

Satisfaction on physical therapy care received in hospitals: point of view of patients and physical therapists**Satisfação do atendimento fisioterapêutico hospitalar: visão do paciente e do fisioterapeuta****Satisfacción de la atención fisioterapéutica del hospital: visión del paciente y del fisioterapeuta****Received: 17/12/2019****Approved: 02/05/2020****Published: 01/07/2020**

Letícia Andrade Silva¹
Isabel Aparecida Porcatti de Walsh²
Karlla Leandro Costa³
Lislei Jorge Patrizzi Martins⁴
Suraya Gomes Novais Shimano⁵
Marilita Falangola Accioly⁶

This is a cross-sectional, quantitative and descriptive study carried out in 2016, aiming to verify the satisfaction of patients and physical therapists regarding physical therapy in a Public University Hospital. The non-probabilistic sample was composed of 40 individuals for convenience purposes, aged 43.1 ± 10.5 years; 15 females, aged between 26 and 59 (43.1 ± 10.5 years), corresponding to the group of patients, with prescription and undergoing physical therapy. The group of professionals was composed by 12 female physical therapists. Two structured questionnaires were applied, the first of which presented 12 questions (four from the Interaction domain, four from the Resources domain and four from the Environment domain) and the second 20 questions (four from the Interaction domain, four from the Resources domain, four from the Environment domain, four from the Working Conditions domain – hours and payment, and four from Working Conditions domain – staff and training). The domain of greatest satisfaction for patients was the Environment ($M = 11$). Interaction was the domain of least satisfaction (8.3). For physical therapists, the Environment was the domain of least satisfaction (8.42) and the one with the greatest satisfaction was Interaction (13.5). It is important to start the discussion regarding the need for tools that assess satisfaction of users of physical therapy services, as well as of the professional physical therapist.

Descriptors: Physical therapy speciality; Patient satisfaction; Job satisfaction; Hospital, Public.

Trata-se de um estudo transversal, quantitativo e descritivo, realizado em 2016, com o objetivo de verificar a satisfação dos pacientes e fisioterapeutas em relação ao atendimento fisioterapêutico em um Hospital Universitário Público. A amostra não-probabilística por conveniência, foi composta por 40 indivíduos, com idade de $43,1 \pm 10,5$ anos; 15 do sexo feminino, com faixa etária entre 26 e 59 ($43,1 \pm 10,5$ anos), correspondente ao grupo de pacientes, com prescrição e realizando fisioterapia. O grupo de profissionais foram 12 fisioterapeutas, do sexo feminino. Foram aplicados dois questionários estruturados, sendo que o primeiro apresentou 12 questões (quatro do domínio Interação, quatro do Recursos e quatro do Ambiente) e o segundo 20 questões (quatro do domínio Interação, quatro do Recursos, quatro do Ambiente, quatro do Condições de trabalho-horário e remuneração, e quatro do Condições de trabalho – equipe e capacitação). O domínio de maior satisfação para os pacientes foi o Ambiente ($M=11$). A Interação foi o domínio de menor satisfação (8,3). Para os fisioterapeutas o Ambiente foi o domínio de menor satisfação (8,42) e o de maior satisfação foi a Interação (13,5). É salutar iniciar a discussão a respeito da necessidade de instrumentos que avaliem a satisfação dos usuários de serviços de fisioterapia, bem como, do profissional fisioterapeuta.

Descritores: Fisioterapia; Satisfação do paciente; Satisfação no emprego, Hospitais públicos.

Se trata de un estudio transversal, cuantitativo y descriptivo, realizado en 2016, con el objetivo de verificar la satisfacción de los pacientes y los fisioterapeutas en relación con la atención fisioterapéutica en un Hospital Universitario Público. La muestra no probabilística por conveniencia fue compuesta por 40 individuos, de $43,1 \pm 10,5$ años de edad; 15 mujeres, de 26 a 59 años ($43,1 \pm 10,5$ años), que correspondían al grupo de pacientes, con prescripción y realizando fisioterapia. El grupo de profesionales fueron 12 mujeres fisioterapeutas. Se aplicaron dos cuestionarios estructurados, el primero con 12 preguntas (cuatro del ámbito de Interacción, cuatro de Recursos y cuatro de Ambiente) y el segundo con 20 preguntas (cuatro del ámbito de Interacción, cuatro de Recursos, cuatro de Ambiente, cuatro de Condiciones de trabajo -horario y remuneración- y cuatro de Condiciones de trabajo -equipo y capacitación-). El ámbito de mayor satisfacción para los pacientes fue el Ambiente ($M=11$). La Interacción fue el ámbito de menor satisfacción (8,3). Para los fisioterapeutas el Ambiente fue el ámbito de menor satisfacción (8,42) y el de mayor satisfacción fue la Interacción (13,5). Es conveniente iniciar el debate sobre la necesidad de contar con instrumentos que evalúen la satisfacción de los usuarios de los servicios de fisioterapia, así como del fisioterapeuta profesional.

Descritores: Fisioterapia; Satisfacción del paciente; Satisfacción en el Trabajo; Hospitales públicos.

1. Physical therapist. Specialist in Adult Health. Physical therapist and Pilates instructor at Simplesmente Ser in Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0001-9593-4903 Email: silva.leticiaandrade@gmail.com

2. Physical therapist. Specialist in Public Health. Master in Production Engineering. PhD in Physical Therapy. Assistant Professor of the Undergraduate course in Physical Therapy and the Post Graduate Program in Associative Physical Therapy, Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro/Universidade Federal de Uberlândia (PPGF-UFTM/UFU), Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0002-2317-1326 E-mail: isabelpwalsh@gmail.com

3. Physical Therapist. Specialist in Respiratory Physical therapy. Master's student at PPGF-UFTM/UFU, Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0003-4532-8838 E-mail: karlla.leandro@yahoo.com.br

4. Physical Therapist. Specialist in Hospital and Outpatient Motor Physical Therapy. Master in Rehabilitation. PhD in Medical Sciences. Associate Professor of the Undergraduate Course in Physical Therapy and PPGF-UFTM/UFU, Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0002-3729-7675 E-mail: lispatrizzi@gmail.com

5. Physical Therapist. Specialist in Rehabilitation in Orthopedics and Traumatology. Master in Bioengineering. PhD in Rehabilitation Sciences. Associate Professor of the Undergraduate Course in Physical Therapy at UFTM - Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0002-9421-9227 E-mail: surayagnovais@gmail.com

6. Physical Therapist. Master in Physical Education. PhD and Post Doctor in Health Sciences. Associate Professor of the Undergraduate Course in Physical Therapy and PPGF-UFTM/UFU, Uberaba, MG, Brazil. ORCID: 0000-0002-9623-3145 E-mail: marilitafisio@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Ensuring the quality of hospital care is essential for the people assisted and the workers in these places. For this, it is important to emphasize knowledge, technological updating, interpersonal relationships, reorganization of services, renewal of health practices, restructuring of environment, provision of professionals, necessary materials, interaction and consent of patient in their treatment^{1,2}.

In Brazil, although the evaluation of quality in health is not yet carried out in a systematic and systematized way, most institutions already have instruments that make it possible to assess the degree of satisfaction of users of health services and other items that also make up the triad structure, process and result. Assessing the perception of professionals is no less important, since the satisfaction of their psychosocial needs in the work situation is directly linked to motivation, improvement of their productivity and quality of care¹⁻³.

The performance of physical therapy in the hospital environment has been increasing widely and studies have been focused on its benefits in hospitalized patients. Thus, it is important to assess patients' perception of the quality of this provided care. However, although studies have evaluated the satisfaction of attending physical therapy⁴⁻⁷, there is a small number of those that refer to the satisfaction of users of physical therapy services and physical therapists in a Public University Hospital - PUH (*Hospital Universitário Público - HUP*).

Thus, an instrument for assessing patient satisfaction in relation to physical therapy care at a PUH is necessary and must be different from questionnaires on medical interventions⁵. Likewise, the physical therapist's assessment of the service and its performance deserves the same importance. Thus, the objective of this study was to verify the satisfaction of patients and physical therapists in relation to physical therapy care at a Public University Hospital.

METHOD

This is a cross-sectional, quantitative and descriptive study carried out in 2016, at a PUH, which offers high-complexity tertiary care to 27 municipalities that make up the macro-region of the Triângulo Sul region, on the state of Minas Gerais, also encompassing other macro-regions of the state, as well as other states in the Brazilian federation⁸. Four sectors of this HUP participated in the study: Infectious Parasitic Diseases Unit (IPDU); Medical Clinic (MC); Surgical Clinic (SC) and Orthopedics (ORT).

The sample was non-probabilistic, for convenience purposes, and its maximization was adopted for data collection, both for patients and physical therapists, over a period of three months. Patients were considered hospitalized in the described sectors, corresponding to the group of patients (GP).

It was adopted as inclusion criteria for the GP: hospitalized in the previously mentioned sectors, with prescription and undergoing physical therapy, between 18 and 59 years of age, both genders, being all aware and able to speak, according to information obtained in the medical records, with different diagnoses and comorbidities. Patients who were unable to identify the physical therapy treatment as distinct from other treatments by the health team were excluded.

The group of professional physical therapists (GPT) was composed of all those active in the surveyed sectors. The exclusion criteria for the GPT were: professionals not working in the mentioned sectors and those on leave at the time of data collection.

Data collection took place in the hospital environment, with an approximate application time of 20 minutes. A single evaluator applied the two structured questionnaires (one for GP and one for GPT). These were prepared based on other studies⁹⁻¹³ and were preceded by questions related to sociodemographic aspects (gender, age and sector of hospitalization/work).

The questionnaire, applied to the GP presented 12 questions, four from the Interaction domain (which is related to interaction between physical therapist and patient during the entire care and treatment process), four from the Resources domain (related to material and human resources of the surveyed locations) and four from the Environment domain (related to physical environment of the surveyed locations).

The second questionnaire, applied to the GPT presented 20 questions, four from the Interaction domain, four from the Resources domain, four from the Environment domain, four from the Working Conditions - Hours and Remuneration (WC - HR) domain, related to the satisfaction of physical therapists regarding working hours, breaks, remuneration, four in the domain Working Conditions - Team and Training (WC-TT), which means the satisfaction of physical therapists regarding interactions with the team, and courses or training offered and carried out within the workplace. For each dimension, the evaluation criteria varied according to the Likert Scale of four points (from one to four)¹⁰, in increasing order, considering the categories from bad to excellent.

For data analysis, an Excel® database was organized, entered by double typing and consistency was evaluated. In the identification of inconsistencies, the reading of the collection form was resumed and then the information was adjusted. The database was transferred to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS®) Statistics Base version 24.0. Numerical variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics using central and dispersion measures, and categorical variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics according to absolute and relative frequency.

In the evaluation of domains, the sum of the scores for each component question was considered, with the maximum score being distributed respectively, with $n = 16$ for all domains. To analyze the scores achieved from the perspective of each domain in relation to the participants, univariate analysis was performed for the categorical variables frequency (absolute and relative) and for the numerical variables, the arithmetic mean (\bar{X}) and the standard deviation (sd), with a 95% confidence interval (95% CI).

This project was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro under protocol 1,234,848.

RESULTS

The GP, composed by 42 patients, had two patients excluded, as they were unable to identify the physical therapeutic treatment as distinct from the other treatments of the health team, making up a total of 40 patients (10 from each sector of four sectors). Of these, 15 were female and 25 were male, aged between 26 and 59 years (43.1 ± 10.5 years). The GPT, composed by all physical therapists in the sectors studied, had a total of 12, two from IPDU, three from MC, three from SC and four from ORT, all female.

For the GP, in relation to the interaction domain, most patients declare the answers to the four questions as 'excellent' (feeling welcomed by physical therapy, confidence in attending physical therapy, physical therapy helping in improvements and feeling better after physical therapy). In the resources domain, it is noteworthy that 42.5% say they are excellently satisfied with the number of times that they are seen by physical therapy during a day, considering the week as Monday to Friday. In the environmental domain, 40% said the cleanliness of the place was excellent and 50% considered excellent the comfort of the place (Table 1).

Table 1. Patient satisfaction with physical therapeutic care at a Public University Hospital. Uberaba, Minas Gerais, 2016.

Aspects	Poor		Good		Great		Excellent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interaction Area								
Do you feel welcomed by physical therapy?	0	0.0%	11	27.5%	7	17.5%	22	55.0%
Do you have confidence in attending physical therapy?	1	2.5%	10	25.0%	10	25.0%	19	47.5%
Does physical therapy help you improve?	0	0.0%	6	15.0%	8	20.0%	26	65.0%
Do you feel better after physical therapy?	0	0.0%	5	12.5%	14	35.0%	21	52.5%
Resources Area								
Are there enough materials for physical therapy to work?	3	7.5%	13	32.5%	11	27.5%	13	32.5%
Do you think that the number of physical therapists is enough to attend all patients who need physical therapy?	6	15.0%	14	35.0%	9	22.5%	11	27.5%
Are you satisfied with the number of times you are treated by physical therapy during a day, considering a week as Monday to Friday?	0	0.0%	7	17.5%	16	40.0%	17	42.5%
Are you satisfied with the number of times you are treated by physical therapy on weekends?	3	7.5%	14	35.0%	11	27.5%	12	30.0%
Environment Area								
How is the noise of the place where you perform physical therapy?	6	15.0%	12	30.0%	8	20.0%	14	35.0%
How is the lighting of the place that performs physical therapy?	3	7.5%	8	20.0%	14	35.0%	15	37.5%
How do you consider cleaning the place you are in?	1	2.5%	10	25.0%	16	40.0%	13	32.5%
How is the comfort of the place you are in?	3	7.5%	5	12.5%	12	30.0%	20	50.0%

N = number; % = percentage

For the GPT, it is noteworthy, in relation to the interaction domain, that the majority chose the option "great" for all questions and for the other domains, the majority chose the option "good" for all questions (Table 2).

The domain of greatest satisfaction for the GPT was the Environment (M = 11). Interaction was the domain of least satisfaction (8.3). In contrast, for the GPT, the Environment was the domain of least satisfaction (8.42), with greater satisfaction for the Interaction domain (13.5) (Table 3).

Table 2. Physical therapists' satisfaction regarding physical therapy care at a Public University Hospital. Uberaba, Minas Gerais, 2016.

Aspects	Poor		Good		Great		Excellent	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interaction Area								
Does physical therapy welcome the patient?	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	4	33.3%
Do you have confidence in your service?	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	6	50.0%	5	41.7%
Does physical therapy help to improve the patient?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	8	66.7%
Do you feel good after work?	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	4	33.3%
Resources Area								
Are there enough material resources for physical therapy to work?	5	41.7%	7	58.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Do you think that the number of physical therapists is enough to care for all patients who need physical therapy?	6	50.0%	4	33.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%
Do you use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)?	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	5	41.7%
Are there enough PPEs?	1	8.3%	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	2	16.7%
Environment Area								
How is the noise of the place you work?	2	16.7%	9	75.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
How is the lighting of the place you work in?	0	0.0%	10	83.3%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%
How do you consider cleaning the place you work?	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	3	25.0%	1	8.3%
How is the local comfort that works?	4	33.3%	6	50.0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%
Working Conditions Area - Hours and Remuneration (WC - HR)								
Are you satisfied with your work schedule?	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	7	58.3%	2	16.7%
Do you have breaks in your work period (eating, going to the bathroom, drinking water)?	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	2	16.7%
Do you think the remuneration matches your job?	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%
Are you satisfied with the remuneration for your work?	3	25.0%	3	25.0%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%
Working Conditions Area - Team and Training (WC - TT)								
Is there interaction between all physical therapists in the service?	1	8.3%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%	3	25.0%
Is there interaction between the staff of the place that works?	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	75.0%	3	25.0%
Is there a multiprofessional job in the place that is?	1	8.3%	6	50.0%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%
Are there frequent courses or training in the physical therapy service?	1	8.3%	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	4	33.3%

N = number; % = percentage

Table 3. Measures of central tendency and variability of the assessment domains for patients and physical therapists. Uberaba, Minas Gerais, 2016.

Domains	Patient						Physical Therapist					
	Min	Max	M	sd	CI 95%		Min	Max	M	sd	CI 95%	
Interaction	8	16	8.3	1.8	7.2	9.4	10	16	13.5	1.9	12.3	14.7
Resources	7	16	8.6	2.9	6.8	10.4	6	11	9	1.8	7.9	10.2
Environment	4	16	11	2.1	9.2	11.8	6	15	8.42	2.5	6.8	10
WC - HR	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	16	10.3	3	8.4	12.2
WC - TT	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	16	11.3	2.3	9.9	12.8

Min = minimum score; Max = maximum score; M = arithmetic mean; sd = standard deviation; CI 95% = confidence interval of 95%; WC - HR = Working conditions - Hours and Remuneration; WC - TT = Working conditions - Team and Training

DISCUSSION

The domain of greatest satisfaction for the GP was the Environment, followed by the domains of Resources and Integration. It can be inferred that, for patients, there is greater demand and criticism regarding services directly related to their care and resources made available to them than to the physical environment.

It is known that the hospitalized patient, in addition to struggling to recover their health, is subjected to aggressions from the physical hospital environment, related to physical agents (noise, extreme temperatures and others). This can interfere with the patient's response to treatment, aggravating stress and negatively affecting their recovery¹⁴.

In this context, the indication of good results from the patient's perception of this area can be very important, since the humanization of physical hospital environment contributes to their therapeutic process and the quality of health services provided by the professionals involved¹⁵.

In contrast, for the GPT, the Environment was the domain of least satisfaction, possibly due to the fact that the physical space has a very intense flow of people, including workers, patients, students, visits and companions; although the results of noise, lighting, cleanliness and comfort aspects were classified as "Good".

The greatest satisfaction for the GPT was in the Interaction domain, which represents interaction between physical therapist and patient throughout the therapeutic process. It is possible that this fact is related to the creation of a bond between both parties in the entire therapeutic process, favoring that it be carried out in a pleasant way with respect and intimacy. In this sense, another study also analyzed the same relationship, identifying that 53.9% of physical therapists classified the relationship as "Good"³.

However, this perception is not confirmed for the GP, since Interaction was the domain of least satisfaction (M = 8.3) for this one. These results disagree with what is said by other authors^{10,15}, who found more positive perceptions in the physical therapist-patient relationship, although they were evaluating the outpatient physical therapy service. A study that evaluated the degree of satisfaction of users of the public physical therapy service found that the domains physical therapist-patient relationship and technical skill of the physical therapist were considered "Great/Excellent" by 70.8% of users¹⁰.

In another study, satisfaction with the physical therapy service was noted and the issue with the highest score was the physical therapist's respect for the patient. However, 89% of patients received only one physical therapy service per day, 60% of them had only the basic level and 38% had a monthly income of a minimum wage¹⁵, implying that, because they are less educated and more in need of care, the that would lead them to feel satisfied, even receiving minimal treatment.

The fact that patients in the present study indicate interaction with the physical therapist as the domain with the lowest score indicates the need for a better assessment of this aspect. A weakness of this study is that it does not have other patient data such as educational level, economic situation and other aspects, which could explain these perceptions of professionals and of them, in this aspect. Thus, it is indicated to carry out other studies within this PUH, which can more fully analyze this issue, valuing and understanding the reason for the dissatisfaction of these patients in this sense, in order to find ways to overcome these difficulties.

The result referring to the second domain of greatest satisfaction for the GPT (Working Conditions - Team and Training), may be due to the PUH frequently providing training and knowledge updates and the sectors surveyed have a multiprofessional team with a variety of different professional areas. Thus, contact between them is necessary to provide quality service.

Along the same lines, a study that evaluated the importance of the relationship between the team, reports that the greatest satisfaction of a multidisciplinary team in a psychiatric hospital was in Relationships¹⁶.

In the specific case of physical therapists, a study measured the level of satisfaction of physical therapists in Saudi Arabia and observed high levels of job satisfaction in the fields of professional development and teamwork¹². In Brazil, a study that evaluated job satisfaction of physical therapists in the hospital area found that 50.6% rated the relationship with colleagues in the work environment as "Very Good"³.

In the present study, it was identified that the Resources domain was the second of least satisfaction for GPT and they considered that the amount of materials used in therapy was not sufficient. This is possibly related to the fact that PUH is a public institution, where the financial resources for the acquisition of equipment may be insufficient or need more time to be acquired. Added to this is the fact that it serves 27 municipalities that make up the Triângulo Sul macro-region of the state of Minas Gerais, being the only hospital that offers entirely public high complexity care, accounting for 73% of all medium and high complexity macroregion and 100% of high complexity in the same area⁸.

The number of professionals to perform physical therapy procedures was also classified as "Poor" and "Good" (50% and 33.3%, respectively), by the GPT, and good by the GP (35%). This is possibly due to the complexity of the patient seen. According to the parameters of hospital physical therapeutic assistance, of Resolution 444 of COFFITO¹⁷, the number of patients treated by the physical therapist for six hours is eight to ten. As a suggestion, this resolution could be re-evaluated and further studies could be done to confirm this perception.

This study reaffirms the need to assess satisfaction of users and professionals of this service. Future studies should be designed to verify the interaction between variables to be proposed, as well as the domains of this study and satisfaction, seeking to understand the interferences and causes that permeate the dynamics of physical therapy activity.

CONCLUSION

The domain of greatest satisfaction for patients was the Environment and, for physical therapists, it was Interaction. It is salutary to start the discussion regarding the need for instruments that assess the satisfaction of users of physical therapy services, as well as of the professional physical therapist.

As limitations, the sample is considered for convenience and the questionnaire applied has not yet been validated. Therefore, the importance of validating an evaluation instrument to verify the semantics, balance of questions and punctuation is emphasized, so that the results can then be generalized to scenarios with similar characteristics.

REFERENCES

1. Esperidião MA, Trad LAB. Avaliação da satisfação dos usuários: considerações teórico-conceituais. *Cad Saúde Pública* [Internet]. 2006 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 22(6):1267-76. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/csp/v22n6/16.pdf>
2. França ISX, Marinho DDT, Baptista RS. Assistência de saúde humanizada: conquistas e desafios em Campina Grande-PB. *Rev Rene* [Internet]. 2008 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 9(4):15-23. Available from: <http://www.periodicos.ufc.br/rene/article/view/5099>
3. Fonseca ES. A satisfação no trabalho dos fisioterapeutas da área hospitalar de Cuiabá e Várzea Grande-Mato Grosso, Brasil [dissertação]. Vila Real, Portugal: Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro; 2011.
4. Spekman HG, Pleasant JM, Sutton GB. The job satisfaction of physical therapists. *Physiother Res Int*. [Internet]. 1996 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 1(4):247-54. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9238741>
5. Beattie PF, Pinto MB, Nelson MK, Nelson R. Patient satisfaction with outpatient physical therapy: instrument validation. *Phys Ther*. 2002; 82(6):557-65.
6. Monnin D, Perneger TV. Scale to measure patient satisfaction with physical therapy. *Phys Ther*. [Internet]. 2002 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 82(7):682-91. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/ptj/article/82/7/682/2857659>

7. Lima PMB, Cavalcante HEF, Rocha ÂRM, Brito RTF. Fisioterapia no pós-operatório de cirurgia cardíaca: a percepção do paciente. *Rev Bras Cir Cardiovasc.* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 26(2):244-9. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbccv/v26n2/v26n2a15.pdf>
8. Ministério da Educação (Brasil), Empresa Brasileira de Serviços Hospitalares, Instituto Sírio-Libanês de Ensino e Pesquisa. Curso de Especialização em Gestão de Hospitais Universitários do SUS: Plano Diretor Estratégico do Hospital de Clínicas da Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro [Internet]. São Paulo: EBSEERH; 2013-2014 [cited 03 Mar 2016]. 138p. Available from: <http://www.ebserh.gov.br/documents/147715/148046/plano+diretor.pdf/52510c9d-c6e3-410c-8d09-a2a3dbcbcb16>
9. Mendonça KMPP, Guerra RO. Desenvolvimento e validação de um instrumento de medida da satisfação do paciente com a fisioterapia. *Rev Bras Fisioter.* [Internet]. 2007 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 11(5):369-76. Available from: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbfis/v11n5/a07v11n5>
10. Rainho MC, Pimenta G, Antunes MC, Monteiro MJ. Validação da escala de stress profissional em enfermeiros. *Rev Port Enferm Saúde Mental* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 14:48-54. Available from: <http://www.scielo.mec.pt/pdf/rpasm/n14/n14a07.pdf>
11. Quinderé ML, Fraga YC, Mont'Alverne DGB. Satisfação dos usuários do serviço público de fisioterapia do município de Maranguape-CE: em busca da participação comunitária. *Anais da Jornada de Fisioterapia da UFC;* 2011; Fortaleza. Fortaleza: UFC; 2011. p. 36-7.
12. Gonçalves JR, Veras FEL, Matos ACM, Lima ISA. Avaliação da satisfação dos pacientes submetidos à intervenção fisioterapêutica no município de Campo Maior, PI. *Fisioter Mov.* [Internet]. 2011 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 24(1):47-56. Available in: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/fm/v24n1/v24n1a06>
13. Aleisa E, TSE C, Alkassabi O, Buragadda S, Melam GR. Predictors of global job satisfaction among Saudi physiotherapists: a descriptive study. *Ann Saudi Med.* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 35(1):46-50. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26142938>
14. Nogueira ILS. A importância do ambiente físico hospitalar no tratamento terapêutico do paciente hospitalizado. *Especialize On-line* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 10(1):1-15. Available from: <http://docplayer.com.br/34482226-A-importancia-do-ambiente-fisico-hospitalar-no-tratamento-terapeutico-do-paciente-hospitalizado.html>
15. Martins VP. A humanização e o ambiente físico hospitalar. *Anais do I Congresso Nacional da ABDEH, IV Seminário de Engenharia Clínica;* 2004; Salvador. Salvador: ABDEH; 2004. p. 63-7. Available from:
16. Dias GC; Furegatto ARF. Impacto do trabalho e satisfação da equipe multiprofissional de um hospital Psiquiátrico. *Rev Enferm UERJ* [Internet]. 2016 [cited 02 Apr 2020]; 24(1):e8164. Available from: http://bvsm.sau.gov.br/bvs/publicacoes/humanizacao_ambiente_fisico.pdf
17. Conselho Federal de Fisioterapia e Terapia Ocupacional (Brasil). Resolução COFFITO n. 444 de 26 de abril de 2014. Altera a Resolução COFFITO n° 387/2011, que fixa e estabelece os Parâmetros Assistenciais Fisioterapêuticos nas diversas modalidades prestadas pelo fisioterapeuta [Internet]. Brasília, DF: COFFITO; 2014 [cited 24 Oct 2016]. Anexo 1. Available from: <https://www.legisweb.com.br/legislacao/?id=275977>

CONTRIBUTIONS

Leticia Andrade Silva e **Marilita Falangola Accioly** contributed in the conception, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, revision and writing. **Isabel Aparecida Porcatti de Walsh**, **Karilla Leandro Costa**, **Lislei Jorge Patrizzi Martins** and **Suraya Gomes Novais Shimano** participated in the analysis and interpretation of data, writing and revision.

How to cite this article (Vancouver)

Silva LA, Walsh IAP, Costa KL, Martins LJP, Shimano SGN, Accioly MF. Satisfaction on physical therapy care received in hospitals: point of view of patients and physical therapists. *REFACS* [Internet]. 2020 [cited in *insert day, month and year of access*]; 8(3):456-463. Available from: *insert access link*. DOI: *insert DOI link*.

How to cite this article (ABNT)

SILVA, L. A.; WALSH, I. A. P.; COSTA, K. L.; MARTINS, L. J. P.; SHIMANO, S. G. N.; ACCIOLY, M. F. Satisfaction on physical therapy care received in hospitals: point of view of patients and physical therapists. *REFACS*, Uberaba, MG, v. 8, n. 3, p. 456-463, 2020. Available from: *insert access link*. Access in: *insert day, month and year of access*. DOI: *insert DOI link*.

How to cite this article (APA)

Silva, L.A., Walsh, I.A.P., Costa, K.L., Martins, L.J.P., Shimano, S.G.N., & Accioly, M.F. (2020). Satisfaction on physical therapy care received in hospitals: point of view of patients and physical therapists. *REFACS*, 8(3), 456-463. Retrieved in: *insert day, month and year of access* from *insert access link*. DOI: *insert DOI link*.