The Responsiveness of Health Systems and Its Domains

Jyothi Kurapati[1], Bal Nagorao Rakshase[2]
MPhil Scholar[1], Associate Professor[2]
School of Health System Studies
Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India.

Abstract

Responsiveness means understanding non-health and non-budgetary aspects that improve health system health. This clear distinction between medical and non-medical approaches prevents double counting of results. Responsiveness is linked to health promotion, prevention, rehabilitation, and curative services, the most focused part of the health system—two perspectives on responsiveness. First, the health system user appears as a consumer, and greater responsiveness is seen as enticing consumers. Second, responsiveness protects patients' rights to adequate care and assistance. Responsiveness is how individuals are treated and the environment in which they are treated, including an individual's interaction with the health system. Responsiveness is a system's response to expectations and needs unrelated to patient health. It was further broken down into elements related to respecting people and customer orientation or how the system reacts to patients' and families' fears as healthcare customers.

Keywords: Responsiveness, Dimensions of Responsiveness, Health System, Health Care, Expectations of Patients, Non-Medical Aspects.

Introduction

Responsiveness

Responsiveness has been defined as understanding non-health and non-budgetary aspects that improve health in the health system. This flawless demarcation concerning medical and non-medical approaches is essential to avoid duple counting in measuring results. Additionally, it is essential to remember that responsiveness is connected to health promotion, prevention, and rehabilitation, along with curative services, the maximum focused part of the health system. Responsiveness can be seen from two angles. First, the health system user often appears as a consumer, and more excellent responsiveness is perceived as the affluence of enticing consumers. Second, responsiveness protects patients' rights to adequate and appropriate care and assistance (De Silva & Valentine, 2000). Responsiveness can be defined as how individuals are treated and the environment in which they are treated, including the conception of an individual's experience in interaction with the health system (Valentine et al., 2003). Responsiveness has been defined as a measure of the system's response to the expectations and needs unrelated to the health of the population it works for. It was further broken down into those elements linked to the respect of people and the customer orientation component, the way the system reacts to the trepidations of patients and their families as health care customers (Valentine et al., 2003).

Understanding Responsiveness

To keep consumers healthy, the health system must treat them with dignity, support their participation in care decisions, and ensure flawless communication with their healthcare providers. Respect for persons is part of the health system's responsiveness. Consumers want immediate attention, social support, provider choice, and quality essential services. These are client-oriented (De Silva & Valentine, 2000). Match responsiveness with health measures to measure the health system's performance. Health outcomes, clinical care processes, disease prevention, and health promotion programs are evaluated. To measure responsiveness, consumers are asked to report their involvement with care elements and other health system services, which are indicators

of system performance as health measures. Respect for people and customer orientation are the best sources of information and drive responsiveness (Darby et al., 2000).

In developed countries, satisfied patients are more likely to use medical services, provide appropriate information to their providers, and continue care. Patient satisfaction affects service use and professional recommendations in developing countries. We know that responsiveness is essential even without its impact on health. In the WHO framework to assess health system performance, responsiveness is limited to individual well-being and does not consider health improvement. This helps measure responsiveness and health goals (Wouters, 1991). The WHO proposed and promoted the concept of responsiveness as a measure of health system performance. It includes non-medical and non-financial measurements of quality of care related to respect for a person's dignity and interpersonal aspects of the treatment course. Human rights include respect for the patient's autonomy and dignity, interpersonal aspects of care, and consumer orientation, emphasizing hospital amenities like the quality of essential services. Gradually, patients' opinions and views are recognized as a source of non-medical healthcare information, and the health system's responsiveness is based mainly on health surveys. In standard, responsiveness includes health services, broader practices, and interactions with health systems, such as health campaigns and public health interventions (Valentine et al., 2009).

First, respondents rate their most recent past year interaction with health services in each of the eight domains (Robone et al., 2011). Responsiveness cannot simply be a question of closing health expenditures. At the same time, some responsiveness elements may be expensive (such as setting quality), while others are not (for example, the quality of the structures). For example, dignity and communication may need more training and attention (Blendon et al., 2001). Increased health sector funding does not necessarily lead to better services in weak institutions. Spending on health care affects responsiveness and treatment types differently in different countries (Valentine et al., 2003; Valentine et al., 2009).

Methodology

The overall goals of this chapter are to explore the previous studies on the topic worldwide. This review builds the base for the current study by providing sufficient literature and tries to connect the current study. The Literature review was undertaken with the primary objective of exploring the studies on the dissertation. This mainly was carried out to facilitate and develop an in-depth understanding of the area of research. For searching the literature, the Online databases used are PubMed, Medline via PubMed, Relemed, Science Direct, Cochrane Library, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Jgate Plus, J store, Lancet, Wiley, Sage, Springer etc.

The main keywords used for the literature review are "Performance of the health systems", "responsiveness of health systems", "responsiveness and human rights", "responsiveness and patient satisfaction", "dimensions of responsiveness", "framework for measuring the responsiveness", patients" priorities and perceptions. Based on the above keywords, the literature review was carried out on various websites, which yielded the articles reviewed below thoroughly to include in the literature.

The Importance of Responsiveness

Health system stewardship focuses on individuals' legitimate expectations. In its stewardship function, the health system must ensure performers' equality. Consumers are generally disadvantaged when dealing with healthcare producers and need information and protection from the health system. Responsiveness requires simplifying the flow of information between the health system and the population. This information helps the system's steward addresas inequities (Murray & Frenk, 1999). Human rights depend on responsiveness. Health, economics, education, culture, and politics are responsiveness goals. Effective systems respond to citizens' legitimate needs. This collective responsiveness goal protects and improves human rights. Failure to meet health system responsiveness would negate collective responsibility (Darby et al., 2000). The WHO conducted a website survey to develop a scoring system for the three intrinsic goals. Respondents included WHO employees and others who accessed

the site and chose to take the survey. We expected respondents to prioritize their health. Both clusters of respondents rated the three intrinsic goals similarly. Respondents said health should get 50%, responsiveness 25%, and fair funding 25%. These results confirm responsiveness importance (Gakidou et al., 2000).

Specific responsiveness components can be developed without large reserves. Refining the respect given by people in the system may require significant changes in staff attitudes toward their components, but a little financial investment. Perhaps training health workers to be more receptive to the right to be treated with dignity requires minimal funds. Improving responsiveness does not require the same investment in technology or personnel as health improvements. Improving responsiveness and fair funding may not require new regulation. Not all responsiveness changes are inexpensive. Other resources may be needed to understand client orientation responsiveness elements like physician choice or immediate attention. A healthcare system can improve responsiveness without a significant investment of reserves (Darby et al., 2000). Responsiveness can improve before the other two intrinsic goals. Since it doesn't require a significant investment and as interventions progress, responsiveness can be improved much faster than health. Improving how healthy clinic staff treat patients can be reflected in survey responses much faster than changes in behavior that indicate health improvements. Like other WHR2000 health system performance indicators, responsiveness was assessed based on moderate success and distribution in the served population. This means the system must respond well to all without discrimination (Luo et al., 2013).

To measure WHO responsiveness, 50 key informers from 35 countries were chosen and asked to complete a country-specific questionnaire. Fifty key informants rated every aspect. Others surveyed 1000 WHO website visitors to rank domains' importance. Average scores for each country were multiplied by weights and added to get overall responsiveness scores. Other countries' scores were estimated by adjusting country-reporting group differences. The same interviewees were asked to identify groups who felt unappreciated. The proportion of a group is multiplied by the number of times it is mentioned. All subgroup yields were added and transformed to get a responsiveness score (De Silva, 2000). Patients' opinions and views are increasingly used as evidence for non-medical aspects of health care, and opinion polls measure the health system's responsiveness. The concept includes health services, more comprehensive experiences, and connections with health systems, such as health campaigns and interventions (Valentine et al., 2009). To what extent a healthcare system should be held responsible for a health determinant depends on how well it can change its outcome. The length of the analysis determines how much a healthcare system can change a determinant. Many health sector reforms and institutional changes take years to effect, requiring a long-term perspective for evaluation.

Domains of Responsiveness

The WHO responsiveness component collects information on outpatient and inpatient health services. This investigation only covers hospital services. Respondents evaluated their most recent contact with the health system in eight domains. Domains include autonomy (involvement in decisions), choice (of health care personnel), clarity of communication (of health care provider), privacy (speaking in private), dignity (respectful treatment and communication), prompt attention (wait times), quality of basic amenities, and social support. Current responsiveness analyses include dignity, prompt attention, clarity of communication, choice, confidentiality, and quality of basic amenities (WHO, 2000). Responsiveness in health systems results from health organizations and influential relationships that know and respond to a person's legitimate expectations. This definition is from 2 perspectives. First, the health system user is a consumer whose responsiveness attracts clients. Second, responsiveness protects patient's rights to timely care (Njeru et al., 2009).

Seven responsiveness features are essential to consumers and the healthcare system. The first responsiveness feature, dignity, focuses on patients' and families' trust and kindness. Autonomy means respect for self-rule and the ability to make health decisions independently. Third, confidentiality regulates who can access personal health information. The fourth feature prompt attention, it

means quick attention in emergencies and rational waiting times for non-emergencies and includes two sub-aspects; the first is contact, where the ability to get immediate attention through suitably located health care entities is essential, not for the reason that it would improve health effects (which would be acquired based on health measurements), however because the existence of these structures are very close it would recover the psychic well-being of individuals (De Silva, 2000). Second, it improves health by reducing consultation, treatment, and transaction wait times. The fifth feature, the quality of essential services, focuses on physical attributes that do not improve the health of medical care units, such as cleaning accommodations, the sufficiency of furniture, and the quality of foodstuff. The sixth feature is access to social support systems, which include family and friends during treatment and recovery. The final caregiver choice includes access to specialist care and second opinions. The WHO has estimated and related the response level of the health systems of 191 member countries based on the results of 35 studies countrywide and the survey of critical informants conducted on the Internet (WHO report, 2000).

1. Dignity

The concept of dignity includes the right to receive treatment with respect, a caring, and non-discriminatory environment, to be treated with respect as an individual, and the right not to be embarrassed. It also covers the right not to be discriminated against in contradiction due to physical or mental incapacity and the right to protection from unnecessary and cumbersome medical and surgical processes. Dignity is defined as a patient's right to be treated as an individual in their right rather than simply as a patient who, due to lopsided information and physical disabilities, has revoked the right to be cured with dignity. This includes protection of human rights protection, such as freedom of movement, including for people suffering from HIV, leprosy, or tuberculosis, respectful treatment by health professionals, the right to question and provide information during consultations and treatment, privacy during the treatment and examination (De Silva, 2000).

Longer consultation times are highly correlated with higher rating scores. The ratings in their practice are based on the patient's answers to the following questions: as a result of their visit to the doctor today, their ability to face life, understand their illness, cope with their disease, and stay healthy. The range of comparable answers was much better or better, with no change or lower, and not applicable. They were also questioned if this visit gave them confidence in their health and could be helped with more, more, equal, or fewer response options, and they were not applicable. These questions release some aspects of improving well-being that does not improve health. More consultations are likely associated with greater chances for patients to converse about their problems with their physicians and to ask queries more freely and, therefore, with more enablement (Howie et al., 1999).

Patient satisfaction levels increase if doctors take the time to speak with the patient by making non-health-related comments or joking. They find that while on more extended visits, patient satisfaction rises with the extent of response information provided on lab results, the findings generated by the patient history, or the outcomes of the physical examination, patients who have short visits are less satisfied. In contrast, the visit is spent for information. The writers suggest that this difference may be due to the rapidity with which this information is delivered or because patients lose the element of the conversation and the relaxed atmosphere that promotes the increase of patient's concerns (Gross et al., 1998)

Studies on patient priorities regarding general care generate that many priority lists contain the desire for humanity in health sector communications. This dispute is essential not only in face-to-face communications but also in the case of health education and information dissemination. The preparation of posters or leaflets on HIV and AIDS, for instance, should consider the emotional facets of stigmatization that could affect an insensitive formulation (Wensing et al., 1998). Privacy throughout medical examinations is essential to encourage people to use health services. The significance of the right to privacy in conditions such as childbirth is highlighted.

2. Autonomy

Autonomy is a self-directed choice or freedom in the context of this study; four rights are defined such as the right of a person to information about his illness and alternatives, treatment possibilities (this enables informed choice), The right to be referred about treatment, informed consent in context test and treatment and the right of patients with a healthy mind to refuse treatment (De Silva, 2000). A reasonable consumer, like someone ready to seek the best package of medical care concerning price and quality, can sufficiently assimilate information on prices and quality of health care and, based on this information, has the capability to and the aspiration to make health decisions. However, empirical evidence recommends that healthcare consumers are often ill-informed and rely on the health service provider to obtain information. It challenges the extent to which consumers can play their role and, more essentially, if they wish to achieve it. Healthcare consumers often want advice and thus voluntarily sacrifice their autonomy for the trust generated by a decision of experts.

In 1997 Charles and his team presented four models concerning autonomy. The first is the paternalistic model, in which the healthcare provider makes all decisions on behalf of the patient since it is believed that the provider is better informed; this is well-thought-out optimal. The second model, the informed decision-making model, executes the need to disclose information to the provider and the responsibility to make decisions about the patient. The model of the professional agent makes the patient voluntarily renounce the right to make decisions, even if well-informed, through the deliberate and explicit transfer of the task to the supplier. The final model, called a shared decision-making model, centers on the exchange of information and decision-making amongst the provider and patient and the determination of choices.

In some cultures, the question of autonomy is further complicated by the need to consider the views of the family rather than being limited to the individual. When an individual voluntarily terminates his or her right to the entire decision of his or her healthcare decisions, healthcare providers are required to consult family members, both in the presence and absence of the patient individually. Charles and his colleagues (1997) list the different roles that family or friends can play during the decision-making process collector of information, order or interpreter, advise the patient to ask some questions, counselor, negotiator on behalf of the patient about time, place or treatment and treatment options, caretaker supports and reinforces the patient's treatment decision.

Informed consent is also vital in the context of the detection of the disease. Since all procedures have a combination of benefits and risks, the person being examined must receive complete and accurate information about the procedure and provide informed consent. For example, when there is uncertainty about false positives, this problem should be discussed with a suggestion explicitly supported by the best available evidence.

3. Confidentiality

Information about the patient and his or her illness must not be disclosed during the course of treatment, unless in specific contexts, without the patient's prior consent. This is related to the notion that patient well-being is the primary concern of the health care professional. This would involve consultation with patients to protect their privacy, safeguarding the confidentiality of information given by the patient and information about a person "s disease, apart from in cases where such information must be provided to a provider. Medical attention or where explicit consent was obtained (De Silva, 2000). Preserving confidentiality raises issues, particularly in the public health milieu. Notification of AIDS cases became a problem in the early 1990s; however, in many countries, it was resolved with an emphasis on protecting the identity of the diseased person. In fact, in developing countries, the absence of universal precautions often makes the health profession much less authoritarian in confidentiality in these cases.

The dilemmas faced by health professionals with the need to preserve confidentiality include the issue of public security and divided loyalty in the case of treating more than one member of a family. The emphasis in the first case was to educate the person about the risks involved in their interactions

with society. The second was to encourage the person to voluntarily share information with other at-risk people (Rylance & George, 1999). In developed countries, many recent debates have involved archiving medical assistance registers in electronic databases and the right to access such information. Particularly in private insurance and employment, the confidentiality of medical information becomes fundamental. Genetic information databases are another related area of discussion. At the other end of the spectrum, in developing countries, the debate prevails over whether to keep patient information at the head of the bed, a practice currently being followed in most hospital facilities.

4. Prompt Attention

Three characteristics define prompt attention. Patients should have the right to prompt attention in an emergency, and patients ought to be entitled to receive treatment within a reasonable time frame, even in non-emergency medical or surgical assistance issues, so waiting slants should not cover long periods. Patients searching for care in healthcare units do not have to face long waiting spells for consultations and care (De Silva, 2000).

Achieving prompt attention is often subject to restrictions imposed by an inadequate resource base. Geographical approachability is of particular significance since the possibility of rapid access to medical care, taking into version distance, the convenience of means of transport and land reduces ambiguity and tension for people, which contributes directly to well-being which is the crucial aspect here more than health influences of immediate care. Show respect for the individual's time and feelings is the problem at stake instead of providing urgent health care. The next would be captured under health and inequality in health.

Healthcare researchers have also studied timeouts in various healthcare settings, including elective surgery, emergency care, and outpatient care, and are universally found to be negatively associated with patient satisfaction. Furthermore, long waits are sometimes associated with the decision of patients to seek assistance in the private sector instead of waiting (Besley et al., 1999). International health research indicates that the dissatisfaction of pending non-emergency surgical patients increases with the expected waiting time and the severity of symptoms. Therefore, the long wait has contributed to the patient's negative attitudes toward the health system before they contact him. However, the researchers also found that patients were far more tolerant of delayed OPD if the reason was explained, emphasizing the importance of communication and information in health facilities (Becker & Douglass, 2008).

5. Clear Communication

For many reasons, communication between the patient and the healthcare provider is paramount in the medical assistance process. Not only does it set the foundation for mutual trust, but it is also the first step in achieving a preliminary diagnosis. Furthermore, the patient's ability to understand the information provided by the doctor and ask questions is also emphasized in this domain. Another aspect of communication is health communication through the media, which aims to educate people about disease prevention and health promotion. The clarity of communication overlaps slightly with the domain of dignity since it implies that the doctor carefully listens to the patient and answers all his questions and concerns.

It has been found that more extended visits are associated with greater patient satisfaction, which indicates that an informal and open conversation between patients and providers creates confidence and comfort for the patient. Another critical aspect of the interaction between the patient and the provider is the lack of communication during examinations and physical procedures, which leads to inconsistency between the patient's hypotheses and the supplier's actions. This has been shown to cause significant anxiety and apprehension in patients undergoing invasive treatment procedures such as surgery and genital examinations (Ubido et al., 2002).

6. Quality of Basic Amenities

This feature is related to providing physical infrastructure besides a favorable care environment. The study describes the basic amenities as follows clean environments, systematic procedures for cleaning plus maintenance of buildings and hospital premises, sufficient furniture, adequate ventilation, pure

water, clean toilets, fresh clothes, and appetizing food. Preventive measures, which include non-personal preventive activities such as cleaning public places, fumigation with insecticides, and avoiding mosquito breeding in vacant lands, are several activities that should be considered in the quality of basic amenities. This concept must not be narrow to health facilities, nonetheless should be connected to the health system as a whole, including interactions with the health system at work, home, or school (De Silva, 2000).

Patients seeking medical care should have access to clean, comfortable, and suitable washing and toilet facilities, but studies in developed countries have also shown wide disparities between patient needs and the availability of facilities. Inappropriate and unclean bathrooms are not only unpleasant and uncomfortable but also a risk to the health and well-being of patients, increasing the risk of falls, injuries, and infectious diseases. Monro and Mully (2004) conducted a study of 46 districts in three hospitals in the north of England to find out whether bathroom facilities had improved since the last two surveys conducted in 1969 and 1998. It is interesting to note that the authors discovered that, despite the 30 years, it still had only showers for wheelchair users, lack of adapters and adjustments for bathing, lack of cleanliness and privacy, poor signage, missing locks, lack of heating, furniture lacking fancy, access unpleasant odors, wet floors, leaks from bathrooms to rooms, the obstructive disorder of the use of bathrooms as storage and inaccessibility of mirrors and light switches for people in wheelchairs.

Providing good quality food is another consideration for patients admitted to hospitals. For decades, it has been recognized that poor diet is a problem faced by patients in health centers. Older patients are at higher risk of malnutrition in healthcare. Recent research has shown that undernourishment in over-hospitalized patients is between 30 and 60%. Malnutrition is an independent predictor of several adverse clinical outcomes, including higher rates of complications, more extended hospitalizations, high costs, and premature mortality (Correia & Waitzberg, 2003). Factors associated with food activity that improve or hinder patient food intake have been studied in research in nursing. The general topics reported in these studies included the inflexibility of meals, the lack of physical access to food trays, the lack of assistance from the staff, and the interruption during meals of nurses and doctors (Xia & McCutcheon, 2006).

7. Access to social support networks

The study believes that the patient's well-being is best served if the person has access to support networks during the treatment period. In some cases, the fact that healthcare facilities are not evenly distributed in one country means that patients receive care far from their usual places, which is likely to withdraw them from access to social care networks as a family, community, and friends. This study believes that the procedures for providing medical care to hospitalized patients should allow regular visits by family and friends and provision of food and other consumer goods by family and friends; if the hospital's religious practices do not provide them, they do not constitute an obstacle to the hospital activities or damage (Kruse et al., 2002).

Several studies have examined the beneficial effect of social support in different regions, such as protection against dementia, areas of recovery after myocardial infarction and stroke, and the prevalence of anxiety and depression (Crooks et al., 2008). The literature also suggests possible links between social isolation, poor social support, and premature morbidity and mortality. Additionally, it was found that the level of social support, or lack thereof, influences that look for health and health promotion behaviors, as well as in predicting adherence to treatment regimens (Vyavaharkar et al., 2007). Several studies have studied the association between social support and recovery from a severe acute illness, especially in the elderly. Most of these studies measured social support at varying intervals after hospital discharge. However, an essential aspect of measuring social support is not a static entity as a characteristic or feature. It is a social exchange process through which the supply of support from suppliers changes according to the recipient's demand. The level of support before a person becomes ill determines the amount and type of support available during the illness and, therefore, during recovery.

Most of these studies have focused on social support available to patients after discharge; so far, the concept of WHO responsiveness is linked to the social support available to patients when they are admitted to healthcare centers. This support is different in nature and quantity from those mentioned above and has more direct effects on the well-being of the patient and the recovery of the disease. Family support during hospitalization has been found to reduce stress and promote well-being by helping patients" better cope with the disease and its consequences (Kruse et al., 2002). Patients gain the courage and strength of family members to reduce the burden of anxiety, which has a beneficial effect (Tekle et al., 2002).

8. Choice of Care Provider

The choice regarding institution and healthcare provider is essential for health system users. The capability to choose among care providers becomes increasingly important as additional aspects of responsiveness are encountered. The cost of granting the health provider choice is more severe for countries with limited human resources. There is a debate about whether the choice of the service provider is a luxury beyond the reach of developing countries. Establishing universal standards in this context is complex, and to be realistic, it may have to be related to an exogenous criterion, such as the amount of health personnel trained in a country (De Silva, 2000). The choice of supplier depends on several factors, including the payment mechanism and perceived competence of health care providers. The choice of supplier can be limited to those with physical or financial access to health centers.

Families with socioeconomic problems expose themselves to the risk of limited choice when seeking medical assistance. Research shows that people in the lower socioeconomic strata often turn to poor-quality health services and seek medical care less frequently, and if they do, it is more common**.** It is likely that in an emergency. This indicates the limitations imposed on the choice of supplier for these patients because of their socioeconomic disadvantage **(**Norredam et al., 2004). Another aspect of the choice of provider is the ability of the patient to seek medical advice from the same provider. In fact, in cases where the patient suffers from a long-term illness, care may be required by the same provider due to the greater familiarity of the provider regarding the course of the patient's illness and also because of confidence and trust that the patient and his or her family can develop in the provider's capabilities. Saultz and Albedaiwi (2004) concluded a consistent and significant positive relationship between the continuity of interpersonal care and patient satisfaction. However, this domain is also sensitive to respondents' age and education level. It has been discovered that younger respondents and those with higher levels of education prefer the free choice of doctors to older people.

Clinical research also shows that when patients have a sense of control, they feel motivated to exercise this control to reduce the disturbing effect of the disease on their lives and to resume regular activity. Failure to control feelings, emotions, and actions has been linked to malfunctioning and increased risk of addiction. It is probably through the sense of mastery and control that the activity of choosing providers experiences a beneficial effect on the patient.

Responsiveness vs. Patient Satisfaction

The framework proposed by the WHO in 2000 highlights health, responsiveness, and adequate financing as the three key objectives in assessing the health system's performance. Of the three, and suggested for the first time, responsiveness mentions how the health system encounters the people's expectations for aspects that do not improve the healthsystem. Hulka and colleagues (1970) then began conceptualizing patient satisfaction, a mature concept with an established international standard called the Client Satisfaction Index (CSI). Despite being a new concept hosted by the WHO in 2000, responsiveness is suitable for a hot spot for assessing the health services system.

Secondly, patient satisfaction is generally assessed in non-medical and medical aspects, where satisfaction with nursing care and medical technology is essential. In assessing responsiveness, non-medical features of the health system receive more attention than doctors. Third, patient satisfaction is a complex mix of expectations and experiences of health care. At the same time, the assessment of responsiveness assesses the degree to which the health system

meets the general expectations of individuals for services of health. Finally, the components of responsiveness are more constant than those of patient satisfaction since responsiveness does not evaluate an exact medical technology. Furthermore, the responsiveness of health services is recognized as one of the fundamental human rights (Luo et al., 2013).

Conclusion

Responsiveness has eight domains; it isn't just cutting health costs. Some responsiveness elements may be expensive. Dignity includes the right to be treated with respect, care, and non-discrimination and to not be embarrassed. It also protects against unnecessary and cumbersome medical and surgical procedures. Autonomy is self-directed choice or freedom. In this study, four rights are defined: the right of a person to information about his illness and alternatives, treatment possibilities (this enables informed choice), the right to be referred about treatment, informed consent in context test and treatment, and the right of healthy patients to refuse treatment. Health professionals must maintain confidentiality despite public security concerns and divided loyalty when treating multiple family members. Three characteristics define prompt attention. In an emergency, patients should receive prompt attention, and in non-emergency situations, they should receive treatment within a reasonable time frame, so waiting slants should not be extended. Patients don't wait long for consultations and care in healthcare units.

Patient-provider communication is crucial in medical assistance for many reasons. It establishes mutual trust and provides a preliminary diagnosis. The patient's ability to understand the doctor's information and ask questions is also emphasized in this domain. Basic amenities include clean environments, systematic building cleaning and maintenance, sufficient furniture, adequate ventilation, pure water, clean toilets, fresh clothes, and appetizing food. According to the study, the patient's well-being is best served by access to support networks during treatment.

In some cases, because healthcare facilities aren't evenly distributed in a country, patients receive care far from their usual places, removing them from social care networks like family, community, and friends. Patients' choice of institution and provider is essential. Choosing care providers becomes more critical as more responsiveness aspects are encountered. In countries with limited human resources, allowing patient choice is more expensive.

References

Valentine, N. B., de Silva, A., Kawabata, K., Darby, C., Murray, C. J., & Evans, D. B. (2003). Health system responsiveness: concepts, domains, and operationalization. *Health systems performance assessment: debates, methods, and empiricism. Geneva: World Health Organization*, 573-96.

De Silva, A., Valentine, N., & World Health Organization. (2000). Measuring responsiveness: results of a key informants survey in 35 countries.

Darby, C., Valentine, N., Murray, C. J., & De Silva, A. (2000). World Health Organization (WHO): strategy on measuring responsiveness. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Wouters, A. V. (1991). Essential national health research in developing countries: Healthcare financing and the quality of care. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, *6*(4), 253-271.

Valentine, N.B., A. Prasad, N. Rice, S. Robone, and S. Chatterji. 2009. "Health systems responsiveness - a measure of the acceptability of health care processes and systems". In: *Performance measurement for health system improvement: experiences, challenges and prospects, edited by* P.C. Smith, E. Mossialos and S. Leatherman. Pp 138-186. London: WHO European Regional Office.

Robone, S., Rice, N., & Smith, P. C. (2011). Health Systems' Responsiveness and Its Characteristics: A Cross-Country Comparative Analysis. *Health services research*, *46*(6pt2), 2079-2100.

Blendon, R. J., Kim, M., & Benson, J. M. (2001). The public versus the World Health Organization on health system performance. *Health Affairs*, *20*(3), 10-20.

Murray, C. J., & Frenk, J. (1999). *A WHO framework for health system performance assessment*. Evidence and Information for Policy, World Health Organization.

Gakidou, E. E., Frenk, J., & Murray, C. J. (2000). *Measuring preferences on health system performance assessment*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Luo, Q., Wang, Q., Lu, Z., & Liu, J. (2013). Evaluation of responsiveness of community health services in urban China: a quantitative study in Wuhan City. *PloS one*, *8*(5), e62923.

World Health Organization. (2000). *The world health report 2000: health systems: improving performance*. World Health Organization.

Njeru, M. K., Blystad, A., Nyamongo, I. K., & Fylkesnes, K. (2009). A critical assessment of the WHO responsiveness tool: lessons from voluntary HIV testing and counselling services in Kenya. *BMC health services research*, *9*(1), 243.

Howie, J. G., Heaney, D. J., Maxwell, M., Walker, J. J., Freeman, G. K., & Rai, H. (1999). Quality at general practice consultations: cross sectional survey. *Bmj*, *319*(7212), 738-743.

Gross, D. A., Zyzanski, S. J., Borawski, E. A., Cebul, R. D., & Stange, K. C. (1998). Patient satisfaction with time spent with their physician. *Journal of Family Practice*, *47*(2), 133-138.

Wensing, M., Jung, H. P., Mainz, J., Olesen, F., & Grol, R. (1998). A systematic review of the literature on patient priorities for general practice care. Part 1: Description of the research domain. *Social science & medicine*, *47*(10), 1573-1588.

Rylance, G. (1999). Privacy, dignity, and confidentiality: interview study with structured questionnaire. *Bmj*, *318*(7179), 301-301.

Becker, F., & Douglass, S. (2008). The ecology of the patient visit: physical attractiveness, waiting times, and perceived quality of care. *The Journal of ambulatory care management*, *31*(2), 128-141.

Ubido, J., Huntington, J., & Warburton, D. (2002). Inequalities in access to healthcare faced by women who are deaf. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *10*(4), 247-253.

Correia, M. I. T., & Waitzberg, D. L. (2003). The impact of malnutrition on morbidity, mortality, length of hospital stay and costs evaluated through a multivariate model analysis. *Clinical nutrition*, *22*(3), 235-239.

Xia, C., & McCutcheon, H. (2006). Mealtimes in hospital–who does what?. *Journal of clinical nursing*, *15*(10), 1221-1227.

Kruse, G. R., Rohland, B. M., & Wu, X. (2002). Factors associated with missed first appointments at a psychiatric clinic. *Psychiatric Services*, *53*(9), 1173-1176.

Crooks, V. C., Lubben, J., Petitti, D. B., Little, D., & Chiu, V. (2008). Social network, cognitive function, and dementia incidence among elderly women. *American journal of public health*, *98*(7), 1221-1227.

Vyavaharkar, M., Moneyham, L., Tavakoli, A., Phillips, K. D., Murdaugh, C., Jackson, K., & Meding, G. (2007). Social support, coping, and medication adherence among HIV-positive women with depression living in rural areas of the southeastern United States. *AIDS patient care and STDs*, *21*(9), 667-680.

Tekle, B., Mariam, D., & Ali, A. (2002). Defaulting from DOTS and its determinants in three districts of Arsi Zone in Ethiopia. *The International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease*, *6*(7), 573-579.

Norredam, M., Krasnik, A., Sorensen, T. M., Keiding, N., Michaelsen, J. J., & Nielsen, A. S. (2004). Emergency room utilization in Copenhagen: a comparison of immigrant groups and Danish-born residents. *Scandinavian journal of public health*, *32*(1), 53-59.

Saultz, J. W., & Albedaiwi, W. (2004). Interpersonal continuity of care and patient satisfaction: a critical review. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, *2*(5), 445-451.