

Physician's Satisfaction with Anatomical Pathology Services at a Tertiary Care Hospital in Lahore

SEHR CHAUDHARY, ZEESHAN SARWAR, MUNAZA RUBAB, RAKHSHINDAH BAJWA, FAKEEHA REHMAN

ABSTRACT

Physicians and surgeons are important consumers of laboratory services as their opinions play an important role in shaping laboratory services. Total of 580 physicians participated in this study. The overall mean satisfaction rate was 71% out of 100%. Among all the variables information about the test available at lab and instructions for sample collection and transportation got minimum score.

Keywords: Anatomic Laboratory, satisfaction, physicians

INTRODUCTION

Satisfaction is an important component of any facility provided to the customers but it becomes more important when it comes to the health department requiring higher standards of quality services including both therapeutic and diagnostic services¹. Hostutler described satisfaction as occurring when services are purified in terms of customer hopes, needs, and opinions².

Physicians and surgeons are important consumers of laboratory services as their opinions play an important role in shaping laboratory services. These days assessment of consumer's satisfaction is considered important of laboratory assurance program and for accreditation of the laboratory by international accreditation bodies like CAP college of American pathology³.

In our survey we analyze the satisfaction level, diagnostic accuracy and other components included in Q probe questionnaire, duly filled by physicians working in tertiary care hospital. There are very few studies carried out to address these issues in Pakistan. We hope our study will help to improve the services provided by anatomical labs in terms of consumer's satisfaction.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data was collected from the 580 physicians and surgeons currently working at Mayo hospital, Lahore. Participants were selected by non-probability, convenient sampling. A written informed consent was taken. Data was collected using pre-designed, pre-tested questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed based on previous studies and the CAP survey. It involved several statements covering different anatomical pathological sections and details of laboratory services, which were considered important to physicians as primary customers for the laboratory hospital, including overall satisfaction level, diagnostic accuracy, communication with the department, professionalism and attitude of staff. Demographic variables like age and gender were also recorded.

All data was analyzed using SPSS- 20 version. Quantitative variables like age were presented as mean \pm S.D. Qualitative variables like gender were presented as frequency and percentages.

¹Former HO, Mayo Hospital,

²Medical Lab Technologist, KEMU,

³Assistant Professor, Pathology Department, KEMU

⁴Prof Of Pathology, KEMU

Correspondence: Dr. Sehr Chaudhary, Email: amatullah140@gmail.com

RESULTS

A total of 580 physicians participated in this study. Among the study subjects, 47.2% were male and 52.8% were females. The Mean age of patients was 1.97 ± 0.70 . Most of the subjects were in between age 20 to 44 years old. The overall mean satisfaction rate was 71% out of 100%. Among all the variables information about the test available at lab and instructions for sample collection and transportation got minimum score.

DISCUSSION

Measurement of physician satisfaction brings physician preferences into the quality assessment process and corrects false assumptions about particular aspects of service, which physicians value most and their satisfaction is considered an important factor influencing the quality of health care provision, patient compliance, and costs to health care systems⁴.

As in a number of studies found that the reliability and accuracy of the laboratory results were most important statements for physician as laboratory's customers³. Our study showed max percentage of physicians consider the accuracy of anatomical Lab above average 36.6%.

Other variables like communication of information, pathologists responsiveness and overall professionalism were considered average by most of the physicians in our study. However variables like instructions about available tests, transportation and contact when needed got minimum scores in our study. The satisfaction with management of laboratory showed a very low satisfaction level, there is a major need of dynamic communication between laboratory and physicians especially with unclear, mistake and missing results. The study was conducted in one hospital and one city, thus the results could not be generalized. However this study highlights several areas where physicians continue to have concerns about laboratory performance.

REFERENCES

1. Adul Kader, N.M. and B.E. Triana, *Physician satisfaction with hospital clinical laboratory services in Aden Governorate, Yemen, 2009*. East Mediterr Health J, 2013. 19(6): p. 555-60.
2. Hostutler, J., S. Taft, and C. Snyder, *Patient needs in the emergency department: nurses' and patients' perceptions*. J Nurs Adm., 1999. 29(1): p. 43-50.
3. Jones, B., et al., *Physician satisfaction with clinical laboratory services: a College of American Pathologists Q-probes study*

Physician's Satisfaction with Anatomical Pathology Services

of 138 institutions. Arch Pathol Lab Med., 2009. 133(1): p. 38-43. doi 10.1043/1543-2165-133.1.38.

Probes study of 3065 physician surveys from 94 laboratories. Arch Pathol Lab Med., 2003. 127(1): p. 23-9

4. Zarbo, R., R. Nakhleh, and M. Walsh, *Customer satisfaction in anatomic pathology. A College of American Pathologists Q-*

Table 1: Satisfaction scores and frequencies

QUESTIONS	Excellent	Good	Above average	Below average	Poor
Overall satisfaction level	47(8.1%)	215(37.1%)	176(30.3%)	119(20.5%)	23(4.0%)
Diagnostic accuracy of interpretation.	32(5.5%)	197(34.0%)	212(36.6%)	114(19.7%)	25(4.3%)
Communication of relevant information.	39(6.7%)	152(26.2%)	200(34.5%)	133(22.9%)	56(9.7%)
Tumor board presentations.	18(3.1%)	104(17.9%)	225(38.8%)	147(25.3%)	86(14.8%)
Teaching conferences and courses.	23(4.0%)	156(26.9%)	174(30.0%)	154(26.6%)	73(12.6%)
Laboratory's attitude towards your research projects.	28(4.8%)	137(23.6%)	167(28.8%)	172(29.7%)	76(13.1%)
Pathologists' responsiveness to problems.	11(1.9%)	160(27.6%)	197(34.0%)	155(26.7%)	57(9.8%)
Overall quality of professional interaction.	30(5.2%)	190(32.8%)	184(31.7%)	119(20.5%)	57(9.8%)
Attitude of laboratory staff to solve problems.	22(3.8%)	124(21.4%)	210(36.2%)	148(25.5%)	76(13.1%)
Notification of significant abnormal results.	19(3.3%)	127(21.9%)	181(31.2%)	175(30.2%)	78(13.4%)
Clarity and format of paper and electronic anatomic pathology reports.	18(3.1%)	183(31.6%)	183(31.6%)	147(25.3%)	49(8.4%)
Do you always get contact with the laboratory staff when needed	18(3.1%)	156(26.9%)	152(26.2%)	181(31.2%)	73(12.6%)
Is the request form extensive enough to collect all the clinical information needed	24(4.1%)	195(33.6%)	165(28.4%)	147(25.3%)	49(8.4%)
Has the laboratory provided you with	33(5.7%)	97(16.7%)	162(27.9%)	190(32.8%)	98(16.9%)
• Information on which tests are available at the laboratory					
• Instructions for sample collection & transportation	34(5.9%)	105(18.1%)	106(18.3%)	200(34.5%)	135(23.3%)

Table 2: Socio demographic properties and overall experience

Gender		Age	Current position						
Male	Female		HO	MO	(PGR	(HS	Consultant	(SR	AP
274	306	20±44	203	69	226	65	3	6	8
47.2%	52.8%		35%	11.9%	39%	11.2%	0.5%	1.0%	1.4%