.2	1.4 %	1.2 %	0.82	0.65
	Item 3	4.6	1.4	22.1 %	2.1 %	0.72	0.59	5.0	1.2	3.0 %	1.6 %	0.81	0.64
	Item 4	5.1	1.4	26.1 %	0.9 %	0.82	0.27	4.8	1.6	7.5 %	1.2 %	0.75	0.35
Access to care	Item 1	5.1	1.2	2.1 %	1.4 %	0.83	0.37	5.4	1.1	18.2 %	0.9 %	0.88	0.39
	Item 2	5.0	1.4	9.2 %	1.3 %	0.79	0.30	5.2	1.3	30.4 %	1.9 %	0.83	0.44
	Item 3	5.1	1.3	8.6 %	0.9 %	0.83	0.33	4.8	1.2	6.6 %	1.0 %	0.76	0.65
	Item 4	4.7	1.4	23.4 %	1.3 %	0.73	0.56	5.5	0.9	20.0 %	1.0 %	0.89	0.52

Note: M = mean, SD = standard deviation, item total = corrected item-total correlation

Dimension	Item	Outpatient						Inpatient					
		M	SD	'does not concern me'	No reply	Item-difficulty	Item Total	M	SD	'does not concern me'	No reply	Item-difficulty	Item Total
Coordination and continuity of care	Item 1	3.9	1.8	11.0 %	0.9 %	0.58	0.44	4.2	1.6	9.0 %	1.4 %	0.65	0.61
	Item 2	5.3	1.1	0.5 %	0.9 %	0.85	0.70	5.1	1.1	0.5 %	0.5 %	0.83	0.71
	Item 3	3.5	2.0	27.2 %	1.5 %	0.50	0.52	5.0	1.4	7.2 %	1.0 %	0.80	0.56
	Item 4	5.1	1.4	13.1 %	1.4 %	0.82	0.52	4.8	1.4	6.7 %	1.7 %	0.76	0.69
Patient safety	Item 1	5.1	1.2	16.6 %	2.7 %	0.82	0.59	5.3	1.0	1.0 %	2.3 %	0.87	0.60
	Item 2	5.0	1.5	41.5 %	1.0 %	0.80	0.60	5.2	1.3	13.1 %	1.1 %	0.84	0.56
	Item 3	3.9	1.8	23.4 %	0.8 %	0.58	0.65	4.1	1.7	14.2 %	1.2 %	0.62	0.64
	Item 4	2.3	1.7	30.6 %	0.9 %	0.26	0.45	2.9	1.8	17.1 %	1.3 %	0.38	0.51
Patient information	Item 1	3.9	1.8	16.1 %	1.3 %	0.57	0.62	4.1	1.8	6.6 %	0.8 %	0.62	0.59
	Item 2	4.6	1.6	10.9 %	0.7 %	0.71	0.67	4.6	1.5	6.4 %	1.3 %	0.72	0.65
	Item 3	4.8	1.5	19.2 %	1.1 %	0.75	0.65	4.8	1.5	4.6 %	1.2 %	0.75	0.62
	Item 4	4.0	1.8	14.5 %	1.0 %	0.61	0.67	4.2	1.8	8.9 %	1.4 %	0.63	0.64
Patient involvement in care	Item 1	5.0	1.2	7.6 %	1.3 %	0.79	0.70	4.8	1.3	4.4 %	1.8 %	0.76	0.69
	Item 2	4.3	1.7	27.6 %	0.9 %	0.65	0.64	4.4	1.7	16.4 %	0.8 %	0.69	0.65
	Item 3	4.6	1.6	25.2 %	1.3 %	0.72	0.65	4.3	1.7	18.6 %	1.5 %	0.66	0.64
	Item 4	4.5	1.6	24.8 %	1.1 %	0.71	0.73	4.3	1.6	18.5 %	1.7 %	0.67	0.67
Involvement of family and friends	Item 1	3.1	2.0	42.5 %	1.3 %	0.41	0.64	3.3	1.9	29.6 %	1.0 %	0.46	0.62
	Item 2	3.0	2.0	60.6 %	1.5 %	0.41	0.66	3.1	1.9	50.2 %	1.4 %	0.43	0.58
	Item 3	3.8	2.1	57.5 %	1.5 %	0.57	0.63	4.1	1.9	40.3 %	1.4 %	0.62	0.61
	Item 4	4.0	2.1	56.4 %	1.6 %	0.60	0.63	4.0	1.9	43.0 %	1.9 %	0.59	0.63
Patient empowerment	Item 1	4.6	1.5	9.7 %	1.5 %	0.72	0.73	4.8	1.4	4.8 %	1.1 %	0.75	0.67
	Item 2	3.1	1.8	21.9 %	2.0 %	0.43	0.63	3.3	1.7	16.6 %	1.5 %	0.46	0.62
	Item 3	4.0	1.8	26.0 %	0.8 %	0.61	0.63	4.0	1.7	25.8 %	0.5 %	0.61	0.52
	Item 4	3.6	1.8	35.7 %	0.8 %	0.51	0.65	3.7	1.8	29.1 %	1.0 %	0.55	0.55
Physical support	Item 1	4.8	1.4	54.7 %	1.0 %	0.76	0.61	5.4	1.0	19.4 %	0.8 %	0.87	0.56
	Item 2	4.7	1.4	56.6 %	1.2 %	0.75	0.66	5.2	1.1	23.8 %	0.5 %	0.85	0.55
	Item 3	5.3	1.0	40.3 %	0.8 %	0.87	0.45	5.5	0.9	5.8 %	0.3 %	0.89	0.59
	Item 4	3.2	1.9	67.5 %	0.8 %	0.44	0.56	4.2	1.8	48.2 %	0.6 %	0.64	0.60
Emotional support	Item 1	4.4	1.7	16.8 %	0.7 %	0.69	0.70	4.3	1.7	18.3 %	1.4 %	0.66	0.63
	Item 2	3.8	1.9	17.9 %	1.3 %	0.57	0.71	3.7	1.8	19.5 %	1.7 %	0.54	0.57
	Item 3	4.4	1.7	19.2 %	0.8 %	0.68	0.76	4.4	1.6	15.9 %	1.5 %	0.69	0.72
	Item 4	3.5	2.1	31.5 %	0.9 %	0.50	0.58	3.9	2.0	23.4 %	1.0 %	0.58	0.57

Note: M = mean, SD = standard deviation, item total = corrected item-total correlation

- 1
- 2 Item characteristics per subgroup are shown in Appendix 4 (outpatient sample) and Appendix 5
- 3 (inpatient sample). Item characteristics for all tested items can be requested from the authors.

1 **Structural validity**

2 The model fit indices for the five tested models are shown in Table 3.

3 Table 3: Model fit indices for confirmatory factor analysis on EPAT-64

		Chi square			RMSEA	SRMR	TLI	CFI	AIC	BIC
		χ^2	df	P value						
Recommendation				>.05	\leq .06	<.08	\geq .90	\geq .90	Model with smallest value	
Outpatient version	1 Unidimensional	14957	1952	<.001	.078	.087	.659	.670	166616	167575
	2 Correlated first-order	7098	1832	<.001	.051	.072	.853	.866	158996	160555
	3 Hierarchical	8556	1936	<.001	.056	.084	.825	.832	160247	161286
	4 Bifactor without dimension correlations	No results. Model estimation did not converge.								
	5 Bifactor with dimension correlations	4871	1768	<.001	.040	.055	.910	.921	156898	158776
Inpatient version	1 Unidimensional	15201	1952	<.001	.085	.101	.631	.643	151891	152819
	2 Correlated first-order	7276	1832	<.001	.056	.083	.838	.853	144206	145714
	3 Hierarchical	8839	1936	<.001	.062	.102	.806	.814	145561	146567
	4 Bifactor without dimension correlations	No results. Model estimation did not converge.								
	5 Bifactor with dimension correlations	4721	1768	<.001	.042	.051	.909	.920	141779	143597

4

5 The best fit was found for the bifactor model with correlated dimensions. Here, all items load on their
6 respective specific dimension as well as a general dimension. Specific dimensions are intercorrelated
7 but their correlation with the general factor was restricted to be zero. Standardised factor loadings of
8 this model are reported in Table 5. Correlations between specific dimension showed a wide variability
9 ranging from -0.140 to 0.824 (see Appendix 6).

Table 5: Standardised actor loadings and reliability coefficients of the correlated bifactor model

	Dimension	Loadings on general factor				Loadings on specific dimension				Reliability
		Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Omega_H
Outpatient sample	Essential characteristics of the clinicians	0.795	0.759	0.767	0.575	0.216	0.440	0.387	0.571	0.214
	Clinician-patient relationship	0.682	0.754	0.565	0.627	0.595	0.474	0.225	0.345	0.242
	Patient as a unique person	0.795	0.704	0.366	0.288	0.332	0.498	0.782	0.833	0.515
	Biopsychosocial perspective	0.352	0.495	0.290	0.243	0.717	0.488	0.805	0.814	0.705
	Clinician-patient communication	0.760	0.457	0.739	0.608	0.371	0.424	0.384	0.498	0.256
	Integration of medical and non-medical care	0.143	0.218	0.188	0.165	0.836	0.731	0.829	0.854	0.859
	Teamwork and teambuilding	0.347	0.417	0.493	0.390	0.576	0.689	0.518	0.884	0.415
	Access to care	0.323	0.235	0.283	0.475	0.712	0.638	0.535	0.502	0.599
	Coordination and continuity of care	0.198	0.739	0.291	0.430	0.516	0.318	0.505	0.345	0.355
	Patient safety	0.586	0.458	0.359	0.114	0.298	0.453	0.683	0.685	0.506
	Patient information	0.374	0.489	0.534	0.426	0.649	0.620	0.564	0.665	0.559
	Patient involvement in care	0.732	0.447	0.506	0.529	0.356	0.566	0.651	0.734	0.461
	Involvement of family and friends	0.187	0.201	0.233	0.255	0.882	0.895	0.825	0.791	0.872
	Patient empowerment	0.570	0.227	0.232	0.224	0.515	0.732	0.764	0.790	0.718
	Physical support	0.567	0.586	0.457	0.190	0.706	0.725	0.209	0.443	0.461
	Emotional support	0.464	0.359	0.516	0.196	0.766	0.857	0.755	0.680	0.736
	General factor									0.868
Inpatient sample	Essential characteristics of the clinicians	0.830	0.783	0.758	0.575	0.155	0.312	0.230	0.517	0.128
	Clinician-patient relationship	0.674	0.785	0.323	0.657	0.539	0.338	0.612	0.263	0.291
	Patient as a unique person	0.775	0.720	0.340	0.250	0.238	0.444	0.779	0.869	0.484
	Biopsychosocial perspective	0.180	0.445	0.257	0.263	0.776	0.476	0.813	0.826	0.757
	Clinician-patient communication	0.744	0.559	0.727	0.798	0.334	0.483	0.352	0.395	0.215
	Integration of medical and non-medical care	0.233	0.286	0.265	0.252	0.833	0.835	0.824	0.846	0.847
	Teamwork and teambuilding	0.718	0.744	0.643	0.448	0.465	0.425	0.553	0.918	0.213
	Access to care	0.541	0.528	0.692	0.655	0.538	0.711	0.114	0.821	0.217
	Coordination and continuity of care	0.459	0.784	0.521	0.659	0.518	0.233	0.288	0.355	0.199
	Patient safety	0.734	0.558	0.392	0.256	0.123	0.249	0.695	0.726	0.365
	Patient information	0.378	0.489	0.592	0.538	0.673	0.622	0.443	0.575	0.493
	Patient involvement in care	0.695	0.534	0.532	0.479	0.378	0.564	0.676	0.738	0.474
	Involvement of family and friends	0.273	0.265	0.415	0.378	0.850	0.862	0.689	0.755	0.780
	Patient empowerment	0.572	0.330	0.212	0.223	0.398	0.687	0.742	0.866	0.668
	Physical support	0.662	0.670	0.677	0.415	0.622	0.632	0.169	0.230	0.268
	Emotional support	0.327	0.186	0.493	0.272	0.846	0.878	0.735	0.619	0.768
	General factor									0.908

1 We further explored the general factor in the bifactor model by calculating correlations with other
2 measures. We found a strong correlation between the model-based scores of the general factor and
3 satisfaction with care as measured by the overall score of ZUF-8 (0.73 for the outpatient sample and
4 0.83 for the inpatient sample). The magnitude of correlations between the general factor and health
5 literacy, general health status, comorbidity, age, and time since first diagnosis of the corresponding
6 disease, respectively, were below 0.3.

7 We were not able to examine measurement invariance between different disease groups. The
8 combination of small sample sizes within the groups, high rates of missing values due to the “does not
9 concern me” option, and the complexity of the tested model with a high number of parameters to be
10 estimated led to estimation problems (e.g., models did not converge or the variance-covariance matrix
11 of the estimated parameters was not positive definite). This problem persisted when we used multiple
12 imputation to impute missing data or when we excluded the three dimensions with the highest rate of
13 “does not concern me” replies.

14 **Reliability**

15 McDonald’s Omega hierarchical was high for the general factor (0.868 for outpatients, 0.908 for
16 inpatients) and varied widely for the specific dimensions (range 0.214 to 0.872 for outpatients and
17 0.128 to 0.847 for inpatients). In order to support interpretability of sum scores for specific dimensions,
18 we examined their correlations with the model-based factor scores. The results suggest that the sum
19 scores measure a mixture of the general factor and the specific dimensions. The median correlation of
20 the dimension specific sum scores with the general factor score estimate was 0.558 in the outpatient
21 sample and 0.639 in the inpatient sample. The median correlation with the factor score of their
22 corresponding dimension was 0.811 in the outpatient sample and 0.745 in the inpatient sample,
23 respectively (Appendix 7). These coefficients suggest that the proportion of explained variance
24 attributable to the general factor in subscale scores ranges approximately between one and three
25 thirds for most dimensions.

26 **Construct validity**

27 Using model-based factor scores, discriminant validity was confirmed for all dimensions and the
28 general factor, that is the magnitude of all correlations with general health status were below 0.3.
29 Convergent validity was confirmed for the general factor, which was strongly correlated with
30 satisfaction with care, while the specific dimensions showed no strong correlations. Correlations for
31 all dimensions and the general factor are shown in Appendix 8.

32 **DISCUSSION**

33 **Summary of the findings**

34 The EPAT-64 is a PREM to assess 16 dimensions of PC from the patients’ perspective. All items
35 demonstrated high acceptability. Most items had low rates of patients answering ‘does not concern
36 me’. Regarding item difficulty, most items were within the recommended range, yet a few items
37 showed ceiling effects. Item-total correlations were good for all but one item. CFA showed the best fit

1 for a bifactor model. In terms of construct validity, discriminant validity was confirmed for all
2 dimensions and the general factor. Convergent validity was confirmed for the general factor.
3 McDonalds Omega hierarchical suggests good reliability of the general factor, while there was a wide
4 variability for the specific dimensions.

5 **Strengths and limitations**

6 The EPAT-64 is the first PREM that comprehensively assesses PC.^{25 26} One of its strengths is the
7 thorough development and item selection process, guided by a model derived from literature and
8 input from the target group.^{16 18 27} This was continued during the item selection process after
9 psychometric testing. The results above show that not all items included in the EPAT-64 have excellent
10 psychometric properties, in particular regarding ceiling effects, which may limit the ability to
11 discriminate between high and low PC. These items were included for a number of reasons. We
12 decided to choose four items for each dimension, as we aimed for parsimony but needed at least four
13 items for statistical model identifiability.⁴³ For some dimensions, the preliminary version of the EPAT
14 had only four items.²⁷ This meant that we had to either include all items or delete the whole dimension.
15 However, as our Delphi study prior to questionnaire development showed that all dimensions were
16 relevant to patients,¹⁸ deleting dimensions would have reduced the comprehensiveness and hence the
17 content validity of the EPAT-64. Furthermore, we considered not only the quantitative characteristics
18 of the items but also their content. We would like to argue that selecting items solely on the basis of
19 quantitative data risks compromising content validity.⁴³ It may lead to more reliable questionnaires
20 with better discrimination between groups, but it also runs the risk of deleting items whose content is
21 essential for measuring the given construct.

22 The CFA showed best fit for a bifactor model with correlated dimensions. This model postulates that
23 all items load both on a general factor and on their respective specific dimension, which is independent
24 of the general factor. A strength of the bifactor model that is enables users to partition scores into an
25 estimation of the general factor and of the specific dimension.⁴⁴ We suspect that the general factor
26 captures more subjective aspects of PC as it is strongly correlation with satisfaction with care. The
27 variance in the data that is not captured by the general factor seems to be well explained by the
28 postulated dimensions of PC, which is a confirmation of the underlying conceptual model. As these
29 dimensions are independent of the (presumably) subjective general factor, we assume that they
30 capture more objective aspects of PC, i.e., rather if something happened than how well it went. This
31 corresponds to frequent definitions of PREMs²¹. To be able to evaluate both aspects of PC, we strongly
32 recommend users to apply the whole EPAT-64 and model the bifactor model with their own data set.
33 This way, scores can be calculated separately, first for the more subjective general factor, and secondly
34 a more objective score for each dimension. Yet, in routine care this might be infeasible as often there
35 are not sufficient resources to administer and analyse a questionnaire with 64 items or there is a lack
36 of time or statistical expertise to estimate bifactor models. Here, users might want to choose just the
37 most relevant dimensions for their context and calculate sum scores. This approach gives a high degree
38 of flexibility, which allows users to adapt the questionnaire to their question, area of application, and
39 resources. We suggest that sum scores are calculated per dimension only for respondents with one or

1 less missing values. One missing value per dimension can be replaced by the mean of the other three
2 items for each respondent. For respondents with two or more missing values in one dimension, no
3 sum score should be calculated for this dimension. When interpreting those sum scores one should
4 consider that this score combines subjective and objective PC assessments, which cannot be well
5 differentiated based on sum scores alone. Further, the dimensions have different degrees of reliability
6 when estimated without the general factor. For example, “Integration of medical and non-medical
7 care” seems to be more appropriate to be administered as a stand-alone dimension than “Essential
8 characteristics of the clinicians”, based on their reliability estimated by Omega hierarchical. In addition,
9 the correlations between the specific dimensions makes the interpretation of their sum scores more
10 challenging. Appendix 7 can help to guide interpretation of sum scores, but more research is needed.

11 A limitation is that we were not able to examine measurement invariance between different disease
12 groups. Items were developed generically and we tested the EPAT in four disease groups
13 (cardiovascular, cancer, musculoskeletal, mental health). As these diseases affect a large proportion of
14 the population and show different courses and treatment pathways, we hope that the results will be
15 transferable to other disease groups as well. Yet, due to the complex measurement model and the
16 large number of ‘does not concern me’-replies in some items, we were not able to confirm that the
17 EPAT does indeed have a common factor structure within each subgroup.

18 **Implications**

19 There is a wide range of possible applications of the EPAT-64. Measuring PC is essential for research
20 on the current state of PC as well as on interventions aiming to foster PC. Internationally, PREMs are
21 used to provide feedback to healthcare providers, inform quality improvement, public reporting,
22 benchmarking, and value-based purchasing.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ As Coulter and colleagues discussed, measurement
23 alone is not sufficient to improve patient experiences.⁴⁸ The resulting data need to be used for quality
24 improvement in a coordinated approach (including senior leadership, clear goals and continuous
25 performance measurement).⁴⁸ Nevertheless, there is emerging evidence that being informed about
26 patient experiences is associated with improved communication⁴⁹ and meetings to discuss PREM
27 results are associated with improved patient experience.⁴⁶

28 Psychometric testing in independent samples are indispensable to ensure that the psychometric
29 properties found here hold in other populations and contexts. Particular attention should be paid to
30 the interpretation of the bifactor structure with correlated dimensions and measurement invariance,
31 that is whether the factor structure found here can be replicated for different subgroups. In addition
32 to validity and reliability, aspects of fairness and responsiveness should be investigated.⁵⁰ Regarding
33 testing in other patient groups, the EPAT-64 is currently adapted to assess PC in the context of
34 healthcare and support services for women with unintended pregnancy.⁵¹ Further adaptations to other
35 healthcare contexts, such as rehabilitation facilities or non-academic hospitals, could also provide
36 useful insights.

37 Internationally, there is no comparable PREM that comprehensively assesses all dimensions of PC.²⁵
38 Therefore, cross-cultural adaptations and translations of the EPAT-64 would provide an opportunity to

1 promote PC around the world. In addition, translations are helpful to reach parts of the population in
2 Germany that are not fluent in German. Table 2 contains an official translation into English using the
3 TRAPD process.³⁰ However, further tests on comprehensibility and psychometric properties are
4 required.

5 **Conclusion**

6 The EPAT-64, a novel questionnaire assessing 16 dimensions of patient-centeredness from the
7 patient's perspective, emerges from a meticulous development process that blends theory with data
8 driven decisions. Psychometric testing within a substantial patient cohort underscores its robust
9 psychometric properties. Nevertheless, further research is imperative to refine the interpretation of
10 scale scores. The adaptability of this tool to specific purposes positions it as a valuable instrument for
11 both assessment and cultivation of patient-centeredness.

12 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

13 We thank our student assistant Sibel Gürü and our research interns Lucas Bolz, Antonia Buchal, Sophia
14 Ehrentraut, Carolin Guddat, Zoe Henning, Constanze Mahn, Yannick Mosemann, Philip Niemann, Svea-
15 Marie Nohrden, Paul Packheiser, Ronja Platzeck, Mareike Remmers, Ramona Rusch, Laura Stefan,
16 Melvin Schneider, and Lisa Strelow for carrying out data collection. Further, we would like to thank all
17 our collaboration partners who gave us access to their patients for the data collection: Klinik für
18 Psychosomatische Medizin und Psychotherapie (UKE), III. Medizinische Klinik und Poliklinik (UKE),
19 Strahlentherapie & Radioonkologie (UKE), Martiniklinik, Evangelisches Krankenhaus Alsterdorf,
20 Verhaltenstherapie Falkenried, Bundeswehrkrankenhaus Hamburg, Asklepios Westklinikum Hamburg,
21 Psychiatrische Ambulanz Dr. Guth, and Fachzentrum Altona für Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie.

22 **AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS**

23 IS was the responsible principle investigator of the study. IS, LK and MH were involved in planning and
24 preparation of the study. SZ, AS, HF and EC recruited participants and collected data. EC analysed data
25 with supervision by LK. EC, SZ, JZ, IS, MH, PH and LK interpreted results and discussed the item
26 selection. EC wrote the first draft of the manuscript. CB, JG, CG, CM, VM, KSB and AS acitively
27 supported data collection. All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual
28 content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published and agreed to be accountable
29 for the work.

30 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

31 PH declares to have no financial conflicts of interest. PH is a board member of the International Shared
32 Decision Making Society, a charitable scientific society. PH received research funding from German
33 Research Foundation, University of Hamburg and Robert-Bosch-Foundation. IS received honoraria for
34 presentations and speeches on patient-centered care from the following commercial entities:
35 onkowissen.de GmbH, ClinSol GmbH & Co. KG. All other authors declare that they have no competing
36 interests.

1 FUNDING STATEMENT

2 This study was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium
3 für Bildung und Forschung – BMBF) with the grant number 01GY1614. The funder had no role in
4 decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

5 ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

6 The study was carried out according to the latest version of the Helsinki Declaration of the World
7 Medical Association. Principles of good scientific practice were respected. The study had been
8 approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical Association Hamburg (study ID: PV5724). Study
9 participation was voluntary and no foreseeable risks for participants resulted from the participation in
10 this study. Participants were fully informed about the aims of the study, data collection, and the use
11 of collected data. Written informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Preserving principles
12 of data sensitivity, data protection, and confidentiality requirements were met.

13 REFERENCES

- 14 1. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century.
15 Washington, DC: The National Academies Press 2001.
- 16 2. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the
17 provider. *The Annals of Family Medicine* 2014;12(6):573-76.
- 18 3. Bertakis KD, Azari R. Patient-centered care is associated with decreased health care utilization. *The*
19 *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine* 2011;24(3):229-39.
- 20 4. Dwamena F, Holmes-Rovner M, Gaulden CM, et al. Interventions for providers to promote a patient-
21 centred approach in clinical consultations. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012(12)
22 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD003267.pub2
- 23 5. McMillan SS, Kendall E, Sav A, et al. Patient-centered approaches to health care: a systematic review
24 of randomized controlled trials. *Medical care research and review* 2013;70(6):567-96.
- 25 6. Rathert C, Wyrwich MD, Boren SA. Patient-centered care and outcomes: a systematic review of the
26 literature. *Medical Care Research and Review* 2013;70(4):351-79.
- 27 7. Bravo P, Härter M, McCaffery K, et al. 20 years after the start of international Shared Decision-
28 Making activities: is it time to celebrate? Probably...: Elsevier, 2022:1-4.
- 29 8. Bundesministerium für Gesundheit. Gesundheitskompetenz und Patientenorientierung [Available
30 from:
31 [https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/ministerium/ressortforschung/handlungsfel-](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/ministerium/ressortforschung/handlungsfelder/gesundheitskompetenz-und-patientenorientierung.html)
32 [der/gesundheitskompetenz-und-patientenorientierung.html](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/ministerium/ressortforschung/handlungsfelder/gesundheitskompetenz-und-patientenorientierung.html) accessed 03.08.2023.
- 33 9. Dierks M-L, Seidel G, Schwartz FW, et al. Themenheft 32" Bürger-und Patientenorientierung". 2006
- 34 10. Bundesrat. Gesetz zur Verbesserung der Rechte von Patientinnen und Patienten [Available from:
35 [https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/ old-](https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/old-files/downloads/Patientenrechtegesetz_BGBI.pdf)
36 [files/downloads/Patientenrechtegesetz_BGBI.pdf](https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/old-files/downloads/Patientenrechtegesetz_BGBI.pdf).
- 37 11. Brandstetter S, Curbach J, McCool M, et al. Patientenorientierung in der Versorgungsforschung.
38 *Das Gesundheitswesen* 2014:200-05.
- 39 12. Arbeitskreis „Versorgungsforschung“ beim Wissenschaftlichen Beirat der Bundesärztekammer.
40 Definition und Abgrenzung der Versorgungsforschung [Available from:
41 [https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/ old-files/downloads/pdf-](https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/old-files/downloads/pdf-Ordner/Versorgungsforschung/Definition.pdf)
42 [Ordner/Versorgungsforschung/Definition.pdf](https://www.bundesaerztekammer.de/fileadmin/user_upload/old-files/downloads/pdf-Ordner/Versorgungsforschung/Definition.pdf).
- 43 13. Härter M, Dirmaier J, Scholl I, et al. The long way of implementing patient-centered care and shared
44 decision making in Germany. *Zeitschrift für Evidenz, Fortbildung und Qualität im*
45 *Gesundheitswesen* 2017;123:46-51.

- 1 14. Schmale-Grede R, Faubel U. Der Patient im Mittelpunkt der Versorgungsforschung. *Zeitschrift für*
2 *Rheumatologie* 2020;79(10)
- 3 15. Wissenschaftsrat. Empfehlungen zur Weiterentwicklung des Medizinstudiums in Deutschland auf
4 Grundlage einer Bestandsaufnahme der humanmedizinischen Modellstudiengänge
5 Dresden2014 [Available from: [https://www.wissenschaftsrat.de/download/archiv/4017-](https://www.wissenschaftsrat.de/download/archiv/4017-14.pdf?blob=publicationFile&v=1)
6 [14.pdf? blob=publicationFile&v=1](https://www.wissenschaftsrat.de/download/archiv/4017-14.pdf?blob=publicationFile&v=1) accessed 26.08.2022.
- 7 16. Scholl I, Zill JM, Härter M, et al. An integrative model of patient-centeredness—a systematic review
8 and concept analysis. *PLoS one* 2014;9(9):e107828.
- 9 17. Zill JM, Scholl I, Härter M, et al. Which dimensions of patient-centeredness matter?—Results of a
10 web-based expert delphi survey. *PLoS one* 2015;10(11):e0141978.
- 11 18. Zeh S, Christalle E, Hahlweg P, et al. Assessing the relevance and implementation of patient-
12 centredness from the patients' perspective in Germany: results of a Delphi study. *BMJ open*
13 2019;9(12):e031741.
- 14 19. Epstein RM, Street RL. The values and value of patient-centered care: *Annals Family Med*,
15 2011;100-03.
- 16 20. Browne K, Roseman D, Shaller D, et al. Measuring patient experience as a strategy for improving
17 primary care. *Health affairs* 2010;29(5):921-25.
- 18 21. Beattie M, Murphy DJ, Atherton I, et al. Instruments to measure patient experience of healthcare
19 quality in hospitals: a systematic review. *Systematic reviews* 2015;4(1):1-21.
- 20 22. Coulter A. Can patients assess the quality of health care?: British Medical Journal Publishing Group,
21 2006:1-2.
- 22 23. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience
23 and clinical safety and effectiveness. *BMJ open* 2013;3(1):e001570.
- 24 24. Anhang Price R, Elliott MN, Zaslavsky AM, et al. Examining the role of patient experience surveys
25 in measuring health care quality. *Medical Care Research and Review* 2014;71(5):522-54.
- 26 25. Bull C, Byrnes J, Hettiarachchi R, et al. A systematic review of the validity and reliability of patient-
27 reported experience measures. *Health services research* 2019;54(5):1023-35.
- 28 26. Mihaljevic AL, Doerr-Harim C, Kalkum E, et al. Measuring patient centeredness with German
29 language Patient-Reported Experience Measures (PREM)—A systematic review and qualitative
30 analysis according to COSMIN. *Plos one* 2022;17(11):e0264045.
- 31 27. Christalle E, Zeh S, Hahlweg P, et al. Development and content validity of the Experienced Patient-
32 Centeredness Questionnaire (EPAT)—A best practice example for generating patient-reported
33 measures from qualitative data. *Health Expectations* 2022
- 34 28. Christalle E, Zeh S, Hahlweg P, et al. Assessment of patient centredness through patient-reported
35 experience measures (ASPIRED): protocol of a mixed-methods study. *BMJ open*
36 2018;8(10):e025896.
- 37 29. Gagnier JJ, Lai J, Mokkink LB, et al. COSMIN reporting guideline for studies on measurement
38 properties of patient-reported outcome measures. *Quality of Life Research* 2021;30(8):2197-
39 218.
- 40 30. Harkness J, Pennell BE, Schoua-Glusberg A. Survey questionnaire translation and assessment.
41 *Methods for testing and evaluating survey questionnaires* 2004:453-73.
- 42 31. Wirtz MA, Morfeld M, Glaesmer H, et al. Konfirmatorische Prüfung der Skalenstruktur des SF-12
43 Version 2.0 in einer deutschen bevölkerungs-repräsentativen Stichprobe. *Diagnostica*
44 2018;64(2):84-96.
- 45 32. Kriz D, Nübling R, Steffanowski A, et al. Patientenzufriedenheit in der stationären Rehabilitation:
46 Psychometrische Reanalyse des ZUF-8 auf der Basis multizentrischer Stichproben
47 verschiedener Indikation. *Zeitschrift für medizinische Psychologie* 2008;17(2-3):67-79.
- 48 33. Röthlin F, Pelikan JM, Ganahl K. Die Gesundheitskompetenz der 15-jährigen Jugendlichen in
49 Österreich. *Abschlussbericht der österreichischen Gesundheitskompetenz Jugendstudie im*
50 *Auftrag des Hauptverbands der österreichischen Sozialversicherungsträger (HVSV)* 2013
- 51 34. Döring N, Bortz J. Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation. *Wiesbaden: Springer* 2006

- 1 35. Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, et al. Best practices for developing and validating scales for
2 health, social, and behavioral research: a primer. *Frontiers in public health* 2018;6:149.
- 3 36. Rosseel Y. Lavaan estimators [Available from: <https://lavaan.ugent.be/tutorial/est.html> accessed
4 28.08.2022.
- 5 37. Irwing P, Booth T, Hughes DJ. The Wiley handbook of psychometric testing: A multidisciplinary
6 reference on survey, scale and test development: John Wiley & Sons 2018.
- 7 38. Cochran WG. The χ^2 test of goodness of fit. *The Annals of mathematical statistics* 1952:315-45.
- 8 39. Rodriguez A, Reise SP, Haviland MG. Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting
9 statistical indices. *Psychological methods* 2016;21(2):137.
- 10 40. Oltedal S, Garratt A, Bjertnæs Ø, et al. The NORPEQ patient experiences questionnaire: data quality,
11 internal consistency and validity following a Norwegian inpatient survey. *Scandinavian Journal*
12 *of Public Health* 2007;35(5):540-47.
- 13 41. Enders CK, Bandalos DL. The relative performance of full information maximum likelihood
14 estimation for missing data in structural equation models. *Structural equation modeling*
15 2001;8(3):430-57.
- 16 42. Jordan S, Hoebel J. Health literacy of adults in Germany: Findings from the German Health Update
17 (GEDA) study. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*
18 2015;58:942-50.
- 19 43. Diamantopoulos A, Sarstedt M, Fuchs C, et al. Guidelines for choosing between multi-item and
20 single-item scales for construct measurement: a predictive validity perspective. *Journal of the*
21 *Academy of Marketing Science* 2012;40(3):434-49.
- 22 44. Chen FF, Hayes A, Carver CS, et al. Modeling general and specific variance in multifaceted
23 constructs: A comparison of the bifactor model to other approaches. *Journal of personality*
24 2012;80(1):219-51.
- 25 45. Bull C, Callander EJ. Current PROM and PREM use in health system performance measurement: still
26 a way to go. *Patient Experience Journal* 2022;9(1):12-18.
- 27 46. Reeves R, West E, Barron D. Facilitated patient experience feedback can improve nursing care: a
28 pilot study for a phase III cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMC Health Serv Res*
29 2013;13:259. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-13-259 [published Online First: 20130704]
- 30 47. Hibbard JH, Stockard J, Tusler M. Hospital performance reports: impact on quality, market share,
31 and reputation. *Health affairs* 2005;24(4):1150-60.
- 32 48. Coulter A, Locock L, Ziebland S, et al. Collecting data on patient experience is not enough: they
33 must be used to improve care. *BMJ* 2014;348:g2225. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g2225 [published
34 Online First: 20140326]
- 35 49. Murante AM, Vainieri M, Rojas D, et al. Does feedback influence patient - professional
36 communication? Empirical evidence from Italy. *Health Policy* 2014;116(2-3):273-80. doi:
37 10.1016/j.healthpol.2014.02.001 [published Online First: 20140224]
- 38 50. Eignor DR. The standards for educational and psychological testing. 2013
- 39 51. Zill JM, Lindig A, Reck LM, et al. Protocol: Assessment of person-centeredness in healthcare and
40 social support services for women with unintended pregnancy (CarePreg): protocol for a
41 mixed-method study. *BMJ Open* 2022;12(9)

42