

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication among physicians and patients in clinical settings with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016902
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Mar-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Jie; School of Public Health, Fudan University, Department of Preventive Medicine Zou, Runyu; Erasmus University Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Fu, Hua; School of Public Health, Fudan University Qian, Haihong; School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University Yan, Yueren; School of Public Health, Fudan University Wang, Fan; School of Public Health, Fudan University
Primary Subject Heading:	Communication
Secondary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine
Keywords:	Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3
4 **Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication**
5
6 **among physicians and patients in clinical settings with the**
7
8 **Chinese-revised Patient–Practitioner Orientation Scale**
9

10
11 Jie Wang^a, ¹ Runyu Zou^b, Hua Fu^a, Haihong Qian^c, Yueren Yan^a, Fan Wang^{a*}
12

13
14
15 ^a *Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public*
16 *Health, Fudan University¹, Shanghai, China.*
17

18
19 ^b *Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,*
20 *Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.*
21

22
23 ^c *School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.*
24

25
26 **Words count: 3967**
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ¹ Runyu Zou as joint first author

56 * Corresponding author at: P.O. Box 248, 138 Yixueyuan Road, 200032, Shanghai, China.

57 E-mail address: wangfan512@126.com Tel:86-21-54237509 (F. Wang)

Abstract

Objectives: The study aimed to explore the preference toward patient-centered communication among physicians and patients with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale (CR-PPOS).

Setting: Participants were recruited in clinical settings from eight medical institutes, including four community hospitals and four general hospitals, in Shanghai, China.

Design and participants: Questionnaire-based surveys were conducted among a total of 1018 physicians and patients, in two successive stages in the year of 2015.

Outcome measurements: Analysis mainly probed (1) psychological properties of the original Chinese-translated PPOS version versus the CR-PPOS (2) participants' scores on the CR-PPOS and the influential factors.

Results: Compared with the original PPOS, the 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better reliability and validity indicators. Furthermore, it also showed good discriminative power. Physicians and patients scored significantly differently on each subscale, as well as the total scale of CR-PPOS. Scores of patients were more likely to be influenced by various factors, such as age and education, compared with those of physicians.

Conclusions: The CR-PPOS is a better instrument in the Chinese context than the original translated version. The congruence and divergence in the extent to which patient-centered communication was preferred among Chinese physicians and patients should be noted. Adapting physicians' communication strategy to patients' preference based on their personal features can be an approach to improve clinical efficiency.

Keywords: Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study

- Psychometric properties of PPOS were systematically assessed in Chinese context, with common indicators of reliability, validity and discriminative power.
- Preference toward patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians was simultaneously measured with that of patients using adapted PPOS, which made it possible to make comparisons and find differences between both sides.
- The association between broader variables and participants' preference toward patient-centered communication was explored, such as burnout for physicians and health literacy for patients.
- Due to feasibility, the participants in this study were only drawn from eight clinical units in Shanghai, and sampling was not exact random, which both brought the issue on selection bias and limited generalization validity.
- It might be problematic to directly compare scores measured by CR-PPOS and scores measured by other versions of PPOS because we developed the CR-PPOS from the original PPOS mainly based on statistical approach, without any supplementary items being added to keep the amount of items constant.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Since its first introduction by Balint in 1969^[1], patient-centeredness has been one of the most frequently discussed principles in medical practices over the past few decades^[2]. It has also been regarded as one of the six core components of high-quality medical care^[3]. Enhancing patient-centeredness is eagerly highlighted to improve the quality of health care delivery^[4].

Without a uniform definition^[5], various conceptual models were raised to illustrate

1
2
3 patient-centeredness^[6,7]. Epstein^[8] further determined that patient-centeredness could
4 be fulfilled from three levels: interpersonal behaviors, technical intervention, and
5 health system innovation. As a key element in interpersonal behaviors between
6 physicians and patients, patient-centered communication has been a highly
7 recommended model, enabling practitioners to offer care that is concordant with the
8 patient's values, needs, and preferences, and that allows patients to become actively
9 involved in decision making regarding their health^[9,10]. Patient-centered
10 communication contributes to building a partnership between physicians and patients,
11 instead of the traditional paternalism^[11]. Patient-centered communication has also
12 been reported to improve a variety of patients' clinical outcomes in diverse settings,
13 and enhance their adherence to prescription medications and other types of
14 treatment^[12,13].

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 However, considering the cultural and contextual differences, patient-centered
28 communication may not be universally applicable despite the benefits it
29 offers^[14]. Thus it is suggested that physicians learn patients' communication
30 preference and then incorporate identified communication strategies into their
31 communication style^[15]. However, available instruments that aim to measure the
32 preference toward patient-centered communication remain sparse. Originally
33 developed by Edward Krupat^[16], the Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale (PPOS),
34 embracing the four elements model of patient-centeredness, has been translated into
35 various languages and has gained worldwide popularity in measuring the preference
36 toward patient-centered communication among physicians, medical students, and
37 patients^[17-20].

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 In China, accounts of patient-physician communication have been hotspots in the new
50 healthcare era, as patient-centeredness is increasingly highlighted in clinical practice.
51 Ting^[21] conducted a survey to detect patients' preferences toward patient-centered
52 communication in a hospital in the southwest part of China, which was the only
53 known attempt to apply PPOS in China. Despite the innovativeness, there were
54 several limitations within this study. For example, as an instrument introduced from
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

abroad, the psychometric properties, such as reliability and validity, of PPOS in the Chinese context have not been well tested. Secondly, the preference toward conducting patient-centered communication among physicians has not yet been explored. Finally, for a country with vast territory and a population in the billions, a single survey conducted in a specific medical unit may not be adequately representative. Thus it is not clear yet how this instrument works in other regions and surroundings.

We conducted this research in Shanghai, which was among the most developed cities in China and possessed abundant high-quality medical resources, aiming to adapt PPOS to Chinese (Mandarin) context and assess its psychometric properties systematically. Furthermore, patients' as well as physicians' preferences toward patient-centered communication were measured using the Chinese-revised PPOS (CR-PPOS). In addition, factors that might exert influence on physicians' and patients' preferences toward patient-centered communication were further explored.

Methods

Description of the instrument

Currently, PPOS has evolved to a version containing 18 items in two dimensions, Caring and Sharing^[22]. The nine-item Caring subscale reflects the degree to which physicians care about providing warmth and emotional support and regard patient as a whole person. The nine-item Sharing subscale reflects the degree to which physicians should share decision making information and power with the patients^[16]. A higher PPOS total score as well as subscale scores indicates a higher preference toward patient-centered style in clinical communication. Conversely, a low Caring score indicates a tendency toward disease-centered style, while a low Sharing score indicates a tendency toward doctor-centered style.

Translation and cultural adaption

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Obtaining the permission to translate and develop PPOS in the Chinese context by the original author, scholars with academic backgrounds in medicine, public health, journalism, and communication, Chinese and English languages, respectively, were invited to translate the PPOS to Chinese(Mandarin).Afterward, the bilingual PPOS versions were sent separately to another five advanced health practitioners for further suggestions and modifications. The Chinese PPOS(C-PPOS) was then back-translated into English and sent back to the original author for confirmation.

For this C-PPOS, we strove to fit every item to its original version, except for item 17 due to noticeable culture difference. Thus, it was replaced by “A friendly manner is a major ingredient in the doctor’s treatment of the patients”, according to the results of a prior study in Nepal^[23]. Additionally, item 2 was back-translated as “Compared with centering on individual patients in the past, focusing on the comprehensive quality of medical services nowadays is more valuable for propelling medical development”, which differed from the original item “Although health care is less personal these days, this is a small price to pay for medical advances” in expression but was mostly consistent in meaning. Finally, 12 physicians and 18 patients were enrolled in cognitive interviews to further enhance the comprehensibility of the scale in the Chinese cultural context.

Pilot study design

A pilot study was conducted in eight clinical settings in Shanghai, including four community hospitals and four general hospitals. As a minimum sample size of 5 to 10 times the number of scale items for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and 10 to 20 times for confirmative factor analysis^[24] was required, as well as taking the probable invalid responses into consideration, we included 400 interviewees. It was assumed that physicians should comprise at least 20% of the total sample. Physicians and patients were randomly recruited from the outpatient department of each hospital. Every eligible participant was requested to complete an anonymous short questionnaire containing the C-PPOS. Retrieved questionnaires were carefully

checked, and those with bad quality were removed from the dataset, including those with missing item scores or with the same item score throughout the entire scale.

Psychometric properties assessment

In this study, we assessed the psychometric properties via reliability, validity, and discriminative power tests, based on which the C-PPOS was revised to the CR-PPOS.

Internal consistency and test–retest reliability are the most widely tested indicators for reliability, thus we performed both in this study. In the test–retest survey, 60 participants completed the C-PPOS again after 2 to 4 weeks.

Hereby we performed EFA and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess construct validity. In addition, content validity was assessed by testing the correlation of the score of each item and the score of the subscale the item belonged to, as well as the score of the total scale.

Discriminative power reflects the extent to which an item can distinguish different levels of target variables. We tested discriminative power by comparing the critical value (CR) of each item.

Formal study design

The formal survey was launched 1 month later, in the same settings where the pilot study was conducted. As a cross-sectional study, the sample size was calculated to be 664 according to the formula provided by Raosoft, Inc.^[25], with a total population size of 24,000,000 (the estimated population of Shanghai) and a confidence level of 99%.

It was then expanded to 750 to guarantee adequate valid responses. Physician and patient participants were randomly recruited in a similar way as that in the pilot study.

After confirming the informed consent, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire containing CR-PPOS, general information (gender, age, education, marriage status, socioeconomic status, self-reported health condition, etc.), and some other well-validated instruments, such as the Patient Confidence in Communication

1
2
3 Scale (PCCS)^[26], Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), the Rapid Health
4 Literacy Scale^[27] for patients, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey
5 (MBI-GS) and Medical Communication Competence Scale (MCCS)^[28] for
6
7 physicians.
8
9

10 11 *Statistical analysis*

12
13 We utilized Epidata 3.1 and Excel 2007 software for dataset establishment. IBM SPSS
14 20.0 and AMOS 21.0 were employed to perform data cleaning and analysis.
15
16

17
18 Cronbach's α coefficient was tested as the indicator of internal consistency and
19 reliability. Normally, a Cronbach's α of no less than 0.6 is deemed acceptable for an
20 instrument with a relatively small number of items (i.e. no more than 6)^[29]. Test-retest
21 reliability was assessed as the indicator of interclass correlation coefficient (ICC).
22 Test-retest reliability was considered poor if the ICC value was lower than 0.4 and/or
23 the correlation was not statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 For EFA, data were subjected to a principal component analysis with extraction of
32 eigenvalues (greater than 1) for subscales (EFA round 1) and fixed two factors for the
33 total scale (EFA round 2). In EFA round 1, items were removed if a) their factor
34 loadings under either dimension were greater than 0.4, b) their factor loadings under
35 any two dimensions were close (the absolute value difference was less than 0.1), and c)
36 they were the only item under one dimension^[30].
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 CFA was performed by maximum likelihood analysis to verify the main adjustment
45 indices of the model, including chi-squared/degree of freedom (χ^2/df), root mean
46 square error of approximation (RMSEA), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted
47 goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed-fit index (NFI), incremental fit index (IFI), and
48 comparative fit index (CFI). The recommended χ^2/df ratio is 1 to 3, and RMSEA
49 value < 0.08 and GFI, AGFI, NNFI, IFI, and CFI > 0.9 suggest ideal model fit^[31].
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Respondents with the highest (top 27%) and lowest (bottom 27%) total scale scores
57
58
59
60

were divided into two groups, after which their CR values of each item were compared to determine their discriminative power^[32]. The items without significantly distinct CRs were eliminated as they lacked competency to distinguish high scores and low scores.

For single factor analysis, we performed the t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for parameter testing, and the Mann–Whitney U test for non-parameter testing. Multiple linear regression (MLR) was utilized in processing multifactor analysis. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$.

Ethnical consideration

This study obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Fudan University School of Public Health. Informed consent was provided by all the participants before the survey.

Results

Pilot study

Participants

Three hundred and sixty-two eligible questionnaires were included in the pilot study from 395 participants, with a valid response rate of 91.65%. The mean age of the respondents was 47.41 ± 18.42 , and approximately half of them had graduated from college (Table 1).

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the pilot study sample (n=362)

Demographic characteristics	Physicians (n=71)	Patient (n=291)
Mean age (range)	39.39 (24–64)	49.43 (20–96)
Gender, n (%)		
Male	33	123 (42.3%)

	38	165 (56.6%)
Education, n (%)		
College and above	67 (94.4%)	112 (38.5%)
Senior school	4 (5.6%)	83 (28.5%)
Junior school	0	72 (24.7%)
Primary school and below	0	12 (4.1%)
Setting, n (%)		
Community hospital	42 (59.2%)	130 (44.7%)
General hospital	29 (40.8%)	161 (55.3%)

Confirmatory factor analysis of the C-PPOS

The CFA of the C-PPOS indicated poor model fit (Table 2), which called for further revision.

Table 2

Goodness-of-fit indices of the CFA of the CR-PPOS and the original C-PPOS

Model fit indicator	Two factors (18 items)	Two factors (11 items)	Reference value
χ^2/df	5.04	1.85	<3
P-value	<0.001	<0.001	>0.05
RMSEA	0.11	0.06	<0.08
GFI	0.76	0.94	>0.90
AGFI	0.70	0.90	>0.90
NFI	0.52	0.81	>0.90
IFI	0.58	0.90	>0.90
CFI	0.57	0.90	>0.90

Revision of the C-PPOS

1
2
3 The Cronbach's α of each subscale of C-PPOS was tested as the first step of item
4 reduction. The Cronbach's α of C-PPOS was 0.668, with a Caring subscale score of
5 0.493 and a Sharing subscale of 0.575, showing poor internal consistent reliability.
6
7 Hence, items were eliminated in a stepwise manner for each subscale separately until
8 elimination of another item would lead to a decrease in the Cronbach's α of its
9 corresponding dimension. Finally, five out of nine items were retained in the Caring
10 subscale, and eight out of nine items (except for C-PPOS9) were retained in the
11 Sharing subscale.
12
13

14
15
16
17
18
19 In EFA, the Bartlett's sphericity test reported a Chi-square value of 112.364 ($p < 0.001$)
20 for the Caring subscale and 146.846 ($p < 0.001$) for the Sharing subscale. The Kaiser–
21 Meyer–Olkin (KMO) indices for the two subscales were 0.727 and 0.694, respectively.
22 For EFA round 1, all five of the retained items of the Caring subscale were under one
23 principal component, which had an eigenvalue greater than 1 (2.197), explaining
24 43.949% of the total variance. In the Sharing subscale, C-PPOS4 and C-PPOS10 were
25 removed as they met exclusion criteria. Afterward, EFA was performed again on the
26 retained six items of the Sharing subscale. This time all six items loaded under one
27 principal component (eigenvalue=2.247), which explained 37.448% of the total
28 variance. Subsequently, a fixed two-factor EFA was performed to verify the construct
29 of the merged 11-item scale. The result indicated that the five items of the Caring
30 subscale and the six items of the Sharing subscale were well separated, explaining
31 41.67% of the total variance.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 CFA was performed with the 11-item revised C-PPOS (CR-PPOS), according to the
46 prior model, indicating a more acceptable and greatly improved model fit compared
47 with the original scale (Table 2).
48
49

50 ***Reliability of the CR-PPOS***

51
52
53
54 The Cronbach's α of the entire CR-PPOS was 0.735, with 0.709 in the Caring
55 subscale and 0.644 in the Sharing subscale. Furthermore, the scores of the two
56
57
58
59
60

subscale were significantly correlated to the total scale, with Spearman coefficients of 0.744 (Caring) and 0.840 (Sharing), which were higher than that of these two subscales (0.312). The ICC was 0.787 for the CR-PPOS, 0.911 for the Caring subscale, and 0.602 for the Sharing subscale. The ICC for the 11 single items ranged from 0.481 to 0.812. The correlations were all statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating satisfactory test-retest reliability.

Validity of the CR-PPOS

The construct validity was well verified through EFA and CFA (see above). As for content validity, the 11 items' scores and their corresponding subscales' scores were all significantly correlated ($p < 0.01$), with Spearman coefficients ranging from 0.452 to 0.717.

Discriminative power of the CR-PPOS

The CR values of the 11 items were all less than 0.01, reaching statistically significant levels. Thus, the items retained in the CR-PPOS had good discriminative power.

Formal study

Participants

Six hundred and fifty-six eligible questionnaires out of 792 participants were retrieved in this stage, with a valid response rate of 82.83%. One hundred and sixteen physicians and 540 patients were included. Respondents' demographic information is partly shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3

Physicians' demographic characteristics (partly) and CR-PPOS scores

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total		
Gender						
* p<0.0						
5	Male	43 (37.1%)	4.75±0.95	2.81±0.79	3.62±0.62	
9	Female	73 (62.9%)	4.68±0.74	3.01±0.77	3.68±0.57	
11	Table	P value	0.666	0.166	0.648	
Age (Group)						
18	demo	–35	50 (43.1%)	4.78±0.96	2.89±0.71	3.69±0.61
20	graph	–50	52 (44.8%)	4.69±0.63	2.92±0.85	3.63±0.52
22	ic	51–	10 (8.7%)	4.74±0.36	3.33±0.66	3.90±0.41
24	chara	P value	0.827	0.247	0.363	
26	cteris					
28	tics					
Education						
30	(partl					
32	y)	Senior school or below	2 (1.7%)	4.20±0.00	3.00±0.17	3.41±0.14
34	and	College	71 (61.2%)	4.69±0.87	3.04±0.76	3.69±0.64
36	CR-P	Postgraduate	42 (36.2%)	4.78±0.75	2.75±0.80	3.61±0.51
38	POS	P value	0.572	0.161	0.672	
40	score					
42	s					
Marriage status						
45		Married	89 (76.7%)	4.69±0.76	2.91±0.77	3.64±0.53
47		Unmarried	26 (22.4%)	4.88±0.82	3.08±0.74	3.82±0.61
49		P value	0.270	0.318	0.149	

Gender				
Male	195 (36.1%)	4.11±0.95	3.17±0.74	3.49±0.71
Female	330 (61.1%)	4.07±0.96	3.09±0.77	3.44±0.69
P value		0.574	0.295	0.468
Age (Group)				
-35	175 (32.4%)	4.24±0.91	3.32±0.68	3.59±0.67
-50	102 (18.9%)	4.00±1.00	3.02±0.83	3.37±0.75
-65	129 (23.9%)	3.93±1.02	3.00±0.76	3.35±0.72
66-	107 (19.8%)	4.14±0.86	3.12±0.77	3.50±0.64
P value		0.034*	0.001*	0.009*
Education				
Primary school or below	39 (7.2%)	3.93±1.00	2.97±0.81	3.29±0.78
Junior school	112 (20.7%)	3.89±0.95	2.99±0.77	3.29±0.67
Senior school	162 (30.0%)	4.06±0.95	3.12±0.71	3.46±0.69
College or above	203 (37.6%)	4.26±0.93	3.23±0.80	3.59±0.70
P value		0.007*	0.030*	0.002*
Personal income (CNY)				
<1500	23 (4.3%)	3.91±0.93	2.96±0.83	3.27±0.61
-3000	105 (19.4%)	3.83±1.02	2.96±0.83	3.23±0.77
-5000	192 (35.6%)	4.14±0.95	3.16±0.79	3.51±0.71
-10000	115 (21.3%)	4.17±0.94	3.13±0.68	3.54±0.63
10000-	70 (13.0%)	4.11±0.97	3.26±0.73	3.48±0.73

P value		0.048*	0.086	0.006*
Experience as medical staff				
Yes	27 (5.0%)	3.67±1.07	2.84±0.76	3.12±0.80
No	241 (44.6%)	4.05±1.00	3.22±0.75	3.46±0.75
P value		0.071	0.013*	0.028*

*p<0.05

Comparison of physicians' and patients' CR-PPOS scores

The physicians received an average CR-PPOS score of 3.66±0.59, and the patients' average score was significantly lower (3.46±0.70). The physicians scored higher in Caring (4.71±0.82 vs. 4.08±0.95), while the patients scored higher in Sharing (3.13±0.76 vs. 2.94±0.78). The differences were all statistically significant (p<0.05).

Demographic characteristics and CR-PPOS scores

The scores of physicians and patients with distinct demographic characteristics were compared, as partly listed in Tables 3 and 4. Both patients' age and education level were significantly associated with their scores on the Caring subscale(p<0.05), the Sharing subscale(p<0.001) and the total CR-PPOS(p<0.01). While patients' income was only significantly associated with the Caring subscale score(p<0.05) and the total CR-PPOS score(p<0.01). Besides, patients' experience as medical staff was likely to gain their scores on the Sharing subscale(p<0.05) and the total CR-PPOS(p<0.05). However, no associations of such were traced among physicians.

Physicians' burnout and CR-PPOS scores

The burnout level of physicians was measured by the MBI-GS. According to the data,

1
2
3 the group of “relatively severe” (scoring 3–5) and the group of “extremely severe”
4 (scoring 5 or above) were merged as a “severe” group (scoring 3 or above), compared
5 with the “light” group (scoring 3 or below). Physicians who reported “severe” burnout
6 scored significantly lower in both the Caring subscale and the total scale than those
7 reporting “light” burnout.
8
9

10 11 12 13 ***Physicians’ medical communication competency and CR-PPOS scores*** 14

15
16 Ninety-nine percent of physicians completed the MCCS, which aimed to assess the
17 medical communication competency of both physicians and patients. Although
18 physicians were normally assessed by their patients using MCCS, we transformed this
19 into a self-reported scale for physicians in this study. The results indicated that,
20 although the scores of the four dimensions within MCCS were related, no correlation
21 was found between the MCCS scores and the CR-PPOS scores as well as its
22 subscales.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 ***Patients’ anxiety and depression and CR-PPOS scores*** 32

33
34 Five hundred and two patients finished the HADS, an instrument for rapidly screening
35 anxiety and depressive symptoms among clinic physicians and patients. Patients got a
36 mean score of 11.57 in the anxiety subscale and 11.77 in the depression subscale.
37 Three hundred nine patients (57.2%) were determined to be anxiety-positive, and two
38 hundred and seventy seven (51.3%) were determined as depression-positive.
39
40
41
42
43

44 As anxiety and depressive symptoms were highly comorbid, which was also proven in
45 our study ($r_s=0.520$), a two-way ANOVA was performed as the first stage to explore
46 whether an interaction effect existed. It turned out that there was no interaction effect
47 of anxiety and depression. Anxiety was found to lead to a decrease in patients’ scores
48 on both the Caring subscale($p<0.05$) and the total CR-PPOS($p<0.05$). However,
49 patients’ scores on neither the total scale nor the subscales seemed to be influenced by
50 their depressive symptoms.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Patients' health literacy, PCCS, and CR-PPOS scores

Using the three-item Rapid Health Literacy Scale, no statistical difference was found in the total CR-PPOS score and the two subscale scores between the poor literacy group and the adequate literacy group, while patients' health literacy scores showed a significantly positive correlation with their Sharing subscale scores ($r_s=0.112$). Similarly, patients' confidence in medical communication measured by PCCS was inversely correlated with their scores on the Sharing subscale ($r_s=-0.261$). In the following partial correlation tests, the correlation between PCCS and the Sharing subscale score remained significant after controlling for the health literacy score, while no correlation existed between the health literacy score and the Sharing subscale score after controlling for PCCS.

Multivariable analysis

After testing the feasibility, MLR was employed to detect the factors that might exert influence on physicians' and patients' preferences toward patient-centered communication. The results showed that the total burnout level might be the influential factor for physicians in Caring and total CR-PPOS scores, and more factors impacted patients' preference toward patient-centered communication in different dimensions (Table 5).

Table 5

Variables influencing CR-PPOS scores

Dimension	Variables	B	95% CI	P
Physicians				
Caring subscale	Total burn-out	-0.417	(-0.801, -0.033)	0.034
	Sharing subscale			
CR-PPOS total	Total burn-out	-0.341	(-0.611, -0.071)	0.014
Patients				

Caring subscale	Age (Group)	-0.292	(-0.499, -0.086)	0.006
	Education	0.251	(0.079, 0.423)	0.005
	Experience as medical staff	0.538	(0.046, 1.029)	0.032
Sharing subscale	Age (Group)	-0.202	(-0.361, -0.043)	0.013
	Education	0.169	(0.039, 0.299)	0.011
	Experience as medical staff	0.481	(0.109, 0.852)	0.012
	Marriage status	-0.336	(-0.666, -0.006)	0.046
	Confidence in medical communication	-0.298	(-0.451, -0.146)	<0.001
CR-PPOS total	Age (Group)	-0.242	(-0.396, -0.087)	0.001
	Education	0.222	(0.093, 0.350)	0.001
	Experience as medical staff	0.476	(0.111, 0.842)	0.011

Discussion

Although the PPOS has been widely used in various languages, only a few studies have systematically tested its psychometric property while applying it^[33-35], and no related results have been reported in China yet. This study showed that neither the ICC of the overall 18-item C-PPOS nor its two subscales were above 0.7, which was comparable to the existing research but still not good enough. Deletion of items 9 and 17 improved the Cronbach's α , which is consistent with a study conducted in Sri Lanka^[36]. After modifying, the two subscales of the 11-item PPOS were well separated in a fixed-factor EFA, with better indexes than prior similar studies, and the overall scale validity was reconfirmed by CFA. Taking into account the test-retest reliability and discriminative power, the 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better psychometric property than the original 18-item scale; thus it is considered to have

1
2
3 greater applicability in the Chinese population.
4

5
6 Using the 11-item CR-PPOS, physicians and patients indicated similar trends in the
7
8 achieved scores. In the overall scale, they both obtained medium scores (around the
9
10 median value of 3.5), and they both had relatively high Caring scores (over 4.0) and
11
12 low Sharing scores (around 3.0 or below). This indicated that, although physicians
13
14 and patients generally showed a medium level of patient-centeredness in clinical
15
16 communication, they expressed higher preferences toward caring from a
17
18 biopsychosocial perspective than shared information and involvement in decision
19
20 making. Although the physicians' data is still absent in China, the 95% confidence
21
22 interval of mean score of patients in this study slightly overlapped that of the prior
23
24 study^[21], which implied that Chinese patients might express similar preferences
25
26 toward patient-centered communication, regardless of the regions they were living in.
27
28 The differences between the scores of physicians and patients, however, may still
29
30 prompt the gap in Chinese physicians and patients regarding their understanding and
31
32 expectations in clinical communication. Comparing the data of this study with that
33
34 from abroad, the majority showed a similar pattern that physicians were more
35
36 patient-centered in Caring than in Sharing, but there were still two exceptions for the
37
38 surveys conducted in Portugal and Australia, indicating opposite results^[37,38], which
39
40 may be due to the difference in physician training modes and local health systems.
41
42 Thus, further research is needed to determine the reasons for such a distinction.

43
44 Preference toward patient-centered communication, as measured by the PPOS, is
45
46 influenced by both personal characteristics and social environmental factors. This
47
48 study made the first attempt to detect the potential influential factors of
49
50 patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians. The results showed no
51
52 association between PPOS scores and a series of factors, including gender, age,
53
54 education level, career length, and type of setting. These results were consistent with
55
56 several prior studies in other countries, except gender differences, for female
57
58 physicians scored significantly higher than male colleagues in some studies^[39,40].
59
60 Apart from these factors, which were frequently mentioned in the existing research,

1
2
3 we found that burnout level might exert impact on physicians' PPOS total score as
4 well as their Caring subscale score, indicating that physicians with a higher total
5 burnout level were generally less likely to be patient-centered in clinical
6 communication. Although we assumed that poor communication ability may relate to
7 a lower preference for patient-centeredness in communication, no link was found
8 between physicians' medical communication competency measured by MCCS and
9 their PPOS scores in this study.
10
11

12
13
14
15
16
17 Ting^[20] reported that age and education mainly influence Chinese patients' overall
18 preference on patient-centered communication. In this study, younger and/or
19 better-educated patients also expressed a higher preference for patient-centered
20 communication in both the Caring and Sharing dimensions. Although some studies
21 have reported a gender difference^[33,36,41,42], it seems that in case of Chinese patients,
22 age and education level, rather than gender, contribute to the different preferences
23 toward patient-centered communication. Meanwhile, the type of setting and social
24 economic status are not considered as influential factors, which is controversial^[42]. It
25 was found that experience as medical staff decreased the extent to which patients
26 wanted a patient-centered communication style. One plausible explanation is that
27 those who had worked as medical staff had obtained a more comprehensive
28 understanding of how things were inside the hospital than those who had not. Thus,
29 they subconsciously lowered their expectation of a patient-centered manner in
30 communication, which might raise demand for physicians, due to their sympathy
31 toward the doctor groups for their daily heavy workload. Additionally, although
32 anxiety was detected as an influential factor in single factor analysis, the final
33 regression model showed patients' PPOS scores were irrelevant to their anxiety and
34 depression status. There is also a need to further probe the role of patient
35 communication confidence, as well as its seeming mediation effect on the relationship
36 between patients' health literacy and preference for shared information and decision
37 making.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Conclusion**

1
2
3 The 11-item C-PPOS was developed with systematical psychometric property
4 revision in this study. Physicians and patients were generally more likely to be
5 patient-centered in medical communication regarding overall biopsychosocial care
6 than shared information and decision making, but there were still significant gaps
7 between physicians and patients on the extent to which they prefer this type of
8 communication. Relieving of burnout would be beneficial for physicians' health, as
9 well as for an increase in patient-centered communication. Patients with young age,
10 high education level, and medical staff experience are inclined to be more
11 patient-centered overall in clinical communication.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 21 ***Practice implications***

22
23
24 The CR-PPOS is a well-tested instrument that can be applied to the Chinese context to
25 measure the preference toward patient-centered communication of physicians and
26 patients. Physicians should learn to recognize patients' preferences and expectations
27 in clinical communication and adapt specific communication strategies to different
28 individuals.
29
30
31
32

33
34 **Competing interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure
35 form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: Jie Wang had financial
36 support from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation for the submitted work, Fan
37 Wang has received funds from Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission; no
38 financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the
39 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that
40 could appear to have influenced the submitted work."
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Ethics committee approval information:** The study was approved by Fudan
49 University School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (No.
50 IRB#2015-12-0575).
51
52
53
54

55 **Contributors:** Jie Wang granted research funding, engaged in study design and data
56 analysis, and was the main drafter of the Introduction and Discussion sections; Runyu
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Zou led study design, data collection, data analysis, and drafted the Method, and
4 Results sections of the manuscript; Hua Fu and Fan Wang were the co-principal
5 investigators of this project, granting research funding and mentoring study design,
6 data collection, and article revision. They also issued final approval for submission;
7 Haihong Qian and Yueren Yan contributed to data collection and refining the article.
8 All authors have approved the final version of this manuscript.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 **Acknowledgments:** We appreciate Professor Edward Krupat from Harvard
17 University for his generous authorization to use and revise PPOS for the Chinese
18 context. We are also grateful to the coordinators of the collaborating hospitals for their
19 kind assistance.

20
21
22
23
24 **Funding:** This work was supported by the first-class General Financial Grant from
25 the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation [grant number 2015M580283] and
26 Construction of the key disciplines of the fourth round public health three-year action
27 plan of Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number
28 15GWZK1001].

29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Technical appendix, statistical code, and dataset available from the Dryad repository,
36 DOI: [include DOI for dataset here].

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Detail has been removed from this case description/these case descriptions to ensure
anonymity. The editors and reviewers have seen the detailed information available
and are satisfied that the information backs up the case the authors are making.

Reference

- 1 Balint E, Ball D, Hare M. Training medical students in patient-centered medicine, *Compr Psychiatry* 1969;10:249-58.
- 2 Hirono I, Hideki H, Takahiro K. The evolving concept of “patient-centeredness” in patient-physician communication research, *Soc Sci Med* 2013;96:147-53.
- 3 Institute of Medicine. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st

- 1
2
3 century. Washington (DC):National Academies Press 2001:39-40.
- 4
5 4 Mohammed A, Mannan F, Chaudhry Z, et al. Quality of care in university hospitals
6
7 in Saudi Arabia: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*2016;6(2):e008988.
- 8
9 5 Catro EM, van Regenmortel T, Vanhaecht K, et al. Patient empowerment, patient
10
11 participation and patient-centeredness in hospital care: A concept analysis based on a
12
13 literature review. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:1923-39.
- 14
15 6 Stewart M, Brown JB, Weston WW, et al. Patient-centered medicine: transforming
16
17 the clinical method, 2nd edn. United Kingdom: Radcliffe Medical Press 2003:5-16.
- 18
19 7 Hudon C, Fortin M, Haggerty JL, et al. Measuring patients' perceptions of
20
21 patient-centered care: a systematic review of tools for family medicine. *Ann Fam
22
23 Med*2011;9:155-64.
- 24
25 8 Epstein RM, Franks P, Fiscella K, et al. Measuring patient-centered communication
26
27 in patient-physician consultations: theoretical and practical issues. *Soc Sci
28
29 Med*2005;61:1516-28.
- 30
31 9 Bensing JM, Verhaak PF, van Dulmen AM, et al. Communication: the royal
32
33 pathway to patient-centered medicine. *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:1-3.
- 34
35 10 Mead N, Bower P. Patient-centeredness: a conceptual framework and review of the
36
37 empirical literature. *Soc Sci Med*2000;51:1087-10.
- 38
39 11 Taylor K. Paternalism, participation and partnership-the evolution of
40
41 patient-centeredness in the consultation. *Patient Educ Couns*2009;74:150-55.
- 42
43 12 Greenfield S, S. Kaplan, J. Ware, E.M. Yano, H. Frank, Patients' participation in
44
45 medical care. *J Gen Intern Med*1988;88:448-57.
- 46
47 13 Marinker M. From compliance to concordance: achieving shared goals in medicine
48
49 taking. *Brit Med J*1997;314:747-8.
- 50
51 14 Schiavo R. Health Communication: From Theory to Practice, 2nd edn. United
52
53 States: Jossay-Bass 2013:195-96.
- 54
55 15 Morris MA, Clayman ML, Peters KJ, et al. Patient-centered communication
56
57 strategies for patients with aphasia: discrepancies between what patients want and
58
59 what physicians do. *Disabil Health J*2015;8:208-15.
- 60
16 Krupat E, Hiam CM, Fleming MZ, et al. Patient-centeredness and its correlates

- 1
2
3 among first year medical students. *Int J Psychiatry Med*1999;29:347-56.
- 4
5 17 Kim J. Differences in attitude toward patient-centeredness in patients and
6
7 physicians. *Korean J Med Educ*2013;25:149-56.
- 8
9 18 Ishikawa I, Eto M, Kitamura K, et al. Resident physicians' attitudes and
10
11 confidence in communicating with patients: A pilot study at a Japanese University
12
13 hospital. *Patient Educ Couns*2014;96:361-66.
- 14
15 19 Tsimtsiou Z, Kirana PS, Hatzichristou D. Determinants of patients' attitudes
16
17 toward patient-centered care: A cross-sectional study in Greece. *Patient Educ*
18
19 *Couns*2014;97:391-95.
- 20
21 20 Dockens AL, Bellon-Harn ML, Manchaiah V. Preference to patient-centeredness in
22
23 pre-service speech and hearing sciences students: a cross-sectional study. *J Audiol*
24
25 *Otol*2016;20:73-9.
- 26
27 21 Ting X, Yong B, Yin L, et al. Patient perception and the barriers to practicing
28
29 patient-centered communication: A survey and in-depth interview of Chinese patients
30
31 and physicians. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:364-69.
- 32
33 22 Krupat E, Rosenkranz SL, Yeager CM, et al. The practice orientations of
34
35 physicians and patients: the effect of doctor-patient congruence on satisfaction.
36
37 *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:49-59.
- 38
39 23 Moore M. What does patient-centered communication mean in Nepal? *Med*
40
41 *Educ*2008;42:18-26.
- 42
43 24 Hair Jr JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, et al. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th edn. Beijing:
44
45 China Machine Press 2011:100-123.
- 46
47 25 Raosoft Inc. Sample size calculation [online]. www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html.
- 48
49 26 Tran A, Haidet P, Street R, et al. Empowering communication: a community-based
50
51 intervention for patients. *Patient Educ Couns*2004;52:113-21.
- 52
53 27 Chew LD, Bradley KA, Boyko EJ. Brief questions to identify patients with
54
55 inadequate health literacy. *Fam Med*2004;36:588-94.
- 56
57 28 Cegala DJ, Coleman MT, Warisse J. The development and partial test of the
58
59 Medical Communication Competence Scale (MCCS). *J Health*
60
*Commun*1998;10:261-88.

- 1
2
3 29 Ponterotto JG, Ruckdeschel DE. An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability
4 matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological
5 research measures. *Percept Mot Skills*2007;105:997-1014.
6
7
8
9 30 Osborne JW, Costello AB. Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four
10 recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Pract Assess Res Eval*
11 2005;10:1-9.
12
13
14 31 Brown TA. Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research, 2nd edn. New York:
15 The Guilford Press 2015:67-73.
16
17
18 32 Backhoff E, Larrazolo N, Rosas M. The level of difficulty and discrimination
19 power of Basic Knowledge and Skill Examination (EXHCOBA). *Revista Electrónica*
20 *de Investigación Educativa* 2000;2(1).
21 www.researchgate.net/publication/266332601_The_Level_of_Difficulty_and_Discrimination_Power_of_the_Basic_Knowledge_and_Skills_Examination_EXHCOBA.htm
22 (accessed 7 Mar 2017).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 33 Krupat E, Yeager CM, Putnam S. Patient role orientations, doctor-patient fit, and
30 visit satisfaction. *Psychol Health*2000;15:707-19.
31
32
33 34 Pereira CM, Amaral CF, Ribeiro MM, et al. Cross-cultural validation of the
34 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale. *Patient Educ Couns*2013;91:37-43.
35
36
37 35 Kiessling C, Fabry G, Rudolf Fisher M, et al. German translation and construct
38 validation of the Patient-Provider Orientation Scale(PPOS-D12). *Psychother*
39 *Psychosom Med Psychol*2014;64:122-27.
40
41
42 36 Mudiyanse RM, Pallegame RW, Jayalath T, et al. Translation and validation of the
43 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale in Sri Lanka. *Educ Health(Ablington)*
44 2015;28:35-40.
45
46
47
48 37 Laplante-Levesque A, Hickson L, Grenness C. An Australian survey of
49 audiologists' preferences for patient-centeredness. *Int J Audiol*2014;53:S76-82.
50
51
52 38 Manchiah V, Gomersall PA, Tome D, et al. Audiologists' preferences for
53 patient-centeredness: a cross sectional questionnaire study of cross-cultural
54 differences and similarities among professionals in Portugal, India and Iran. *BMJ*
55 *Open*2014;4:e005915.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 39 Abiola T, Udofia O, Abdullahi AT. Patient-doctor relationship: the practice
4 orientations of doctors in Kano. *Niger J Clin Pract*2014;17:241-47.
5

6
7 40 Mann KJ, Hoffman A, Miller D, et al. The effect of a patient- and family-centered
8 care curriculum on pediatric residents' patient-centeredness. *J Grad Med*
9 *Educ*2013;5:36-40.
10

11
12 41 Krupat E, Hsu J, Irish J, et al. Matching patients and practitioners based on beliefs
13 about care: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Manag Care*
14 2004;10:814-22.
15

16
17 42 Lau SR, Christensen ST, Andreason JT. Patients' preferences for patient-centered
18 communication: a survey from an outpatient department in rural Sierra Leone. *Patient*
19 *Educ Couns*2013;93:312-18.
20

21
22 43 Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, et al. Preferences of patients for patient-centered
23 approach to consultation in primary care: observational study. *BMJ*2001;322:468-72.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3,4
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5,6,7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7,8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	8
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7,
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	8
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9,12
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9,12
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9,10,12,13
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	9-17
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	19
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	18,21
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	3
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	21
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	22

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale: A study among physicians and patients in clinical settings in Shanghai, China

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016902.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Jie; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Zou, Runyu; Erasmus University Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Fu, Hua; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Qian, Haihong; School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University Yan, Yueren; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Wang, Fan; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University
Primary Subject Heading:	Communication
Secondary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine, Health services research
Keywords:	Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **1 Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication**
5
6 **2 with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale: A**
7
8
9 **3 study among physicians and patients in clinical settings in Shanghai,**
10
11 **4 China**

12
13 Jie Wang^a, ¹Runyu Zou^b, Hua Fu^a, Haihong Qian^c, Yueren Yan^a, Fan Wang^{a*}
14
15

16
17 ^a *Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public*
18 *Health, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.*

19 ^b *Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,*
20 *Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.*

21 ^c *School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.*
22
23

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

13 Words count: 3994 (excluding title, abstract, article summary, competing interests,
14 contributors, acknowledgments, funding, tables, appendix, and references)

¹ Runyu Zou as joint first author

* Corresponding author at: P.O. Box 248, 138 Yixueyuan Road, 200032, Shanghai, China.
E-mail address: wangfan512@126.com Tel:86-21-54237509 (F. Wang)

1
2
3 **Abstract**
4

5
6
7 *Objectives:* The study aimed to explore the preference toward patient-centered
8
9 communication among physicians and patients with the Chinese-revised Patient-
10
11 Practitioner Orientation Scale (CR-PPOS).
12

13
14
15 *Setting:* Participants were recruited in clinical settings from eight medical institutes,
16
17 including four community hospitals and four general hospitals, in Shanghai, China.
18

19
20
21 *Design and participants:* Questionnaire-based surveys were conducted among a total
22
23 of 1018 physicians and patients, in two successive stages in the year of 2015.
24

25
26
27 *Outcome measurements:* Analysis mainly probed (1) psychological properties of the
28
29 original Chinese-translated PPOS version versus the CR-PPOS (2) participants' scores
30
31 on the CR-PPOS and the influential factors.
32

33
34
35 *Results:* Compared with the original PPOS, the 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better
36
37 reliability and validity indicators. Furthermore, it also showed good discriminative
38
39 power. Physicians and patients scored significantly differently on each subscale, as
40
41 well as the total scale of CR-PPOS. Scores of patients were more likely to be
42
43 influenced by various factors, such as age and education, compared with those of
44
45 physicians.
46

47
48
49 *Conclusions:* The CR-PPOS is a better instrument in the Chinese context than the
50
51 original translated version. The congruence and divergence in the extent to which
52
53 patient-centered communication is preferred among Chinese physicians and patients
54
55 should be noted. Adapting physicians' communication strategy to patients' preference
56
57 based on their personal features can be an approach to improve clinical efficiency.
58

59 **Keywords:** Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale
60

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 *Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study*

- 2 • Psychometric properties of PPOS were systematically assessed in Chinese
3 context, with common indicators of reliability, validity and discriminative
4 power.
- 5 • Preference toward patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians
6 was simultaneously measured with that of patients using the CR- PPOS, which
7 made it possible to make comparisons and find differences between both sides.
- 8 • The association between broader variables and participants' preference toward
9 patient-centered communication was explored, such as burnout for physicians
10 and health literacy for patients.
- 11 • Due to feasibility, the participants in this study were only drawn from eight
12 clinical units in Shanghai, and sampling was not exact random, which both
13 brought the issue on selection bias and limited generalization validity.
- 14 • Caution should be used when directly comparing scores measured by the
15 CR-PPOS and the original PPOS, as we developed the CR-PPOS from the
16 PPOS following a standardized statistical process, without the constraint of
17 keeping the number of items constant.

18
19 ***Introduction***

20 In 1969, Balint^[1] was greatly influential in the development of patient-centeredness,
21 which has been one of the most frequently discussed principles in medical practices
22 over the past few decades^[2]. It has also been regarded as one of the six core
23 components of high-quality medical care^[3]. Enhancing patient-centeredness is eagerly
24 highlighted to improve the quality of health care delivery^[4].

25 Patient-centeredness, however, is hard to be uniformly defined^[5]. And it is not for sure
26 that patient-centeredness can be considered as a set of gestures (a combination of

1 setting, language, paralanguage, and so on), or a state of mind. Furthermore, it is
2 uncertain whether it exists as a yearning inside the head of the physician or the patient,
3 whether it is a set of things to do or things to think, or a compendium of things to
4 say^[6].

5 Despite these conundrums, various conceptual models have been raised to illustrate
6 patient-centeredness for the positive effects it brings to medical care ^[7,8]. And
7 Epstein^[9] further indicated that patient-centeredness could be fulfilled from three
8 levels: interpersonal behaviors, technical intervention, and health system innovation.
9 As a key element in interpersonal behaviors between physicians and patients,
10 patient-centered communication has been a highly recommended model, enabling
11 practitioners to offer care that is concordant with the patient's values, needs, and
12 preferences, and that allows patients to become actively involved in decision making
13 regarding their health^[10,11]. Patient-centered communication contributes to building a
14 partnership between physicians and patients, instead of the traditional paternalism^[12].
15 Patient-centered communication has also been reported to improve a variety of
16 patients' clinical outcomes in diverse settings, and enhance their adherence to
17 prescription medications and other types of treatment^[13,14].

18 However, considering the cultural and contextual differences, patient-centered
19 communication may not be universally applicable despite the benefits it
20 offers^[15]. Thus it is suggested that physicians learn patients' communication
21 preference and then incorporate identified communication strategies into their
22 communication style^[16]. However, available instruments that aim to measure the
23 preference toward patient-centered communication remain sparse. Originally
24 developed by Krupat^[17], the Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale (PPOS),
25 embracing the four elements model of patient-centeredness, has been translated into
26 various languages and has gained worldwide popularity in measuring the preference
27 toward patient-centered communication among physicians, medical students, and
28 patients ^[18-21].

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 In China, accounts of patient–physician communication have been hotspots in the new
2 healthcare era, as patient-centeredness is increasingly highlighted in clinical practice.
3 Ting^[22] conducted a survey to detect patients’ preferences toward patient-centered
4 communication in a hospital in the southwest part of China, which was the only
5 known attempt to apply PPOS in China. Despite the innovativeness, there were
6 several limitations within this study. For example, as an instrument introduced from
7 abroad, the psychometric properties, such as reliability and validity, of PPOS in the
8 Chinese context have not been well tested. Secondly, the preference toward
9 conducting patient-centered communication among physicians has not yet been
10 explored. Finally, for a country with vast territory and a population in the billions, a
11 single survey conducted in a specific medical unit may not be adequately
12 representative. Thus it is not clear yet how this instrument works in other regions and
13 surroundings.

14 We conducted this research in Shanghai, which was among the most developed cities
15 in China and possessed abundant high-quality medical resources, aiming to adapt
16 PPOS to Chinese (Mandarin) context and assess its psychometric properties
17 systematically. Furthermore, patients’ as well as physicians’ preferences toward
18 patient-centered communication were measured using the Chinese-revised PPOS
19 (CR-PPOS). In addition, factors that might exert influence on physicians’ and patients’
20 preferences toward patient-centered communication were further explored.

21 ***Methods***

22 ***Description of the instrument***

23 Currently, PPOS has evolved to a version containing 18 items in two dimensions,
24 Caring and Sharing^[23]. The nine-item Caring subscale reflects the degree to which
25 physicians care about providing warmth and emotional support and regard patient as a
26 whole person. The nine-item Sharing subscale reflects the degree to which physicians
27 should share decision making information and power with the patients^[17]. A higher

1 PPOS total score as well as subscale scores indicates a higher preference toward
2 patient-centered style in clinical communication. Conversely, a low Caring score
3 indicates a tendency toward disease-centered style, while a low Sharing score
4 indicates a tendency toward doctor-centered style.

5 ***Translation and cultural adaption***

6 Obtaining the permission to translate and develop PPOS in the Chinese context by the
7 original author, scholars with academic backgrounds in medicine, public health,
8 communication, Chinese and English languages, respectively, were invited to translate
9 the PPOS to Chinese(Mandarin).Afterward, the bilingual PPOS versions were sent
10 separately to another five advanced health practitioners for further suggestions and
11 modifications. The Chinese PPOS(C-PPOS) was then back-translated into English
12 and sent back to the original author for confirmation.

13 For this C-PPOS, we strove to fit every item to its original version, except for item 17
14 due to noticeable culture difference. Thus, it was replaced by “A friendly manner is a
15 major ingredient in the doctor’s treatment of the patients”, according to the results of
16 a prior study in Nepal^[24]. Additionally, item 2 was back-translated as “Compared with
17 centering on individual patients in the past, focusing on the comprehensive quality of
18 medical services nowadays is more valuable for propelling medical development”,
19 which differed from the original item “Although health care is less personal these
20 days, this is a small price to pay for medical advances” in expression but was mostly
21 consistent in meaning. Finally, 12 physicians and 18 patients were enrolled in
22 cognitive interviews to further enhance the comprehensibility of the scale in the
23 Chinese cultural context.

24 ***Pilot study design***

25 A pilot study was conducted in eight clinical settings in Shanghai, including four
26 community hospitals and four general hospitals. As a minimum sample size of 5 to 10
27 times the number of scale items for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and 10 to 20

1 times for confirmative factor analysis^[25] was required, as well as taking the probable
2 invalid responses into consideration, we included 400 interviewees. It was assumed
3 that physicians should comprise at least 20% of the total sample. Physicians and
4 patients were recruited from the outpatient department of each hospital. Every eligible
5 participant was requested to complete an anonymous short questionnaire containing
6 the C-PPOS. Retrieved questionnaires were carefully checked, and those with bad
7 quality were removed from the dataset, including those with missing item scores or
8 with the same item score throughout the entire scale.

9 *Psychometric properties assessment*

10 In this study, we assessed the psychometric properties via reliability, validity, and
11 discriminative power tests, based on which the C-PPOS was revised to the CR-PPOS.

12 Internal consistency and test–retest reliability are the most widely tested indicators for
13 reliability, thus we performed both in this study. In the test–retest survey, 60
14 participants completed the C-PPOS again after 2 to 4 weeks.

15 Hereby we performed EFA and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess construct
16 validity. In addition, content validity was assessed by testing the correlation of the
17 score of each item and the score of the subscale the item belonged to, as well as the
18 score of the total scale.

19 Discriminative power reflects the extent to which an item can distinguish different
20 levels of target variables. We tested discriminative power by comparing the critical
21 value (CR) of each item.

22 *Formal study design*

23 The formal survey was launched 1 month later, in the same settings where the pilot
24 study was conducted. As a cross-sectional study, the sample size was calculated to be
25 664 according to the formula provided by Raosoft, Inc.^[26], with a total population size
26 of 24,000,000 (the estimated population of Shanghai) and a confidence level of 99%.

1
2
3
4 1 It was then expanded to 750 to guarantee adequate valid responses. Physician and
5
6 2 patient participants were recruited in a similar way as that in the pilot study. After
7
8 3 confirming the informed consent, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire
9
10 4 containing CR-PPOS, general information (gender, age, education, marriage status,
11
12 5 socioeconomic status, self-reported health condition, etc.), and some other
13
14 6 well-validated instruments, such as the Patient Confidence in Communication Scale
15
16 7 (PCCS)^[27], Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), the Rapid Health
17
18 8 Literacy Scale^[28] for patients, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey
19
20 9 (MBI-GS) and Medical Communication Competence Scale (MCCS)^[29] for
21
22 10 physicians.

23 ***Statistical analysis***

24
25
26 12 We utilized Epidata 3.1 and Excel 2007 software for dataset establishment. IBM SPSS
27
28 13 20.0 and AMOS 21.0 were employed to perform data cleaning and analysis.

29
30
31 14 Cronbach's α coefficient was tested as the indicator of internal consistency and
32
33 15 reliability. Normally, a Cronbach's α of no less than 0.6 is deemed acceptable for an
34
35 16 instrument with a relatively small number of items (i.e. no more than 6)^[30]. Test-retest
36
37 17 reliability was assessed as the indicator of interclass correlation coefficient (ICC).
38
39 18 Test-retest reliability was considered poor if the ICC value was lower than 0.4 and/or
40
41 19 the correlation was not statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).

42
43 20 For EFA, data were subjected to a principal component analysis with extraction of
44
45 21 eigenvalues (greater than 1) for subscales (EFA round 1) and fixed two factors for the
46
47 22 total scale (EFA round 2). In EFA round 1, items were removed if a) their factor
48
49 23 loadings under either dimension were greater than 0.4, b) their factor loadings under
50
51 24 any two dimensions were close (the absolute value difference was less than 0.1), and c)
52
53 25 they were the only item under one dimension^[31].

54
55 26 CFA was performed by maximum likelihood analysis to verify the main adjustment
56
57 27 indices of the model, including chi-squared/degree of freedom (χ^2/df), root mean

1 square error of approximation (RMSEA), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted
2 goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed-fit index (NFI), incremental fit index (IFI), and
3 comparative fit index (CFI). The recommended χ^2/df ratio is 1 to 3, and RMSEA
4 value <0.08 and GFI, AGFI, NNFI, IFI, and CFI >0.9 suggest ideal model fit^[32].

5 Respondents with the highest (top 27%) and lowest (bottom 27%) total scale scores
6 were divided into two groups, after which their CR values of each item were
7 compared to determine their discriminative power^[33]. The items without significantly
8 distinct CRs were eliminated as they lacked competency to distinguish high scores
9 and low scores.

10 For single factor analysis, we performed the t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA)
11 for parameter testing, and the Mann–Whitney U test for non-parameter testing.
12 Multiple linear regression (MLR) was utilized in processing multifactor analysis.
13 Statistical significance was set at $P<0.05$.

14 ***Ethnical consideration***

15 This study obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Fudan
16 University School of Public Health. Informed consent was provided by all the
17 participants before the survey.

18 ***Results***

19 ***Pilot study***

20 ***Participants***

21 Three hundred and sixty-two eligible questionnaires were included in the pilot study
22 from 395 participants, with a valid response rate of 91.65%. The mean age of the
23 respondents was 47.41 ± 18.42 , and approximately half of them had graduated from
24 college (Table 1).

25 **Table 1**

1 Demographic characteristics of the pilot study sample (n=362)

Demographic characteristics	Physicians (n=71)	Patient (n=291)
Mean age (range)	39.39 (24–64)	49.43 (20–96)
Gender, n (%)		
Male	33(46.5%)	123 (42.3%)
Female	38(53.5%)	165 (56.6%)
Education, n (%)		
College and above	67 (94.4%)	112 (38.5%)
Senior school	4 (5.6%)	83 (28.5%)
Junior school	0	72 (24.7%)
Primary school and below	0	12 (4.1%)
Setting, n (%)		
Community hospital	42 (59.2%)	130 (44.7%)
General hospital	29 (40.8%)	161 (55.3%)

2

3 ***Confirmatory factor analysis of the C-PPOS***

4 The CFA of the C-PPOS indicated poor model fit (Table 2), which called for further
5 revision.

6 **Table 2**

7 Goodness-of-fit indices of the CFA of the CR-PPOS and the original C-PPOS

Model fit indicator	Two factors (18 items)	Two factors (11 items)	Reference value
χ^2/df	5.04	1.85	<3
P-value	<0.001	<0.001	>0.05
RMSEA	0.11	0.06	<0.08
GFI	0.76	0.94	>0.90

AGFI	0.70	0.90	>0.90
NFI	0.52	0.81	>0.90
IFI	0.58	0.90	>0.90
CFI	0.57	0.90	>0.90

1

2 *Revision of the C-PPOS*

3 The Cronbach's α of each subscale of C-PPOS was tested as the first step of item
 4 reduction. The Cronbach's α of C-PPOS was 0.668, with a Caring subscale score of
 5 0.493 and a Sharing subscale of 0.575, showing poor internal consistent reliability.
 6 Hence, items were eliminated in a stepwise manner for each subscale separately until
 7 elimination of another item would lead to a decrease in the Cronbach's α of its
 8 corresponding dimension. Finally, five out of nine items were retained in the Caring
 9 subscale, and eight out of nine items (except for C-PPOS9) were retained in the
 10 Sharing subscale.

11 In EFA, the Bartlett's sphericity test reported a Chi-square value of 112.364 ($p < 0.001$)
 12 for the Caring subscale and 146.846 ($p < 0.001$) for the Sharing subscale. The Kaiser–
 13 Meyer–Olkin (KMO) indices for the two subscales were 0.727 and 0.694, respectively.
 14 For EFA round 1, all five of the retained items of the Caring subscale were under one
 15 principal component, which had an eigenvalue greater than 1 (2.197), explaining
 16 43.949% of the total variance. In the Sharing subscale, C-PPOS4 and C-PPOS10 were
 17 removed as they met exclusion criteria. Afterward, EFA was performed again on the
 18 retained six items of the Sharing subscale. This time all six items loaded under one
 19 principal component (eigenvalue=2.247), which explained 37.448% of the total
 20 variance. Subsequently, a fixed two-factor EFA was performed to verify the construct
 21 of the merged 11-item scale. The result indicated that the five items of the Caring
 22 subscale and the six items of the Sharing subscale were well separated, explaining
 23 41.67% of the total variance.

1 CFA was performed with the 11-item revised C-PPOS (CR-PPOS, see supplementary
2 appendix), according to the prior model, indicating a more acceptable and greatly
3 improved model fit compared with the original scale (Table 2).

4 ***Reliability of the CR-PPOS***

5 The Cronbach's α of the entire CR-PPOS was 0.735, with 0.709 in the Caring
6 subscale and 0.644 in the Sharing subscale. Furthermore, the scores of the two
7 subscales were significantly correlated to the total scale, with Spearman coefficients
8 of 0.744 (Caring) and 0.840 (Sharing), which were higher than that of these two
9 subscales (0.312). The ICC was 0.787 for the CR-PPOS, 0.911 for the Caring subscale,
10 and 0.602 for the Sharing subscale. The ICC for the 11 single items ranged from 0.481
11 to 0.812. The correlations were all statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating
12 satisfactory test-retest reliability.

13 ***Validity of the CR-PPOS***

14 The construct validity was well verified through EFA and CFA (see above). As for
15 content validity, the 11 items' scores and their corresponding subscales' scores were
16 all significantly correlated ($p < 0.01$), with Spearman coefficients ranging from 0.452
17 to 0.717.

18 ***Discriminative power of the CR-PPOS***

19 The CR values of the 11 items were all less than 0.01, reaching statistically significant
20 levels. Thus, the items retained in the CR-PPOS had good discriminative power.

21 ***Formal study***

22 ***Participants***

23 Six hundred and fifty-six eligible questionnaires out of 792 participants were retrieved
24 in this stage, with a valid response rate of 82.83%. One hundred and sixteen
25 physicians and 540 patients were included. Respondents' demographic information is

1 partly shown in Tables 3 and 4.

2 **Table 3**

3 Physicians' demographic characteristics (partly) and CR-PPOS scores

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total
Gender				
Male	43 (37.1%)	4.75±0.95	2.81±0.79	3.62±0.62
Female	73 (62.9%)	4.68±0.74	3.01±0.77	3.68±0.57
P value		0.666	0.166	0.648
Age (Group)				
–35	50 (43.1%)	4.78±0.96	2.89±0.71	3.69±0.61
–50	52 (44.8%)	4.69±0.63	2.92±0.85	3.63±0.52
51–	10 (8.7%)	4.74±0.36	3.33±0.66	3.90±0.41
P value		0.827	0.247	0.363
Education				
Senior school or below	2 (1.7%)	4.20±0.00	3.00±0.17	3.41±0.14
College	71 (61.2%)	4.69±0.87	3.04±0.76	3.69±0.64
Postgraduate	42 (36.2%)	4.78±0.75	2.75±0.80	3.61±0.51
P value		0.572	0.161	0.672
Marriage status				
Married	89 (76.7%)	4.69±0.76	2.91±0.77	3.64±0.53

1	*	Unmarried	26 (22.4%)	4.88±0.82	3.08±0.74	3.82±0.61
2	p<0.0	P value		0.270	0.318	0.149
3	5					

5 **Table 4**

6 Patients' demographic characteristics (partly) and CR-PPOS scores

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total
Gender				
Male	195 (36.1%)	4.11±0.95	3.17±0.74	3.49±0.71
Female	330 (61.1%)	4.07±0.96	3.09±0.77	3.44±0.69
P value		0.574	0.295	0.468
Age (Group)				
-35	175 (32.4%)	4.24±0.91	3.32±0.68	3.59±0.67
-50	102 (18.9%)	4.00±1.00	3.02±0.83	3.37±0.75
-65	129 (23.9%)	3.93±1.02	3.00±0.76	3.35±0.72
66-	107 (19.8%)	4.14±0.86	3.12±0.77	3.50±0.64
P value		0.034*	0.001*	0.009*
Education				
Primary school or below	39 (7.2%)	3.93±1.00	2.97±0.81	3.29±0.78
Junior school	112 (20.7%)	3.89±0.95	2.99±0.77	3.29±0.67
Senior school	162 (30.0%)	4.06±0.95	3.12±0.71	3.46±0.69
College or above	203 (37.6%)	4.26±0.93	3.23±0.80	3.59±0.70

P value 0.007* 0.030* 0.002*

Personal income (CNY)

<1500	23 (4.3%)	3.91±0.93	2.96±0.83	3.27±0.61
–3000	105 (19.4%)	3.83±1.02	2.96±0.83	3.23±0.77
–5000	192 (35.6%)	4.14±0.95	3.16±0.79	3.51±0.71
–10000	115 (21.3%)	4.17±0.94	3.13±0.68	3.54±0.63
10000–	70 (13.0%)	4.11±0.97	3.26±0.73	3.48±0.73
P value		0.048*	0.086	0.006*

Experience as medical

staff

Yes	27 (5.0%)	3.67±1.07	2.84±0.76	3.12±0.80
No	241 (44.6%)	4.05±1.00	3.22±0.75	3.46±0.75
P value		0.071	0.013*	0.028*

*p<0.05

3 *Comparison of physicians' and patients' CR-PPOS scores*

4 The physicians received an average CR-PPOS score of 3.66±0.59, and the patients'
5 average score was significantly lower (3.46±0.70). The physicians scored higher in
6 Caring (4.71±0.82 vs. 4.08±0.95), while the patients scored higher in Sharing
7 (3.13±0.76 vs. 2.94±0.78). The differences were all statistically significant (p<0.05).

8 *Demographic characteristics and CR-PPOS scores*

9 The scores of physicians and patients with distinct demographic characteristics were
10 compared, as partly listed in Tables 3 and 4. Both patients' age and education level

1 were significantly associated with their scores on the Caring subscale($p<0.05$), the
2 Sharing subscale($p<0.001$) and the total CR-PPOS($p<0.01$). While patients' income
3 was only significantly associated with the Caring subscale score($p<0.05$) and the total
4 CR-PPOS score($p<0.01$). Besides, patients' experience as medical staff was likely to
5 gain their scores on the Sharing subscale($p<0.05$) and the total CR-PPOS($p<0.05$).
6 However, no associations of such were traced among physicians.

7 ***Physicians' burnout and CR-PPOS scores***

8 The burnout level of physicians was measured by the MBI-GS. According to the data,
9 the group of "relatively severe" (scoring 3–5) and the group of "extremely severe"
10 (scoring 5 or above) were merged as a "severe" group (scoring 3 or above), compared
11 with the "light" group (scoring 3 or below). Physicians who reported "severe" burnout
12 scored significantly lower in both the Caring subscale and the total scale than those
13 reporting "light" burnout.

14 ***Physicians' medical communication competency and CR-PPOS scores***

15 Ninety-nine percent of physicians completed the MCCS, which aimed to assess the
16 medical communication competency of both physicians and patients. Although
17 physicians were normally assessed by their patients using MCCS, we transformed this
18 into a self-reported scale for physicians in this study. The results indicated that,
19 although the scores of the four dimensions within MCCS were related, no correlation
20 was found between the MCCS scores and the CR-PPOS scores as well as its
21 subscales.

22 ***Patients' anxiety and depression and CR-PPOS scores***

23 Five hundred and two patients finished the HADS, an instrument for rapidly screening
24 anxiety and depressive symptoms among clinic physicians and patients. Patients got a
25 mean score of 11.57 in the anxiety subscale and 11.77 in the depression subscale.
26 Three hundred nine patients (57.2%) were determined to be anxiety-positive, and two

1 hundred and seventy seven (51.3%) were determined as depression-positive.
2 Meanwhile, it should be noticed that HADS can only be used for screening purpose,
3 thus the positive results cannot be equal to the anxiety/depression with clinical
4 significance.

5 As anxiety and depressive symptoms were highly comorbid, which was also proven in
6 our study ($r_s=0.520$), a two-way ANOVA was performed as the first stage to explore
7 whether an interaction effect existed. It turned out that there was no interaction effect
8 of anxiety and depression. Anxiety was found to lead to a decrease in patients' scores
9 on both the Caring subscale($p<0.05$) and the total CR-PPOS($p<0.05$). However,
10 patients' scores on neither the total scale nor the subscales seemed to be influenced by
11 their depressive symptoms.

12 *Patients' health literacy, PCCS, and CR-PPOS scores*

13 Using the three-item Rapid Health Literacy Scale, no statistical difference was found
14 in the total CR-PPOS score and the two subscale scores between the poor literacy
15 group and the adequate literacy group, while patients' health literacy scores showed a
16 significantly positive correlation with their Sharing subscale scores ($r_s=0.112$).
17 Similarly, patients' confidence in medical communication measured by PCCS was
18 inversely correlated with their scores on the Sharing subscale ($r_s=-0.261$). In the
19 following partial correlation tests, the correlation between PCCS and the Sharing
20 subscale score remained significant after controlling for the health literacy score,
21 while no correlation existed between the health literacy score and the Sharing
22 subscale score after controlling for PCCS.

23 *Multivariable analysis*

24 After testing the feasibility, MLR was employed to detect the factors that might exert
25 influence on physicians' and patients' preferences toward patient-centered
26 communication. The results showed that the total burnout level might be the
27 influential factor for physicians in Caring and total CR-PPOS scores, and more factors

1 impacted patients' preference toward patient-centered communication in different
2 dimensions (Table 5).

3 **Table 5**

4 Variables influencing CR-PPOS scores

Dimension	Variables	B	95% CI	P
Physicians				
Caring subscale	Total burn-out	-0.417	(-0.801, -0.033)	0.034
Sharing subscale				
CR-PPOS total	Total burn-out	-0.341	(-0.611, -0.071)	0.014
Patients				
Caring subscale	Age (Group)	-0.292	(-0.499, -0.086)	0.006
	Education	0.251	(0.079, 0.423)	0.005
	Experience as medical staff	0.538	(0.046, 1.029)	0.032
Sharing subscale	Age (Group)	-0.202	(-0.361, -0.043)	0.013
	Education	0.169	(0.039, 0.299)	0.011
	Experience as medical staff	0.481	(0.109, 0.852)	0.012
	Marriage status	-0.336	(-0.666, -0.006)	0.046
	Confidence in medical communication	-0.298	(-0.451, -0.146)	<0.001
CR-PPOS total	Age (Group)	-0.242	(-0.396, -0.087)	0.001
	Education	0.222	(0.093, 0.350)	0.001
	Experience as medical staff	0.476	(0.111, 0.842)	0.011

5

6 **Discussion**

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Although the PPOS has been widely used in various languages, only a few studies
2 have systematically tested its psychometric property while applying it^[34-36], and no
3 related results have been reported in China yet. This study showed that neither the
4 ICC of the overall 18-item C-PPOS nor its two subscales were above 0.7, which was
5 comparable to the existing research but still not good enough. Deletion of items 9 and
6 17 improved the Cronbach's α , which is consistent with a study conducted in Sri
7 Lanka^[37]. After modifying, the two subscales of the 11-item PPOS were well
8 separated in a fixed-factor EFA, with better indexes than prior similar studies, and the
9 overall scale validity was reconfirmed by CFA. Taking into account the test-retest
10 reliability and discriminative power, the 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better
11 psychometric property than the original 18-item scale; thus it is considered to have
12 greater applicability in the Chinese population.

13 Using the 11-item CR-PPOS, physicians and patients indicated similar trends in the
14 achieved scores. In the overall scale, they both obtained medium scores (around the
15 median value of 3.5), and they both had relatively high Caring scores (over 4.0) and
16 low Sharing scores (around 3.0 or below). This indicated that, although physicians
17 and patients generally showed a medium level of patient-centeredness in clinical
18 communication, they expressed higher preferences toward caring from a
19 biopsychosocial perspective than shared information and involvement in decision
20 making. Although the physicians' data is still absent in China, the 95% confidence
21 interval of mean score of patients in this study slightly overlapped that of the prior
22 study^[22], which implied that Chinese patients might express similar preferences
23 toward patient-centered communication, regardless of the regions they were living in.
24 The differences between the scores of physicians and patients, however, may still
25 prompt the gap in Chinese physicians and patients regarding their understanding and
26 expectations in clinical communication. Comparing the data of this study with that
27 from abroad, the majority showed a similar pattern that physicians were more
28 patient-centered in Caring than in Sharing, but there were still two exceptions for the
29 surveys conducted in Portugal and Australia, indicating opposite results^[38,39], which

1 may be due to the difference in physician training modes and local health systems.
2 Thus, further research is needed to determine the reasons for such a distinction.

3 Preference toward patient-centered communication, as measured by the PPOS, is
4 influenced by both personal characteristics and social environmental factors. This
5 study made the first attempt to detect the potential influential factors of
6 patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians. The results showed no
7 association between PPOS scores and a series of factors, including gender, age,
8 education level, career length, and type of setting. These results were consistent with
9 several prior studies in other countries, except gender differences, for female
10 physicians scored significantly higher than male colleagues in some studies ^[40,41].
11 Apart from these factors, which were frequently mentioned in the existing research,
12 we found that burnout level might exert impact on physicians' PPOS total score as
13 well as their Caring subscale score, indicating that physicians with a higher total
14 burnout level were generally less likely to be patient-centered in clinical
15 communication. Although we assumed that poor communication ability may relate to
16 a lower preference for patient-centeredness in communication, no link was found
17 between physicians' medical communication competency measured by MCCS and
18 their PPOS scores in this study.

19 As Ting^[22] reported, age and education mainly influenced Chinese patients' overall
20 preference on patient-centered communication. In this study, younger and/or
21 better-educated patients also expressed a higher preference for patient-centered
22 communication in both the Caring and Sharing dimensions. Although some studies
23 have reported a gender difference^[34,37,42,43], it seems that in case of Chinese patients,
24 age and education level, rather than gender, contribute to the different preferences
25 toward patient-centered communication. Meanwhile, the type of setting and social
26 economic status are not considered as influential factors, which is controversial^[44]. It
27 was found that experience as medical staff decreased the extent to which patients
28 wanted a patient-centered communication style. One plausible explanation is that
29 those who had worked as medical staff had obtained a more comprehensive

1 understanding of how things were inside the hospital than those who had not. Thus,
2 they subconsciously lowered their expectation of a patient-centered manner in
3 communication, which might raise demand for physicians, due to their sympathy
4 toward the doctor groups for their daily heavy workload. Additionally, although
5 anxiety was detected as an influential factor in single factor analysis, the final
6 regression model showed patients' PPOS scores were irrelevant to their anxiety and
7 depression status. There is also a need to further probe the role of patient
8 communication confidence, as well as its seeming mediation effect on the relationship
9 between patients' health literacy and preference for shared information and decision
10 making.

11 Though we are far away from disentangling the patient-centered conundrum^[6],
12 considering the deteriorating physician-patient relationship in current Chinese society,
13 this study still has significant practice implications. As a valid instrument, the
14 CR-PPOS can be applied to better measure both physicians' and patients' preference
15 toward patient-centered communication in China. On one hand, the divergence in
16 communication preference between physicians and patients can be discovered. On the
17 other hand, it will be possible and reasonable to link certain personal characteristics
18 with individuals' preference toward clinical communication, and in China it is
19 particularly true for patients according to this study. Based on these findings, specific
20 training can be developed and offered to physicians, guiding them how to recognize
21 patients with different communication preferences and adopt corresponding
22 communication strategies afterwards. In this way not only patients' expectations are
23 better fulfilled, but also the communication efficiency is enhanced, both contributing
24 to reduced complaints in clinical communication, and improved physician-patient
25 relationship^[45].

26 **Conclusion**

27 The CR-PPOS was developed as an applicable instrument to measure the preference
28 toward patient-centered communication of physicians and patients in Chinese context.

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Physicians and patients were generally more patient-centered in medical
2 communication regarding overall biopsychosocial care than shared information and
3 decision making, but there were still significant gaps between physicians and patients
4 on the extent to which they prefer this type of communication. Relieving of burnout
5 could help physicians to be more patient-centered in communication. Patients with
6 young age, high education level, and medical staff experience tended to have higher
7 preference toward patient-centered communication.

8 **Competing interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure
9 form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: Jie Wang had financial
10 support from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation for the submitted work, Fan
11 Wang has received funds from Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission; no
12 financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the
13 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that
14 could appear to have influenced the submitted work."

15
16 **Ethics committee approval information:** The study was approved by Fudan
17 University School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (No.
18 IRB#2015-12-0575).

19
20 **Contributors:** Jie Wang granted research funding, engaged in study design and data
21 analysis, and was the main drafter of the Introduction and Discussion sections; Runyu
22 Zou led study design, data collection, data analysis, and drafted the Method, and
23 Results sections of the manuscript; Hua Fu and Fan Wang were the co-principal
24 investigators of this project, granting research funding and mentoring study design,
25 data collection, and article revision. They also issued final approval for submission;
26 Haihong Qian and Yueren Yan contributed to data collection and refining the article.
27 All authors have approved the final version of this manuscript.

28 **Acknowledgments:** We appreciate Professor Edward Krupat from Harvard
29 University for his generous authorization to use and revise PPOS for the Chinese

1 context. We are also grateful to the coordinators of the collaborating hospitals for their
2 kind assistance.

3 **Funding:** This work was supported by the first-class General Financial Grant from
4 the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation [grant number 2015M580283] and
5 Construction of the key disciplines of the fourth round public health three-year action
6 plan of Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission [grant number
7 15GWZK1001].

8 **Data Sharing Statement:** Extra data from this study could be accessed by contacting
9 the corresponding author Fan Wang via wangfan512@126.com.

10 Detail has been removed from this case description/these case descriptions to ensure
11 anonymity. The editors and reviewers have seen the detailed information available
12 and are satisfied that the information backs up the case the authors are making.

13 **Reference**

- 14 1 Balint E, Ball D, Hare M. Training medical students in patient-centered medicine,
15 *Compr Psychiatry*1969;10:249-58.
- 16 2 Hirono I, Hideki H, Takahiro K. The evolving concept of “patient-centeredness” in
17 patient-physician communication research, *Soc Sci Med*2013;96:147-53.
- 18 3 Institute of Medicine. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st
19 century. Washington (DC):National Academies Press 2001:39-40.
- 20 4 Mohammed A, Mannan F, Chaudhry Z, et al. Quality of care in university hospitals
21 in Saudi Arabia: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*2016;6(2):e008988.
- 22 5 Catro EM, van Regenmortel T, Vanhaecht K, et al. Patient empowerment, patient
23 participation and patient-centeredness in hospital care: A concept analysis based on a
24 literature review. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:1923-39.
- 25 6 Skelton J. Language and Clinical Communication: this bright Babylon. Oxford:
26 Radcliffe Publishing 2008:93-98.
- 27

- 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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- 1 7 Stewart M, Brown JB, Weston WW, et al. Patient-centered medicine: transforming
2 the clinical method, 2nd edn. United Kingdom: Radcliffe Medical Press 2003:5-16.
- 3 8 Hudon C, Fortin M, Haggerty JL, et al. Measuring patients' perceptions of
4 patient-centered care: a systematic review of tools for family medicine. *Ann Fam*
5 *Med*2011;9:155-64.
- 6 9 Epstein RM, Franks P, Fiscella K, et al. Measuring patient-centered communication
7 in patient-physician consultations: theoretical and practical issues. *Soc Sci*
8 *Med*2005;61:1516-28.
- 9 10 Bensing JM, Verhaak PF, van Dulmen AM, et al. Communication: the royal
10 pathway to patient-centered medicine. *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:1-3.
- 11 11 Mead N, Bower P. Patient-centeredness: a conceptual framework and review of the
12 empirical literature. *Soc Sci Med*2000;51:1087-10.
- 13 12 Taylor K. Paternalism, participation and partnership-the evolution of
14 patient-centeredness in the consultation. *Patient Educ Couns*2009;74:150-55.
- 15 13 Greenfield S, S. Kaplan, J. Ware, E.M. Yano, H. Frank, Patients' participation in
16 medical care. *J Gen Intern Med*1988;88:448-57.
- 17 14 Marinker M. From compliance to concordance: achieving shared goals in medicine
18 taking. *Brit Med J*1997;314:747-8.
- 19 15 Schiavo R. Health Communication: From Theory to Practice, 2nd edn. San
20 Francisco: Jossay-Bass 2013:195-96.
- 21 16 Morris MA, Clayman ML, Peters KJ, et al. Patient-centered communication
22 strategies for patients with aphasia: discrepancies between what patients want and
23 what physicians do. *Disabil Health J*2015;8:208-15.
- 24 17 Krupat E, Hiam CM, Fleming MZ, et al. Patient-centeredness and its correlates
25 among first year medical students. *Int J Psychiatry Med*1999;29:347-56.
- 26 18 Kim J. Differences in attitude toward patient-centeredness in patients and
27 physicians. *Korean J Med Educ*2013;25:149-56.
- 28 19 Ishikawa I, Eto M, Kitamura K, et al. Resident physicians' attitudes and
29 confidence in communicating with patients: A pilot study at a Japanese University
30 hospital. *Patient Educ Couns*2014;96:361-66.

- 1
2
3 1 20 Tsimtsiou Z, Kirana PS, Hatzichristou D. Determinants of patients' attitudes
4 toward patient-centered care: A cross-sectional study in Greece. *Patient Educ*
5 *Couns*2014;97:391-95.
6
7
8 21 Dockens AL, Bellon-Harn ML, Manchaiah V. Preference to patient-centeredness in
9 pre-service speech and hearing sciences students: a cross-sectional study. *J Audiol*
10 *Otol*2016;20:73-9.
11
12 22 Xu T, Bao Y, Liang Y, et al. Patient perception and the barriers to practicing
13 patient-centered communication: A survey and in-depth interview of Chinese patients
14 and physicians. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:364-69.
15
16 23 Krupat E, Rosenkranz SL, Yeager CM, et al. The practice orientations of
17 physicians and patients: the effect of doctor-patient congruence on satisfaction.
18 *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:49-59.
19
20 24 Moore M. What does patient-centered communication mean in Nepal? *Med*
21 *Educ*2008;42:18-26.
22
23 25 Hair Jr JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, et al. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th edn. Beijing:
24 China Machine Press 2011:100-123.
25
26 26 Raosoft Inc. Sample size calculation [online]. www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html.
27
28 27 Tran A, Haidet P, Street R, et al. Empowering communication: a community-based
29 intervention for patients. *Patient Educ Couns*2004;52:113-21.
30
31 28 Chew LD, Bradley KA, Boyko EJ. Brief questions to identify patients with
32 inadequate health literacy. *Fam Med*2004;36:588-94.
33
34 29 Cegala DJ, Coleman MT, Warisse J. The development and partial test of the
35 Medical Communication Competence Scale (MCCS). *J Health*
36 *Commun*1998;10:261-88.
37
38 30 Ponterotto JG, Ruckdeschel DE. An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability
39 matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological
40 research measures. *Percept Mot Skills*2007;105:997-1014.
41
42 31 Osborne JW, Costello AB. Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four
43 recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Pract Assess Res Eval*
44 2005;10:1-9.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 32 Brown TA. Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research, 2nd edn. New York:
4 The Guilford Press 2015:67-73.
5
6
7 33 Backhoff E, Larrazolo N, Rosas M. The level of difficulty and discrimination
8 power of Basic Knowledge and Skill Examination (EXHCOBA). *Revista Electrónica*
9 de Investigación Educativa 2000;2(1). Retrieved on December 20, 2016 from:
10
11
12 http://redie.uabc.mx/vol2no1/contents-backhoff.html
13
14 34 Krupat E, Yeager CM, Putnam S. Patient role orientations, doctor-patient fit, and
15 visit satisfaction. *Psychol Health*2000;15:707-19.
16
17
18 35 Pereira CM, Amaral CF, Ribeiro MM, et al. Cross-cultural validation of the
19 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale. *Patient Educ Couns*2013;91:37-43.
20
21
22 36 Kiessling C, Fabry G, Rudolf Fisher M, et al. German translation and construct
23 validation of the Patient-Provider Orientation Scale(PPOS-D12). *Psychother*
24 *Psychsom Med Psychol*2014;64:122-27.
25
26
27 37 Mudiyanse RM, Pallegame RW, Jayalath T, et al. Translation and validation of the
28 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale in Sri Lanka. *Educ Health(Ablingdon)*
29 2015;28:35-40.
30
31
32 38 Laplante-Levesque A, Hickson L, Grenness C. An Australian survey of
33 audiologists' preferences for patient-centeredness. *Int J Audiol*2014;53:S76-82.
34
35
36 39 Manchiah V, Gomersall PA, Tome D, et al. Audiologists' preferences for
37 patient-centeredness: a cross sectional questionnaire study of cross-cultural
38 differences and similarities among professionals in Portugal, India and Iran. *BMJ*
39 *Open*2014;4:e005915.
40
41
42 40 Abiola T, Udofia O, Abdullahi AT. Patient-doctor relationship: the practice
43 orientations of doctors in Kano. *Niger J Clin Pract*2014;17:241-47.
44
45
46 41 Mann KJ, Hoffman A, Miller D, et al. The effect of a patient- and family-centered
47 care curriculum on pediatric residents' patient-centeredness. *J Grad Med*
48 *Educ*2013;5:36-40.
49
50
51 42 Krupat E, Hsu J, Irish J, et al. Matching patients and practitioners based on beliefs
52 about care: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Manag Care*
53 2004;10:814-22.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 43 Lau SR, Christensen ST, Andreason JT. Patients' preferences for patient-centered
4 communication: a survey from an outpatient department in rural Sierra Leone. *Patient*
5 *Educ Couns*2013;93:312-18.
6
7
8
9 44 Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, et al. Preferences of patients for patient-centered
10 approach to consultation in primary care: observational study. *BMJ*2001;322:468-72.
11
12 45 Liu X, Rohrer W, Luo A, et al. Doctor-patient communication skills training in
13 mainland China: A systematic review of the literature. *Patient Educ*
14 *Couns*2015;98:3-14.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix**The CR-PPOS (English version)**

Caring subscale

During clinical process, doctors will be suspected of prying the privacy of patients when they ask patients a lot about personal backgrounds.

If a doctor's diagnosis and treatment levels are high enough, the way of his/her communication with patients is not so important.

If a doctor spends too much honesty and enthusiasm in the doctor-patient communication, he/she wouldn't have made great achievements.

Most patients in clinics want to leave the doctors' office as soon as possible(so as to reduce the time communicating with doctors)

For doctors, knowing the patient's culture and backgrounds is not very important for treating illness.

Sharing subscale

During clinical process, doctors should be the ones who dominate the conversation.

Patients should rely on doctor's professional skills during clinical process and should not try to find out the answers to their medical conditions by themselves.

Many patients keep asking questions to doctors, although they are not necessarily getting more new information.

During the clinical process, if a patient does not agree with the opinions of a doctor, then it means that the doctor doesn't get the patient's respect and trust.

During clinical process, patients should always be aware that doctors are dominant.

It is usually not very helpful if patients search for medical information on their own-instead, they could be even more confused.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6-8
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	7,8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7,8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	7
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6,7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	7
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8,9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9,12
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9,12
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9,10,12-17
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	13,14,16
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	18
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	19
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	3
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	21
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	23

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale: A cross-sectional study among physicians and patients in clinical settings in Shanghai, China

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016902.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Wang, Jie; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Zou, Runyu; Erasmus University Medical Center, Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Fu, Hua; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Qian, Haihong; School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University Yan, Yueren; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University Wang, Fan; Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public Health, Fudan University
Primary Subject Heading:	Communication
Secondary Subject Heading:	Patient-centred medicine, Health services research
Keywords:	Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **1 Measuring the preference toward patient-centered communication**
5
6 **2 with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale: A**
7
8 **3 cross-sectional study among physicians and patients in clinical**
9
10 **4 settings in Shanghai, China**

11
12
13 Jie Wang^a, ¹Runyu Zou^b, Hua Fu^a, Haihong Qian^c, Yueren Yan^a, Fan Wang^{a*}
14
15

16
17 ^a *Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, School of Public*
18 *Health, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.*

19 ^b *Department of Epidemiology, Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,*
20 *Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.*

21 ^c *School of Basic Medicine Science, Fudan University, Shanghai, China.*
22
23

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

13 Words count: 4086 (excluding title, abstract, article summary, competing interests,
14 contributors, acknowledgments, funding, tables, appendix, and references)

¹ Runyu Zou as joint first author

* Corresponding author at: P.O. Box 248, 138 Yixueyuan Road, 200032, Shanghai, China.
E-mail address: wangfan512@126.com Tel:86-21-54237509 (F. Wang)

1
2
3 **Abstract**
4

5 *Objectives:* To adapt the Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale (PPOS) a Chinese
6
7 context and explore the preference toward patient-centered communication among
8
9 physicians and patients with the Chinese-revised Patient-Practitioner Orientation
10
11 Scale (CR-PPOS).
12

13
14
15 *Design:* A cross-sectional questionnaire-based study.
16
17

18
19 *Setting:* Clinical settings from eight medical units, including four community
20
21 hospitals and four general hospitals, in Shanghai, China.
22

23
24 *Participants:* 1018 participants, including 187 physicians and 831 patients, completed
25
26 this study in two successive stages.
27

28
29
30 *Outcome measurements:* Psychometric properties of the CR-PPOS, and participants'
31
32 score on the CR-PPOS.
33

34
35
36 *Results:* Compared with the original PPOS, the 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better
37
38 psychometric indices. Physicians and patients scored differently on both the total
39
40 CR-PPOS and its two subscales. Compared with physicians, the scores of patients
41
42 were more influenced by their personal characteristics, such as age and education.
43

44
45
46 *Conclusions:* The CR-PPOS is a better instrument in a Chinese context than the
47
48 original translated version. The divergence in the extent to which patient-centered
49
50 communication is preferred among Chinese physicians and patients should be noted.
51
52 Adapting physicians' communication strategy to patients' preferences based on their
53
54 personal characteristics can be a viable approach toward improving clinical efficiency.
55

56 **Keywords:** Patient-centered communication, Clinical setting, Chinese, Scale
57
58
59
60

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 *Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study*

- 2 • It is the first study to systematically assess the psychometric properties of the
3 PPOS in a Chinese context.
- 4 • Preference toward patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians
5 and patients was simultaneously measured using the CR- PPOS, which made it
6 possible to make comparisons between the two groups.
- 7 • The association between broader factors and participants' preference toward
8 patient-centered communication was explored.
- 9 • For the sake of convenience, the participants in this study were sampled only
10 from eight clinical units in Shanghai, which might lead to limited external
11 validity.
- 12 • Caution should be used when directly comparing scores measured by the
13 CR-PPOS and the PPOS, as the number of items they contain are not
14 consistent.

15
16 **Introduction**

17 In 1969, Balint^[1] was greatly influential in the development of patient-centeredness,
18 which has been one of the most frequently discussed principles in medical practice
19 over the past few decades^[2]. It has also been regarded as one of the six core
20 components of high-quality medical care^[3]. Enhancing patient-centeredness is seen as
21 vital in improving the quality of health care delivery^[4].

22 Patient-centeredness, however, has not been uniformly defined^[5]. It is not clear
23 whether patient-centeredness should be considered as a set of gestures (a combination
24 of setting, language, paralanguage, etc.), or a state of mind. Furthermore, it is
25 uncertain whether patient-centeredness exists as a yearning inside the mind of the
26 physician or the patient, whether it consists of a series of behaviors, or a mindset, or a

1 compendium of things to say^[6].

2 Despite these conundrums, various conceptual models have been created to
3 demonstrate patient-centeredness for the positive effects it brings to medical care^[7,8].

4 Epstein^[9] has indicated that patient-centeredness could be fulfilled at three levels:
5 interpersonal behavior, technical intervention, and health system innovation. As a key
6 element in interpersonal behavior between physicians and patients, patient-centered
7 communication has been a highly recommended model, enabling practitioners to offer
8 care that is concordant with the patient's values, needs, and preferences, and that
9 allows patients to become actively involved in decision that affect their health^[10,11].

10 Patient-centered communication contributes to building a partnership between
11 physicians and patients, instead of the traditional paternalism^[12]. Patient-centered
12 communication has also been reported to improve a variety of clinical outcomes in
13 diverse settings, and to enhance patients' adherence to prescription medication
14 directions and other types of treatment^[13,14].

15 However, considering the cultural and contextual differences that exist in the practice
16 of medicine, patient-centered communication may not be universally applicable
17 despite the benefits it offers^[15]. Thus it is suggested that physicians learn patients'
18 communication preference and then incorporate them into their own communication
19 style^[16]. However, available instruments for measuring the preferences in
20 patient-centered communication remain sparse. Originally developed by Krupat^[17],
21 the Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale (PPOS), which embraces the four element
22 model of patient-centeredness, has been translated into various languages and gained
23 worldwide popularity in measuring the preferences toward patient-centered
24 communication among physicians, medical students, and patients^[18-21].

25 In China, accounts of patient-physician communication have been prominent in the
26 new healthcare era, as patient-centeredness is increasingly highlighted in clinical
27 practice. Ting^[22] conducted a survey to identify patients' preferences toward
28 patient-centered communication in a hospital in the southwest part of China, the only

1 known attempt to apply PPOS in China. Despite its innovativeness, there were several
2 limitations affecting this study. For example, as an instrument introduced from abroad,
3 PPOS' psychometric properties, such as reliability and validity, have not been well
4 tested in the Chinese context. Secondly, the preference of physicians in conducting
5 patient-centered communication has not yet been explored. Finally, for a vast country
6 with a population in the billions, a single survey conducted in a specific medical unit
7 can hardly be considered representative. It is thus unclear how well this instrument
8 would work in other regions and surroundings.

9 We conducted this research in Shanghai, which is among the most developed cities in
10 China and possesses abundant high-quality medical resources. Our goal was to adapt
11 PPOS to a Chinese (Mandarin) context and assess its psychometric properties
12 systematically. Preferences of both patients and physicians toward patient-centered
13 communication were measured using the Chinese-revised PPOS (CR-PPOS). In
14 addition, factors that might exert influence on physicians' and patients' preferences
15 concerning patient-centered communication were further explored.

16 ***Methods***

17 ***Description of the instrument***

18 Currently, PPOS has evolved into a version containing 18 items in two dimensions,
19 Caring and Sharing^[23]. The nine-item Caring subscale reflects the degree to which
20 physicians care about providing warmth and emotional support and regard the patient
21 as a whole person. The nine-item Sharing subscale reflects the degree to which
22 physicians believe they should share decision making information and power with the
23 patients^[17]. A higher PPOS total score, as well as subscale scores, indicates a greater
24 preference toward patient-centered style in clinical communication. Conversely, a low
25 Caring score indicates a tendency toward a disease-centered style, while a low
26 Sharing score indicates a tendency toward a doctor-centered style.

27 ***Translation and cultural adaption***

1
2
3 1 Having obtained from the original author permission to translate and develop the
4
5 2 PPOS in a Chinese context, scholars with academic backgrounds in medicine, public
6
7 3 health, and communication, as well as the Chinese and English languages, were
8
9 4 invited to translate the PPOS into Chinese(Mandarin).Afterward, the bilingual PPOS
10
11 5 versions were sent separately to five other advanced health practitioners for further
12
13 6 suggestions and modifications. The Chinese PPOS(C-PPOS) was then re-translated
14
15 7 into English and sent back to the original author for confirmation as to its accuracy.

16
17
18 8 For this C-PPOS, we strove to fit every item from the original version, except for item
19
20 9 17 due to noticeable culture difference. Thus, it was replaced by “A friendly manner is
21
22 10 a major ingredient in the doctor’s treatment of the patients”, which had been used in a
23
24 11 prior study in Nepal^[24]. Additionally, item 2 was back-translated as “Compared with
25
26 12 centering on individual patients in the past, focusing on the comprehensive quality of
27
28 13 medical services nowadays is more valuable for propelling medical development,”
29
30 14 which differed from the original item, rendered as “Although health care is less
31
32 15 personal these days, this is a small price to pay for medical advances” in expression
33
34 16 but was mostly consistent in meaning. Finally, 12 physicians and 18 patients were
35
36 17 enrolled in cognitive interviews to further enhance the comprehensibility of the scale
37
38 18 in the Chinese cultural context.

39 ***Pilot study design***

40
41
42 20 A pilot study was conducted in eight clinical settings in Shanghai in 2015. To reduce
43
44 21 selection bias, four community hospitals and four general hospitals located in various
45
46 22 areas were selected to cover a broad population. As a minimum sample size of 5 to 10
47
48 23 times the number of scale items for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and 10 to 20
49
50 24 times for confirmative factor analysis^[25] was required, and allowing for a number of
51
52 25 probable invalid responses, we included 400 interviewees. It was assumed that
53
54 26 physicians should comprise at least 20% of the total sample. Physicians and patients
55
56 27 were recruited using a convenient sampling approach from the outpatient department
57
58 28 of each hospital. Every eligible participant was requested to complete an anonymous

1 short questionnaire containing the C-PPOS. Retrieved questionnaires were carefully
2 checked, and those of poor quality were removed from the dataset, including those
3 with missing item scores or with the same item score used throughout the entire scale.

4 ***Psychometric properties assessment***

5 In this study, we assessed the psychometric properties via reliability, validity, and
6 discriminative power tests, based on which the C-PPOS was revised to the CR-PPOS.

7 Internal consistency and test–retest reliability are the most widely used indicators for
8 reliability; thus we performed both in this study. In the test–retest survey, 60
9 participants completed the C-PPOS again after 2 to 4 weeks.

10 We performed EFA and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess construct
11 validity. In addition, content validity was assessed by testing the correlation of the
12 score of each item and the score of the subscale the item belonged to, as well as the
13 score of the total scale.

14 Discriminative power reflects the extent to which an item can distinguish different
15 levels of target variables. We tested discriminative power by comparing the critical
16 value (CR) of each item.

17 ***Formal study design***

18 The formal survey was launched 1 month later, in the same settings where the pilot
19 study was conducted. As a cross-sectional study, the sample size was calculated to be
20 664 according to the formula provided by Raosoft, Inc.^[26], within a total population
21 size of 24,000,000 (the estimated population of Shanghai) and a confidence level of
22 99%. It was then expanded to 750 to guarantee sufficient valid responses. Physician
23 and patient participants were recruited with a convenience sampling strategy. After
24 confirming the informed consent, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire
25 containing the CR-PPOS, general information (gender, age, education, marriage status,
26 socioeconomic status, etc.), and some other well-validated instruments, such as the

1 Patient Confidence in Communication Scale (PCCS)^[27], Hospital Anxiety and
2 Depression Scale (HADS), the Rapid Health Literacy Scale^[28] for patients, and the
3 Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) and Medical Communication
4 Competence Scale (MCCS)^[29] for physicians.

5 *Statistical analysis*

6 We utilized Epidata 3.1 and Excel 2007 software for dataset establishment. IBM SPSS
7 20.0 and AMOS 21.0 were employed to perform data cleaning and analysis.

8 Cronbach's α coefficient was tested as the indicator of internal consistency and
9 reliability. Normally, a Cronbach's α of no less than 0.6 is deemed acceptable for an
10 instrument with a relatively small number of items (i.e. no more than 6)^[30]. Test-retest
11 reliability was assessed as the indicator of interclass correlation coefficient (ICC).
12 Test-retest reliability was considered poor if the ICC value was lower than 0.4 and/or
13 the correlation was not statistically significant ($P < 0.05$).

14 For EFA, data were subjected to a principal component analysis with extraction of
15 eigenvalues (greater than 1) for subscales (EFA round 1) and fixed two factors for the
16 total scale (EFA round 2). In EFA round 1, items were removed if a) their factor
17 loadings under either dimension were greater than 0.4, b) their factor loadings under
18 any two dimensions were close (the absolute value difference was less than 0.1), or c)
19 they were the only item under one dimension^[31].

20 CFA was performed by maximum likelihood analysis to verify the main adjustment
21 indices of the model, including chi-squared/degree of freedom (χ^2/df), root mean
22 square error of approximation (RMSEA), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), adjusted
23 goodness-of-fit index (AGFI), normed-fit index (NFI), incremental fit index (IFI), and
24 comparative fit index (CFI). The recommended χ^2/df ratio is 1 to 3, and RMSEA
25 value < 0.08 and GFI, AGFI, NNFI, IFI, and CFI > 0.9 suggest ideal model fit^[32].

26 Respondents with the highest (top 27%) and lowest (bottom 27%) total scale scores

1 were divided into two groups, after which their CR values of each item were
 2 compared to determine their discriminative power^[33]. The items without significantly
 3 distinct CRs were eliminated as they lacked the ability to distinguish high scores and
 4 low scores.

5 For single factor analysis, we performed the t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA)
 6 for parameter testing, and the Mann–Whitney U test for non-parameter testing.
 7 Multiple linear regression (MLR) was utilized in processing multifactor analysis.
 8 Only cases with complete data were included in the analysis. Statistical significance
 9 was set at $P < 0.05$.

10 **Results**

11 **Pilot study**

12 **Participants**

13 Three hundred and sixty-two eligible questionnaires were included in the pilot study
 14 from 395 participants, with a valid response rate of 91.65%. The mean age of the
 15 respondents was 47.41 ± 18.42 , and approximately half of them had graduated from
 16 college (Table 1).

17 **Table 1**

18 Demographic characteristics of the pilot study sample (n=362)

Demographic characteristics	Physicians (n=71)	Patient (n=291)
Mean age (range)	39.39 (24–64)	49.43 (20–96)
Gender, n (%)		
Male	33(46.5%)	123 (42.3%)
Female	38(53.5%)	165 (56.6%)
Education, n (%)		
College and above	67 (94.4%)	112 (38.5%)

4 (5.6%)	83 (28.5%)
0	72 (24.7%)
0	12 (4.1%)

Setting, n (%)

Community hospital	42 (59.2%)	130 (44.7%)
General hospital	29 (40.8%)	161 (55.3%)

Confirmatory factor analysis of the C-PPOS

The CFA of the C-PPOS indicated poor model fit (Table 2), which called for further revision.

Table 2

Goodness-of-fit indices of the CFA of the CR-PPOS and the original C-PPOS

Model fit indicator	Two factors (18 items)	Two factors (11 items)	Reference value
χ^2/df	5.04	1.85	<3
P-value	<0.001	<0.001	>0.05
RMSEA	0.11	0.06	<0.08
GFI	0.76	0.94	>0.90
AGFI	0.70	0.90	>0.90
NFI	0.52	0.81	>0.90
IFI	0.58	0.90	>0.90
CFI	0.57	0.90	>0.90

Revision of the C-PPOS

The Cronbach's α of each subscale of C-PPOS was tested as the first step of item reduction. The Cronbach's α of C-PPOS was 0.668, with a Caring subscale score of

1 0.493 and a Sharing subscale of 0.575, showing poor internal consistent reliability.
2 Hence, items were eliminated in a stepwise manner for each subscale separately until
3 elimination of another item would lead to a decrease in the Cronbach's α of its
4 corresponding dimension. Finally, five out of nine items were retained in the Caring
5 subscale, and eight out of nine items (except for C-PPOS9) were retained in the
6 Sharing subscale.

7 In EFA, the Bartlett's sphericity test reported a Chi-square value of 112.364 ($p < 0.001$)
8 for the Caring subscale and 146.846 ($p < 0.001$) for the Sharing subscale. The Kaiser–
9 Meyer–Olkin (KMO) indices for the two subscales were 0.727 and 0.694, respectively.
10 For EFA round 1, all five of the retained items of the Caring subscale were under one
11 principal component, which had an eigenvalue greater than 1 (2.197), explaining
12 43.949% of the total variance. In the Sharing subscale, C-PPOS4 and C-PPOS10 were
13 removed as they met exclusion criteria. Afterward, EFA was performed again on the
14 six retained items of the Sharing subscale. This time all six items grouped under one
15 principal component (eigenvalue=2.247), which explained 37.448% of the total
16 variance. Subsequently, a fixed two-factor EFA was performed to verify the construct
17 of the merged 11-item scale. The result indicated that the five items of the Caring
18 subscale and the six items of the Sharing subscale were well separated, explaining
19 41.67% of the total variance.

20 CFA was performed with the 11-item revised C-PPOS (CR-PPOS, see supplementary
21 appendix), according to the prior model, indicating a more acceptable and greatly
22 improved model fit compared with the original scale (Table 2).

23 ***Reliability of the CR-PPOS***

24 The Cronbach's α of the entire CR-PPOS was 0.735, with 0.709 in the Caring
25 subscale and 0.644 in the Sharing subscale. Furthermore, the scores of the two
26 subscales were significantly correlated to the total scale, with Spearman coefficients
27 of 0.744 (Caring) and 0.840 (Sharing), which were higher than those of these two

1 subscales (0.312). The ICC was 0.787 for the CR-PPOS, 0.911 for the Caring subscale,
 2 and 0.602 for the Sharing subscale. The ICC for the 11 single items ranged from 0.481
 3 to 0.812. The correlations were all statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating
 4 satisfactory test–retest reliability.

5 *Validity of the CR-PPOS*

6 The construct validity was well verified through EFA and CFA (see above). As for
 7 content validity, the 11 items' scores and their corresponding subscales' scores were
 8 all significantly correlated ($p < 0.01$), with Spearman coefficients ranging from 0.452
 9 to 0.717.

10 *Discriminative power of the CR-PPOS*

11 The CR values of the 11 items were all less than 0.01, reaching statistically significant
 12 levels. Thus, the items retained in the CR-PPOS had good discriminative power.

13 *Formal study*

14 *Participants*

15 Six hundred and fifty-six eligible questionnaires out of 792 participants were retrieved
 16 in this stage, with a valid response rate of 82.83%. One hundred and sixteen
 17 physicians and 540 patients were included. Respondents' demographic information is
 18 partly shown in Tables 3 and 4.

19 **Table 3**

20 Physicians' demographic characteristics (partly) and CR-PPOS scores

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total
Gender				
Male	43 (37.1%)	4.75±0.95	2.81±0.79	3.62±0.62

1	*	Female	73 (62.9%)	4.68±0.74	3.01±0.77	3.68±0.57
2	p<0.0	P value		0.666	0.166	0.648

3 5

Age (Group)

Table

6	4	-35	50 (43.1%)	4.78±0.96	2.89±0.71	3.69±0.61
7	Patient	-50	52 (44.8%)	4.69±0.63	2.92±0.85	3.63±0.52
8	s'	51-	10 (8.7%)	4.74±0.36	3.33±0.66	3.90±0.41
9	demo	P value		0.827	0.247	0.363

10 graph

11 ic

Education

12 chara

13	cteris	Senior school or below	2 (1.7%)	4.20±0.00	3.00±0.17	3.41±0.14
14	tics	College	71 (61.2%)	4.69±0.87	3.04±0.76	3.69±0.64
15	(partl	Postgraduate	42 (36.2%)	4.78±0.75	2.75±0.80	3.61±0.51
16	y)	P value		0.572	0.161	0.672

17 and

18 CR-P

Marriage status

19 POS

20	score	Married	89 (76.7%)	4.69±0.76	2.91±0.77	3.64±0.53
21	s	Unmarried	26 (22.4%)	4.88±0.82	3.08±0.74	3.82±0.61
		P value		0.270	0.318	0.149

Demographic characteristics	Number (percentage)	Caring subscale	Sharing subscale	CR-PPOS total
-----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------

Gender

Male	195 (36.1%)	4.11±0.95	3.17±0.74	3.49±0.71
Female	330 (61.1%)	4.07±0.96	3.09±0.77	3.44±0.69

P value 0.574 0.295 0.468

Age (Group)

-35	175 (32.4%)	4.24±0.91	3.32±0.68	3.59±0.67
-50	102 (18.9%)	4.00±1.00	3.02±0.83	3.37±0.75
-65	129 (23.9%)	3.93±1.02	3.00±0.76	3.35±0.72
66–	107 (19.8%)	4.14±0.86	3.12±0.77	3.50±0.64
P value		0.034*	0.001*	0.009*

Education

Primary school or below	39 (7.2%)	3.93±1.00	2.97±0.81	3.29±0.78
Junior school	112 (20.7%)	3.89±0.95	2.99±0.77	3.29±0.67
Senior school	162 (30.0%)	4.06±0.95	3.12±0.71	3.46±0.69
College or above	203 (37.6%)	4.26±0.93	3.23±0.80	3.59±0.70
P value		0.007*	0.030*	0.002*

Personal income (CNY)

<1500	23 (4.3%)	3.91±0.93	2.96±0.83	3.27±0.61
-3000	105 (19.4%)	3.83±1.02	2.96±0.83	3.23±0.77
-5000	192 (35.6%)	4.14±0.95	3.16±0.79	3.51±0.71
-10000	115 (21.3%)	4.17±0.94	3.13±0.68	3.54±0.63
10000–	70 (13.0%)	4.11±0.97	3.26±0.73	3.48±0.73
P value		0.048*	0.088	0.006*

Experience as medical staff

Yes	27 (5.0)%	3.67±1.07	2.84±0.76	3.12±0.80
No	241 (44.6%)	4.05±1.00	3.22±0.75	3.46±0.75
P value		0.071	0.013*	0.028*

*p<0.05

3 ***Comparison of physicians' and patients' CR-PPOS scores***

4 The physicians received an average CR-PPOS score of 3.66±0.59, and the patients' average score was significantly lower (3.46±0.70). The physicians scored higher in Caring (4.71±0.82 vs. 4.08±0.95), while the patients scored higher in Sharing (3.13±0.76 vs. 2.94±0.78). The differences were all statistically significant (p<0.05).

8 ***Demographic characteristics and CR-PPOS scores***

9 The scores of physicians and patients with distinct demographic characteristics were compared, as partly listed in Tables 3 and 4. Both patients' age and education level were significantly associated with their scores on the Caring subscale(p<0.05), the Sharing subscale(p<0.001) and the total CR-PPOS(p<0.01). Patients' income was only significantly associated with the Caring subscale score(p<0.05) and the total CR-PPOS score(p<0.01). Furthermore, patients' experience as medical staff was likely to improve their scores on the Sharing subscale(p<0.05) and the total CR-PPOS(p<0.05). However, no associations of such were found among physicians.

17 ***Physicians' burnout and CR-PPOS scores***

18 The burnout level of physicians was measured by the MBI-GS. According to the data, the group of "relatively severe" (scoring 3–5) and the group of "extremely severe" (scoring 5 or above) were merged as a "severe" group (scoring 3 or above), compared with the "light" group (scoring 3 or below). Physicians who reported "severe" burnout scored significantly lower in both the Caring subscale and the total scale than those

1 reporting “light” burnout.

2 ***Physicians’ medical communication competency and CR-PPOS scores***

3 Ninety-nine percent of physicians completed the MCCS, which was used to assess the
4 medical communication competency of both physicians and patients. Although
5 physicians were normally assessed by their patients using MCCS, we transformed this
6 into a self-reported scale for physicians in this study. The results indicated that,
7 although the scores of the four dimensions of MCCS were related, no correlation was
8 found between the MCCS scores and the CR-PPOS scores as well as its subscales.

9 ***Patients’ anxiety and depression and CR-PPOS scores***

10 Five hundred and two patients finished the HADS, an instrument for rapidly screening
11 anxiety and depressive symptoms among clinic physicians and patients. With the
12 cut-off point of 11, 309 patients (57.2%) were determined to be anxiety-positive, and
13 277 (51.3%) were determined as depression-positive. Meanwhile, it should be noticed
14 that HADS can only be used for screening purposes^[34], so the positive results cannot
15 be equal to the anxiety/depression with clinical significance.

16 As anxiety and depressive symptoms were highly comorbid^[35], a two-way ANOVA
17 was performed as the first stage to explore whether an interaction effect existed. It
18 turned out that there was no interaction effect between anxiety and depression.
19 Anxiety was found to lead to a decrease in patients’ scores on both the Caring
20 subscale ($p<0.01$) and the total CR-PPOS ($p<0.05$). However, patients’ scores on
21 neither the total scale nor the subscales seemed to be influenced by their depressive
22 symptoms.

23 ***Patients’ health literacy, PCCS, and CR-PPOS scores***

24 Using the three-item Rapid Health Literacy Scale, no statistical difference was found
25 in the total CR-PPOS score and the two subscale scores between the poor literacy
26 group and the adequate literacy group, while patients’ health literacy scores showed a

1 significantly positive correlation with their Sharing subscale scores ($r_s=0.112$,
 2 $p=0.011$). Similarly, patients' confidence in medical communication, as measured by
 3 PCCS was inversely correlated with their scores on the Sharing subscale ($r_s=-0.261$,
 4 $p<0.001$). In the following partial correlation tests, the correlation between PCCS and
 5 the Sharing subscale score remained significant after controlling for the health literacy
 6 score ($r_s=-0.232$, $p<0.001$), while no correlation existed between the health literacy
 7 score and the Sharing subscale score after controlling for PCCS.

8 *Multivariable analysis*

9 After testing the feasibility, MLR showed that the total burnout level might be an
 10 influential factor for the physicians in Caring and total CR-PPOS scores, and more
 11 factors were associated with the CR-PPOS scores of the patients (Table 5).

12 **Table 5**

13 Variables influencing CR-PPOS scores

Dimension	Variables	B	95% CI	P
Physicians				
Caring subscale	Total burn-out	-0.417	(-0.801, -0.033)	0.034
Sharing subscale	-	-	-	-
CR-PPOS total	Total burn-out	-0.341	(-0.611, -0.071)	0.014
Patients				
Caring subscale	Age (Group)	-0.292	(-0.499, -0.086)	0.006
	Education	0.251	(0.079, 0.423)	0.005
	Experience as medical staff	0.538	(0.046, 1.029)	0.032
Sharing subscale	Age (Group)	-0.202	(-0.361, -0.043)	0.013

	Education	0.169	(0.039, 0.299)	0.011
	Experience as medical staff	0.481	(0.109, 0.852)	0.012
	Marriage status	-0.336	(-0.666, -0.006)	0.046
	Confidence in medical communication	-0.298	(-0.451, -0.146)	<0.001
CR-PPOS total	Age (Group)	-0.242	(-0.396, -0.087)	0.002
	Education	0.222	(0.093, 0.350)	0.001
	Experience as medical staff	0.521	(0.154, 0.887)	0.006

1

2 *Discussion*

3 Although the PPOS has been widely used in various languages, only a few studies
 4 have systematically tested its psychometric property^[36-38], and no related results have
 5 been reported in China to date. This study showed that neither the ICC of the overall
 6 18-item C-PPOS nor its two subscales were above 0.7, which was comparable to the
 7 existing research. Deletion of items 9 and 17 improved the Cronbach's α , which is
 8 consistent with a study conducted in Sri Lanka^[39]. After modification, the two
 9 subscales of the 11-item PPOS were well separated in a fixed-factor EFA, with better
 10 indexes than prior similar studies, and the overall scale validity was reconfirmed by
 11 CFA. Taking into account the test-retest reliability and discriminative power, the
 12 11-item CR-PPOS obtained better psychometric property than the original 18-item
 13 scale. Thus, the CR-PPOS is considered to have greater applicability in the Chinese
 14 context.

15 Using the 11-item CR-PPOS, physicians and patients indicated similar trends in the
 16 achieved scores. In the overall scale, they both obtained medium scores (around the
 17 median value of 3.5), and both had relatively high Caring scores (over 4.0) and low
 18 Sharing scores (around 3.0 or below). This indicated that, although physicians and

1 patients generally showed a medium level of patient-centeredness in clinical
2 communication, they expressed higher preferences toward caring from a
3 biopsychosocial perspective than shared information and involvement in decision
4 making. Although the physicians' data is still absent in China, the 95% confidence
5 interval of the mean score of patients in this study slightly overlapped with that of the
6 prior study^[22], which implied that Chinese patients might express similar preferences
7 toward patient-centered communication, regardless of the regions they were living in.
8 The differences between the scores of physicians and patients, however, may still
9 prompt the gap in Chinese physicians and patients regarding their understanding and
10 expectations in clinical communication. Comparing the data of this study with that
11 from abroad, the majority showed a similar pattern that physicians were more
12 patient-centered in Caring than in Sharing, but there were still two exceptions; the
13 surveys conducted in Portugal and Australia indicated opposite results^[40,41], which
14 may be due to the difference in physician training modes and local health systems.
15 Thus, further research is needed to determine the reasons for such a distinction.

16 Preference toward patient-centered communication, as measured by the PPOS, has
17 been reported to be influenced by both personal characteristics and social
18 environmental factors. This study represents the first attempt to detect the potential
19 influential factors of patient-centered communication among Chinese physicians. The
20 results showed no association between the CR-PPOS scores and physicians' gender,
21 age, education level, career length, or type of setting. These results were consistent
22 with several prior studies in other countries, though female physicians were found to
23 score significantly higher than their male colleagues in some studies^[42,43]. Apart from
24 these factors, which were frequently mentioned in the existing research, we found that
25 burnout level might exert impact on physicians' PPOS total score as well as their
26 Caring subscale score, indicating that physicians with a higher total burnout level
27 were generally less likely to be patient-centered in clinical communication. Although
28 we assumed that poor communication ability might relate to a lower preference for
29 patient-centeredness in communication, no link was found between physicians'

1
2
3
4 1 medical communication competency, as measured by MCCS and their PPOS scores in
5
6 2 this study.

7
8 3 As Ting^[22] reported, age and education mainly influenced Chinese patients' overall
9
10 4 preference on patient-centered communication. In this study, younger and/or
11
12 5 better-educated patients also expressed a higher preference for patient-centered
13
14 6 communication in both the Caring and Sharing dimensions. Although some studies
15
16 7 have reported a gender difference^[36,39,44,45], it seemed that for Chinese patients, age
17
18 8 and education level, rather than gender, contribute to the different preferences toward
19
20 9 patient-centered communication. Meanwhile, the type of setting and socio- economic
21
22 10 status are not considered as influential factors, which was controversial^[46]. One
23
24 11 interesting find was that possessing experience as medical staff decreased the extent
25
26 12 to which patients wanted a patient-centered communication style. A plausible
27
28 13 explanation is that those who had worked as medical staff had obtained a more
29
30 14 comprehensive understanding of how hospitals function than those who had not. Thus,
31
32 15 they subconsciously lowered their expectation of a patient-centered manner in
33
34 16 communication, which might raise the demand for physicians, due to their sympathy
35
36 17 toward the physicians for their heavy workload. Further, although anxiety seemed to
37
38 18 be influential in single factor analysis, the association between the CR-PPOS score
39
40 19 and anxiety disappeared in the multivariable analysis, implying that anxiety was more
41
42 20 likely to be a confounder. Meanwhile, there is a need to further probe the role of
43
44 21 patient communication confidence, as well as its seeming mediation effect on the
45
46 22 relationship between patients' health literacy and preference for shared information
47
48 23 and decision making.

49
50 24 The main limitation of this study lies in that, due to feasibility considerations, the
51
52 25 participants were only recruited from a limited number of medical units, and a
53
54 26 convenient sampling strategy was adopted. Hence, though we have made some efforts
55
56 27 to reduce it, selection bias might still be a major issue, which could influence the
57
58 28 external validity of the findings in this study. Namely, although the CR-PPOS itself
59
60 29 can be well generalized to other studies aiming at a Chinese-speaking population, the

1
2
3 1 extent to which patient-centered communication is preferred and how it is influenced
4
5 2 can be different. Another point to be noticed is, as the CR-PPOS was developed from
6
7 3 the PPOS following a standardized statistical process, without any extra items being
8
9 4 added to keep the numbers of items constant, it may be inappropriate to directly
10
11 5 compare the scores measured by the CR-PPOS and the PPOS.

12
13
14 6 Considering the deteriorating physician-patient relationships in current Chinese
15
16 7 society, this study has significant implications for medical practice. With the valid
17
18 8 instrument CR-PPOS, on one hand, the divergence in communication preference
19
20 9 between physicians and patients can be discovered. On the other hand, it will be
21
22 10 possible and reasonable to link certain personal characteristics with individuals'
23
24 11 preference toward clinical communication, and in China that is particularly true for
25
26 12 patients according to this study. Based on these findings, specific training can be
27
28 13 developed and offered to physicians, guiding them on how to recognize patients with
29
30 14 different communication preferences and to adopt corresponding communication
31
32 15 strategies afterwards. In this way not only patients' expectations are better fulfilled,
33
34 16 but communication efficiency is also enhanced, both contributing to reduced
35
36 17 complaints in clinical communication, and improved physician-patient
37
38 18 relationships^[47].

39 **Conclusion**

40
41
42 20 The CR-PPOS was developed as an applicable instrument to measure the preference
43
44 21 toward patient-centered communication of physicians and patients in a Chinese
45
46 22 context. Physicians and patients were generally more patient-centered in medical
47
48 23 communication regarding overall biopsychosocial care than with respect to shared
49
50 24 information and decision making, but there were still significant gaps between
51
52 25 physicians and patients in the extent to which they prefer this type of communication.
53
54 26 Relieving burnout could help physicians to be more patient-centered in
55
56 27 communication. Patients of a young age, high education level, and with medical staff
57
58 28 experience tended to have a higher preference toward patient-centered

1 communication.

2

3 **Competing interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure
4 form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf and declare: Jie Wang had financial
5 support from the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation for the submitted work, Fan
6 Wang has received funds from Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission; no
7 financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the
8 submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that
9 could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

10

11 **Ethics committee approval information:** The study was approved by Fudan
12 University School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (No.
13 IRB#2015-12-0575).

14

15 **Contributors:** Jie Wang was granted research funding, engaged in the study design
16 and data analysis, and was the main drafter of the Introduction and Discussion
17 sections; Runyu Zou led the study design, data collection, and data analysis, and also
18 drafted the Method, and Results sections of the manuscript; Hua Fu and Fan Wang
19 were the co-principal investigators of this project, were granting research funding, and
20 mentored in the study design, data collection, and article revision. They also issued
21 the final approval for submission; Haihong Qian and Yueren Yan contributed to data
22 collection and refining the article. All authors have approved the final version of this
23 manuscript.

24 **Acknowledgments:** We appreciate Professor Edward Krupat of Harvard University
25 for his generous authorization to use and revise the PPOS for the Chinese context. We
26 are also grateful to the coordinators of the collaborating hospitals for their kind
27 assistance.

28 **Funding:** This work was supported by the first-class [General Financial Grant from
29 the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation] grant number [2015M580283] and

1 [Construction of the key disciplines of the fourth round public health three-year action
2 plan of Shanghai Health and Family Planning Commission] grant number
3 [15GWZK1001].

4 **Data Sharing Statement:** Extra data from this study could be accessed by contacting
5 the corresponding author Fan Wang via wangfan512@126.com.

6 Detail has been removed from this case description/these case descriptions to ensure
7 anonymity. The editors and reviewers have seen the detailed information available
8 and are satisfied that the information backs up the case the authors are making.

9

10 Reference

11 1 Balint E, Ball D, Hare M. Training medical students in patient-centered medicine,
12 *Compr Psychiatry*1969;10:249-58.

13 2 Hirono I, Hideki H, Takahiro K. The evolving concept of “patient-centeredness” in
14 patient-physician communication research, *Soc Sci Med*2013;96:147-53.

15 3 Institute of Medicine. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st
16 century. Washington (DC):National Academies Press 2001:39-40.

17 4 Mohammed A, Mannan F, Chaudhry Z, et al. Quality of care in university hospitals
18 in Saudi Arabia: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*2016;6(2):e008988.

19 5 Catro EM, van Regenmortel T, Vanhaecht K, et al. Patient empowerment, patient
20 participation and patient-centeredness in hospital care: A concept analysis based on a
21 literature review. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:1923-39.

22 6 Skelton J. Language and Clinical Communication: this bright Babylon. Oxford:
23 Radcliffe Publishing 2008:93-98.

24 7 Stewart M, Brown JB, Weston WW, et al. Patient-centered medicine: transforming
25 the clinical method, 2nd edn. United Kingdom: Radcliffe Medical Press 2003:5-16.

26 8 Hudon C, Fortin M, Haggerty JL, et al. Measuring patients’ perceptions of
27 patient-centered care: a systematic review of tools for family medicine. *Ann Fam
28 Med*2011;9:155-64.

- 1
2
3 1 9 Epstein RM, Franks P, Fiscella K, et al. Measuring patient-centered communication
4
5 2 in patient-physician consultations: theoretical and practical issues. *Soc Sci*
6
7 3 *Med*2005;61:1516-28.
8
9 4 10 Bensing JM, Verhaak PF, van Dulmen AM, et al. Communication: the royal
10
11 5 pathway to patient-centered medicine. *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:1-3.
12
13 6 11 Mead N, Bower P. Patient-centeredness: a conceptual framework and review of the
14
15 7 empirical literature. *Soc Sci Med*2000;51:1087-10.
16
17 8 12 Taylor K. Paternalism, participation and partnership-the evolution of
18
19 9 patient-centeredness in the consultation. *Patient Educ Couns*2009;74:150-55.
20
21 10 13 Greenfield S, S. Kaplan, J. Ware, E.M. Yano, H. Frank, Patients' participation in
22
23 11 medical care. *J Gen Intern Med*1988;88:448-57.
24
25 12 14 Marinker M. From compliance to concordance: achieving shared goals in medicine
26
27 13 taking. *Brit Med J*1997;314:747-8.
28
29 14 15 Schiavo R. Health Communication: From Theory to Practice, 2nd edn. San
30
31 15 Francisco: Jossay-Bass 2013:195-96.
32
33 16 16 Morris MA, Clayman ML, Peters KJ, et al. Patient-centered communication
34
35 17 strategies for patients with aphasia: discrepancies between what patients want and
36
37 18 what physicians do. *Disabil Health J*2015;8:208-15.
38
39 19 17 Krupat E, Hiam CM, Fleming MZ, et al. Patient-centeredness and its correlates
40
41 20 among first year medical students. *Int J Psychiatry Med*1999;29:347-56.
42
43 21 18 Kim J. Differences in attitude toward patient-centeredness in patients and
44
45 22 physicians. *Korean J Med Educ*2013;25:149-56.
46
47 23 19 Ishikawa I, Eto M, Kitamura K, et al. Resident physicians' attitudes and
48
49 24 confidence in communicating with patients: A pilot study at a Japanese University
50
51 25 hospital. *Patient Educ Couns*2014;96:361-66.
52
53 26 20 Tsimtsiou Z, Kirana PS, Hatzichristou D. Determinants of patients' attitudes
54
55 27 toward patient-centered care: A cross-sectional study in Greece. *Patient Educ*
56
57 28 *Couns*2014;97:391-95.
58
59 29 21 Dockens AL, Bellon-Harn ML, Manchaiah V. Preference to patient-centeredness in
60
30 pre-service speech and hearing sciences students: a cross-sectional study. *J Audiol*

- 1
2
3
4 1 *Otol*2016;20:73-9.
- 5
6 2 22 Xu T, Bao Y, Liang Y, et al. Patient perception and the barriers to practicing
7
8 3 patient-centered communication: A survey and in-depth interview of Chinese patients
9
10 4 and physicians. *Patient Educ Couns*2016;99:364-69.
- 11
12 5 23 Krupat E, Rosenkranz SL, Yeager CM, et al. The practice orientations of
13
14 6 physicians and patients: the effect of doctor-patient congruence on satisfaction.
15
16 7 *Patient Educ Couns*2000;39:49-59.
- 17
18 8 24 Moore M. What does patient-centered communication mean in Nepal? *Med*
19
20 9 *Educ*2008;42:18-26.
- 21
22 10 25 Hair Jr JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, et al. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th edn. Beijing:
23
24 11 China Machine Press 2011:100-123.
- 25
26 12 26 Raosoft Inc. Sample size calculation [online]. www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html.
- 27
28 13 27 Tran A, Haidet P, Street R, et al. Empowering communication: a community-based
29
30 14 intervention for patients. *Patient Educ Couns*2004;52:113-21.
- 31
32 15 28 Chew LD, Bradley KA, Boyko EJ. Brief questions to identify patients with
33
34 16 inadequate health literacy. *Fam Med*2004;36:588-94.
- 35
36 17 29 Cegala DJ, Coleman MT, Warisse J. The development and partial test of the
37
38 18 Medical Communication Competence Scale (MCCS). *J Health*
39
40 19 *Commun*1998;10:261-88.
- 41
42 20 30 Ponterotto JG, Ruckdeschel DE. An overview of coefficient alpha and a reliability
43
44 21 matrix for estimating adequacy of internal consistency coefficients with psychological
45
46 22 research measures. *Percept Mot Skills*2007;105:997-1014.
- 47
48 23 31 Osborne JW, Costello AB. Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four
49
50 24 recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Pract Assess Res Eval*
51
52 25 2005;10:1-9.
- 53
54 26 32 Brown TA. *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*, 2nd edn. New York:
55
56 27 The Guilford Press 2015:67-73.
- 57
58 28 33 Backhoff E, Larrazolo N, Rosas M. The level of difficulty and discrimination
59
60 29 power of Basic Knowledge and Skill Examination (EXHCOBA). *Revista Electrónica*
30 *de Investigación Educativa* 2000;2:1-16. Retrieved on December 20, 2016 from:

- 1 <http://redie.uabc.mx/vol2no1/contents-backhoff.html>
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 34 Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Health Qual Life*
- 6
- 7 *Outcomes*2003;1:29.
- 8
- 9 35 Wu Z, Fang Y. Comorbidity of depressive and anxiety disorders: challenges in
- 10
- 11 diagnosis and assessment. *Shanghai Arch Psychiatry*2014;26:227-31.
- 12
- 13 36 Krupat E, Yeager CM, Putnam S. Patient role orientations, doctor-patient fit, and
- 14
- 15 visit satisfaction. *Psychol Health*2000;15:707-19.
- 16
- 17 37 Pereira CM, Amaral CF, Ribeiro MM, et al. Cross-cultural validation of the
- 18
- 19 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale. *Patient Educ Couns*2013;91:37-43.
- 20
- 21 38 Kiessling C, Fabry G, Rudolf Fisher M, et al. German translation and construct
- 22
- 23 validation of the Patient-Provider Orientation Scale(PPOS-D12). *Psychother*
- 24
- 25 *Psychsom Med Psychol*2014;64:122-27.
- 26
- 27 39 Mudiyanse RM, Pallegame RW, Jayalath T, et al. Translation and validation of the
- 28
- 29 Patient-Practitioner Orientation Scale in Sri Lanka. *Educ Health(Ablington)*
- 30
- 31 2015;28:35-40.
- 32
- 33 40 Laplante-Levesque A, Hickson L, Grenness C. An Australian survey of
- 34
- 35 audiologists' preferences for patient-centeredness. *Int J Audiol*2014;53:S76-82.
- 36
- 37 41 Manchiah V, Gomersall PA, Tome D, et al. Audiologists' preferences for
- 38
- 39 patient-centeredness: a cross sectional questionnaire study of cross-cultural
- 40
- 41 differences and similarities among professionals in Portugal, India and Iran. *BMJ*
- 42
- 43 *Open*2014;4:e005915.
- 44
- 45 42 Abiola T, Udofia O, Abdullahi AT. Patient-doctor relationship: the practice
- 46
- 47 orientations of doctors in Kano. *Niger J Clin Pract*2014;17:241-47.
- 48
- 49 43 Mann KJ, Hoffman A, Miller D, et al. The effect of a patient- and family-centered
- 50
- 51 care curriculum on pediatric residents' patient-centeredness. *J Grad Med*
- 52
- 53 *Educ*2013;5:36-40.
- 54
- 55 44 Krupat E, Hsu J, Irish J, et al. Matching patients and practitioners based on beliefs
- 56
- 57 about care: Results of a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Manag Care*
- 58
- 59 2004;10:814-22.
- 60
- 61 45 Lau SR, Christensen ST, Andreason JT. Patients' preferences for patient-centered

- 1
2
3 1 communication: a survey from an outpatient department in rural Sierra Leone. *Patient*
4 *Educ Couns*2013;93:312-18.
5
6
7 3 46 Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, et al. Preferences of patients for patient-centered
8
9 4 approach to consultation in primary care: observational study. *BMJ*2001;322:468-72.
10
11 5 47 Liu X, Rohrer W, Luo A, et al. Doctor-patient communication skills training in
12
13 6 mainland China: A systematic review of the literature. *Patient Educ*
14
15 7 *Couns*2015;98:3-14.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix

The CR-PPOS (English version)

Caring subscale

During clinical process, doctors will be suspected of prying the privacy of patients when they ask patients a lot about personal backgrounds.

If a doctor's diagnosis and treatment levels are high enough, the way of his/her communication with patients is not so important.

If a doctor spends too much honesty and enthusiasm in the doctor-patient communication, he/she wouldn't have made great achievements.

Most patients in clinics want to leave the doctors' office as soon as possible(so as to reduce the time communicating with doctors)

For doctors, knowing the patient's culture and backgrounds is not very important for treating illness.

Sharing subscale

During clinical process, doctors should be the ones who dominate the conversation.

Patients should rely on doctor's professional skills during clinical process and should not try to find out the answers to their medical conditions by themselves.

Many patients keep asking questions to doctors, although they are not necessarily getting more new information.

During the clinical process, if a patient does not agree with the opinions of a doctor, then it means that the doctor doesn't get the patient's respect and trust.

During clinical process, patients should always be aware that doctors are dominant.

It is usually not very helpful if patients search for medical information on their own-instead, they could be even more confused.

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6,7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	6,7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	7,8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6,7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8,9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8,9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7,9
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	-
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	-
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	9,12
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	9,12
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	-
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	9,10,12-15
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	9,12-16
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	10-12,15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	17,18
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	16
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	16
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	18,19
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	20,21
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	21
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	22,23

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.