

Patients Speak, AI Listens: LLM-based Analysis of Online Reviews Uncovers Key Drivers for Urgent Care Satisfaction

Xiaoran Xu^{1*}, Zhaoqian Xue^{2*}, Chi Zhang¹, Jhonatan Medri¹, Junjie Xiong¹, Jiayan Zhou³, Jin Jin⁴,
Yongfeng Zhang⁵, Siyuan Ma^{6,†}, Lingyao Li^{1,†}

¹University of South Florida, Tampa, FL; ²Georgetown University, Washington, DC; ³Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA; ⁴University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; ⁵Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NY; ⁶Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN

Abstract: Investigating the public experience of urgent care facilities is essential for promoting community healthcare development. Traditional survey methods often fall short due to limited scope, time, and spatial coverage. Crowdsourcing through online reviews or social media offers a valuable approach to gaining such insights. With recent advancements in large language models (LLMs), extracting nuanced perceptions from reviews has become feasible. This study collects Google Maps reviews across the DMV and Florida areas and conducts prompt engineering with the GPT model to analyze the aspect-based sentiment of urgent care. We first analyze the geospatial patterns of various aspects, including interpersonal factors, operational efficiency, technical quality, finances, and facilities. Next, we determine Census Block Group(CBG)-level characteristics underpinning differences in public perception, including population density, median income, GINI Index, rent-to-income ratio, household below poverty rate, no insurance rate, and unemployment rate. Our results show that interpersonal factors and operational efficiency emerge as the strongest determinants of patient satisfaction in urgent care, while technical quality, finances, and facilities show no significant independent effects when adjusted for in multivariate models. Among socioeconomic and demographic factors, only population density demonstrates a significant but modest association with patient ratings, while the remaining factors exhibit no significant correlations. Overall, this study highlights the potential of crowdsourcing to uncover the key factors that matter to residents and provide valuable insights for stakeholders to improve public satisfaction with urgent care.

Keywords: Urgent care, Patient satisfaction, Crowdsourcing, Large language models, Aspect-based sentiment analysis, Social determinants.

1 Introduction

Urgent care plays a key role in the healthcare system by offering quick, accessible treatment for non-life-threatening conditions. It provides a more efficient and cost-effective option for minor injuries and sudden illnesses compared to primary care, which focuses on long-term health, and emergency rooms, which handle severe cases but often involve higher costs and longer waits^[1]. Therefore, ensuring timely access to urgent care facilities is crucial for maintaining public health and enhancing community well-being, particularly as urban populations continue to grow. Customer satisfaction in urgent care is particularly important as it reflects the quality, responsiveness, and efficiency of the care provided, directly influencing patient outcomes, trust in healthcare providers, and decisions regarding future healthcare utilization^[2:3].

Conventional approaches to measuring patient satisfaction and experiences with healthcare services^[4:5] are often based on surveys and interviews, such as the Household Pulse Survey (HPS) conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic^[6]. However, these surveys and interviews are typically unable to fully capture the

*These two authors contributed equally to this paper

†Corresponding authors: Siyuan Ma siyuan.ma@vumc.org; Lingyao Li lingyaol@usf.edu

nuances and diversity of residents' experiences due to limitations in time, spatial coverage, and resource intensity. For example, large-scale surveys like HPS, though thorough, can be resource-intensive and time-consuming. Such limitations in conventional methods can restrict the ability of healthcare providers and policymakers to promptly understand and respond to the evolving needs of the local community.

Recent research in crowdsourcing methodologies, especially the ones using social media and online review platforms, has provided great opportunities for us to understand healthcare services due to the richness of user-generated content^[7;8;9;10]. Current studies have explored the potential of crowdsourcing in multiple facets, including identifying off-label medication use^[11], detecting early signals of adverse effects^[12], and evaluating customer experiences related to healthcare services^[13]. Crowdsourcing via social media or online reviews can capture diverse voices and continuous feedback from customers, providing a more representative community sentiment about urgent care services and highlighting aspects that residents value most.

However, analyzing crowdsourced data poses unique challenges due to the unstructured format, varying text length, and differential language use of text data across diverse sources. Traditional natural language processing (NLP) approaches often fall short of accurately interpreting these data types. Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have illustrated the capability to effectively derive insights from large-scale textual data^[14;15]. For instance, researchers have successfully utilized LLMs to extract detailed clinical information from electronic health records (EHRs)^[16] and identify sentiment and key themes from patient reviews of medical treatments^[17]. Additionally, current studies have leveraged LLMs to monitor public discourse^[18], derive consumer insights^[19], and predict health decisions^[20]. These applications highlight the potential of LLMs in transforming diverse, unstructured data sources into valuable knowledge that can support healthcare decision-making.

Despite these promising developments, public perceptions specific to urgent care remain underexplored. Moreover, interpreting these perceptions necessitates aspect-based sentiment analysis (ABSA) tailored to healthcare services. Although prior research has demonstrated the effectiveness of LLMs in extracting valuable insights from social media data^[18;20], few studies have assessed LLM's capability for aspect-based sentiment analysis in the healthcare domain. Additionally, there is limited understanding of how customer service factors intersect with social determinants of health in shaping patient satisfaction. To address these gaps, this study examines patient satisfaction through two primary research questions:

- **RQ1:** What patterns emerge across distinct sentiment dimensions in urgent care services, as identified by state-of-the-art LLM analytics?
- **RQ2:** Which of these sentiment dimensions most strongly drive overall patient satisfaction, and do these effects persist independent of the facilities' area-level socioeconomic characteristics?

Our study collects Google Maps reviews to investigate patient satisfaction toward urgent care across diverse geographical areas. Through analytics leveraging state-of-the-art LLM techniques, we reveal nuanced insights into patient perceptions, uncovering specific components of urgent care services that drive patient satisfaction. Moreover, by integrating statistical analysis with ABSA, our study advances the understanding of healthcare services by identifying how localized socioeconomic factors and community demographics intersect with service quality to influence patient satisfaction. Addressing these two research questions, we provide a detailed understanding of how critical aspects shape patient experiences in urgent care. In addition, our study provides useful insights that allow healthcare providers and policymakers to target improvements more effectively, ultimately fostering higher-quality urgent care experiences and better public health outcomes.

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Data Preparation

Our research framework for analyzing sentiment specifically related to urgent care based on Google Maps reviews is summarized in Figure 1. In this study, Google Maps reviews constitute our primary source for measuring patient perceptions. Google Maps enables users to rate and comment on healthcare facilities freely. We choose Google Maps reviews for two principal reasons. First, Google Maps has witnessed a substantial increase in the volume of user-generated reviews, surpassing other review platforms such as Yelp and TripAdvisor^[21]. Second, unlike social media platforms such as Facebook or Twitter, Google Maps provides targeted insights directly related to specific experiences in service quality^[22]. To implement this study, we utilize the Google Maps review dataset^[23;24] published by the University of California, San Diego encompassing Google Maps reviews as of September 2021. The original dataset consists of two parts, including (1) patient review data (e.g., username, rating, review text, and timestamp), and (2) POI metadata (e.g., POI address, geographical coordinates, descriptions, categories, average ratings, total number of ratings).




Figure 1 Workflow of data processing and analysis of Google Maps reviews. **a.** Distribution of urgent care facilities in Florida and DMV (the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia). Each point represents an urgent care facility, with the point size indicating the volume of reviews. **b.** Examples of patient reviews, one negative and one positive. **c.** LLMs used to classify opinions extracted from Google Maps reviews.

Next, we conduct several steps to filter the dataset. First, we use the keyword “urgent care” as the point-of-interest (POI) filtering condition to filter in targeted reviews. This ensures that the reviews analyzed are directly relevant to urgent care facilities, providing targeted insights into healthcare service quality. Then, we select the DMV area and Florida as case studies because both regions feature diverse populations and numerous urgent care centers. This diversity also allows for a comprehensive analysis of patient experiences across different demographic and geographic contexts, offering valuable comparative insights into service quality and user satisfaction. The resulting dataset contains 250,588 reviews covering 1,225 healthcare facilities providing urgent care services. To specifically extract reviews reflecting residents’ attitudes toward

urgent care, we conduct further data processing to exclude entries containing only numerical ratings without textual reviews. Consequently, we identify 152,680 out of 250,588 reviews associated with users’ feedback toward urgent care facilities.

2.2 Patient Satisfaction Analysis Framework

To effectively categorize patient experiences expressed in Google Maps reviews, the first step is to identify the key aspects associated with patient reviews. Our analysis draws insights from established medical service quality frameworks, as summarized in Table 1.

Based on the studies presented in Table 1, we first recognize that certain aspects—such as prescription-related services, provider function, and touchpoint diversity—are often not explicitly captured in Google Maps review data. Meanwhile, aspects such as comfort, communication, interpersonal manner, empathy, and responsiveness often exhibit conceptual overlap, which presents challenges for language models in distinguishing fine-grained aspect-based sentiments. To address these limitations, we consolidate related attributes into broader categories—for example, merging elements such as wait time, process efficiency, and managerial decisions under operational efficiency. Therefore, we identify five key dimensions for the framework: interpersonal interactions, technical quality, financial considerations, operational efficiency, and facility conditions. These dimensions offer a comprehensive yet concise representation of patient experiences in urgent care settings. Furthermore, they align with well-established healthcare quality assessment frameworks (see Table 1) and provide an appropriate level of granularity to support effective aspect-based sentiment analysis using LLMs.

- **Interpersonal factors:** Features that quantify how well providers interact personally with patients (e.g., concern, friendliness, courtesy, disrespect, rudeness).
- **Technical Quality:** Competence of providers and adherence to high standards of diagnosis and treatment (e.g., thoroughness, accuracy, unnecessary risks, mistakes).
- **Operational Efficiency:** The results of medical care encounters (e.g., helpfulness of medical care providers in improving or maintaining health).
- **Finances:** Factors involved in paying for medical services (e.g., reasonable costs, alternative payment arrangements, comprehensiveness of insurance coverage).
- **Facilities:** Presence of medical care resources (e.g., availability of healthcare facilities and equipment)

2.3 Data Annotation

Before utilizing LLMs to extract aspect-based sentiments from patient reviews, it was essential to establish a validation set to ensure accuracy before scaling the approach to the entire dataset. To achieve this goal, we randomly select 400 reviews for which we conduct manual sentiment annotations to evaluate the accuracy of sentiment extraction. Given the inherent challenges of manual labeling—such as high labor intensity, inconsistent standards, and subjective biases—we implement a structured annotation process. Specifically, four independent annotators manually label the selected reviews based on our predefined aspects. To assess annotation quality and consistency, we measure inter-annotator agreement and resolve discrepancies through a majority voting approach, ensuring the reliability and robustness of the final annotated labels. Table 2 provides representative examples for each aspect, aiding in the evaluation and standardization of sentiment classification.

Table 1 Consolidation of Healthcare Quality Aspects from Existing Studies.

Author and Year	Aspects
Ware et al. (1983) ^[25]	Interpersonal manner, technical quality, efficacy/outcomes, accessibility/convenience, finances, continuity, physical environment, facilities/availability
Berry et al. (1990) ^[26]	Reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, responsiveness.
Marshall and Hays (1994) ^[27]	Access to care, financial aspects, availability of services, continuity of care, technical quality, interpersonal care
World Health Organization. (2006) ^[28]	Effectiveness, efficiency, accessibility, patient-centeredness, safety, equity.
Manary et al. (2013) ^[29]	Communication with nurses & physicians, timeliness of assistance, Pain management, discharge planning, cleanliness & facilities, emotional support.
Ozcelik et al. (2019) ^[30]	Provider type & function, touchpoint diversity, patient interaction, environment, psychological support, process efficiency, financial accessibility.
Agarwal et al. (2019) ^[31]	Comfort, professionalism, facilities, pediatric care, staff interactions, communication, waiting, billing/insurance, pain management, diagnostic testing, prescription and pharmacy, reception.
Tucker and Adams (2021) ^[32]	Caring, empathy, reliability, responsiveness, access, communication, outcomes

2.4 Aspect-based Sentiment Analysis (ABSA)

ABSA is a refined form of sentiment analysis that focuses on identifying and extracting opinions about specific attributes or aspects of a product or service, rather than assessing overall sentiment. This method enables a more nuanced understanding of user feedback by linking sentiments to particular service dimensions^[33]. In the context of this study, we leverage ABSA to extract sentiments associated with distinct five aspects of urgent care services from Google Maps reviews. Unlike traditional sentiment analysis, ABSA facilitates a more nuanced evaluation of patient experiences, thereby offering deeper insights into the specific areas that influence patient satisfaction in urgent care settings.

We design prompts to interact with LLMs to extract ABSA. A typical prompt consists of several components, including an instructional introduction, question prompt, text prompt, and expected output constraints. In addition, prior studies have demonstrated^[34] that LLMs exhibit strong few-shot learning capabilities^[34], enabling them to generalize patterns from a few examples provided within the prompt. Research has also shown that providing examples in a prompt can improve accuracy and coherence, particularly in tasks requiring nuanced classification, such as ABSA. Therefore, we design the prompt by incorporating clear definitions, examples, and JSON output, aiming to optimize LLMs' ability to generate reliable and contextually appropriate responses. The designed prompt is presented in Appendix A.

2.5 LLM Implementation and Performance Measure

We evaluate the performance of five candidate LLMs: GPT-3.5, GPT-4o mini, GPT-4o, Claude Haiku, and Claude Sonnet. The sample size for the testing dataset is 400. The performance of these candidate models

is assessed using four key metrics: Precision, Recall, F1-score, and Accuracy. Precision indicates the percentage of true positive (TP) cases among all reviews correctly predicted by each respective model. Recall reflects the percentage of TP cases out of all actual positive cases. The F1-score provides a harmonic mean of precision and recall, balancing both metrics. Accuracy measures the proportion of correctly classified reviews out of all reviews. The performance of the sentiment classification of each model is shown in 2.

Table 2 Representative examples of ABSA from Google Maps reviews for urgent care.

Google Maps review [sic]	ABSA Classification
We had a short wait time, got right in and the doctor was thorough, caring and quick to get us in and out and seen my family as a whole. Amazing visit thank-you next care at 501 N. Park Tucson, Az.	Interpersonal Factors: Positive Operational Efficiency: Positive Technical Quality: Positive Facilities: Positive
Probably not worth the time. Staff was patient and listened well but weren't helpful. Charged me \$550 to give no answers and just told me to follow up with my regular doctor.	Interpersonal Factors: Positive Operational Efficiency: Negative Technical Quality: Negative Finances: Negative
called at 4:50, they close at 5pm and the dr still saw me when i got there just before 5. very friendly and super knowledgeable. highly recommended its \$120 to see the dr without insurance	Operational Efficiency: Positive Technical Quality: Positive Finances: Neutral Facilities: Positive
ABSOLUTELY TERRIBLE!! I called at 11:51 and nobody answered so I just decided to go anyways. I get there at 12:26 (the wind is blowing crazy at this point) and the doors are locked. Thinking I went to the wrong door I decided to walk around the building for another door. When I reached the first door I went to, there was now a HAND WRITTEN sign up saying that they are closed until 1:30....	Interpersonal Factors: Negative Operational Efficiency: Negative Facilities: Negative
Was admitted from heart clinic bed not ready and you know the hospital wasn't full people talking temperature talking about going out and other things not related to job while standing in line they put me in ER people with no mask cussing hitting on doors lady sitting in wheelchair needs restroom no one helps so she pist herself this is ridiculous I pay insurance may not be much but no one needs to be treated like this and they want their co pay please	Interpersonal Factors: Negative Operational Efficiency: Negative Finances: Negative Facilities: Negative

The performance evaluation is based on a sample of 400 reviews, but it is important to note that the dataset is flattened, as each review may include sentiment classifications for multiple aspects. As a result, the distribution of sentiment classes is highly imbalanced: there are 676 positive samples, 180 negative samples, and only 18 neutral samples. This imbalance likely contributes to the challenge of achieving high performance for the neutral class, as purely neutral comments in patient reviews are relatively rare.

Figure 2 reveals several key insights. All five tested LLMs demonstrate an overall accuracy of more than 80%. Notably, GPT-4o and Claude-Sonet achieve comparatively higher test accuracy along with a more balanced and higher F1 score across all classes. However, their cost is over ten times that of more cost-efficient models such as GPT-4o mini or Claude-Haiku. Although GPT-4o mini exhibits slightly lower performance, the trade-off is marginal and generally acceptable. Given the cost-effectiveness—where GPT-4o mini is substantially more affordable—and the large scale of our dataset, we ultimately choose GPT-4o mini for analysis.




Figure 2 Performance on the sentiment classification of candidate models.

2.6 Statistical Models

To examine major factors influencing hospital ratings, we perform both marginal (Pearson correlation) and joint analyses (multiple linear regression) across hospitals, incorporating both the five hospital-level sentiment scores and additional, regional demographic and socioeconomic attributes associated with the hospitals’ geographical locations. The multiple linear regression in particular accounts for the strong confounding correlations amongst sentiment score aspects (Figure 5) and identifies the strongest determinants of perceived quality of urgent care, using hospital ratings as its proxy.

2.6.1 Regression Models

We formulate two multiple linear regression models for the adjusted analysis of sentiment aspect vs. review rating associations. For either model, the dependent variable is the average Google rating for each hospital i , denoted as $Rating_i$, which quantifies overall patient satisfaction based on publicly available reviews. **Model 1** includes the five sentiment scores as predictor variables capturing five key aspects of patient experience—Interpersonal Factors, Operational Efficiency, Technical Quality, Finances, and Facilities. These scores are calculated as averages across reviews per hospital, reflecting collective patient sentiment. That is, let $SentimentScore_{ij}$ denote the average score for hospital i and sentiment aspect j , **Model 1** is formulated as:

$$Rating_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^5 \beta_j SentimentScore_{ij} + \epsilon_i.$$

Here, β_0 is the intercept, β_j s represents the coefficients of interest for the sentiment scores (Interpersonal Factors, Operational Efficiency, Technical Quality, Finances, and Facilities), and ϵ_i is the independent error term^[35]. This fully adjusted regression thus accounts for the strong interdependence amongst the five sentiment aspects (Figure 5), identifying the strongest “determinant” aspects that drive hospital customer rating.

Model 2 includes all sentiment aspects as included in **Model 1** but additionally adjusts for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the hospitals’ geographical location as covariates. These are region-level metrics as linked to Census Block Groups (CBG) that the hospitals are located under, including population density, median income, rent-to-income ratio, Gini index, household below poverty rate, no insurance rate, and unemployment rate. Adjusting these variables in **Model 2** allows us to additionally control for potential

contextual effects of hospitals’ surrounding areas. Specifically, let $SocioeconomicFactor_{ik}$ indicate region-level metric k for hospital i (seven total), **Model 2** is formulated as:

$$Rating_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^5 \beta_j SentimentScore_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^7 \gamma_k SocioeconomicScore_{ik} + \epsilon_i.$$

Compared to **Model 1**, the additional coefficients γ_k represent effects for socioeconomic factors. Prior to inclusion in the regression models, all demographic and socioeconomic variables underwent z-score normalization to address scaling differences and enhance comparability.

2.6.2 Sensitivity Analysis

Interaction. To examine potential regional variations in sentiment-rating relationships, we conduct interaction analyses within our regression framework. Following standard statistical practice for interaction modeling, we center the predictor variables by subtracting their respective means to minimize multicollinearity effects. We include three interaction terms: interpersonal factors \times operational efficiency, interpersonal factors \times population density, and operational efficiency \times population density to address potential geographical heterogeneity in sentiment-satisfaction relationships. These population density-associated interaction terms enable us to test whether the association between key sentiment aspects and hospital ratings varies across different levels of urbanization, which could potentially reveal important contextual influences on patient evaluation of urgent care services.

Data filtering. To ensure reliable sentiment analysis, we restrict the dataset to hospitals with at least 10 reviews for each of the five aspects, yielding a total sample of 534 hospitals. This filtering strategy minimizes noise from sparse review data, enhancing the robustness of the sentiment scores^[36]. To evaluate the potential impact of our stringent filtering criteria on the regression outcomes, we conduct a sensitivity analysis by modifying the inclusion parameters. Specifically, we eliminate the minimum review threshold requirement for the finances aspect, which exhibits the lowest review availability among the five sentiment dimensions. This modification substantially increases our analytical sample from 534 to 716 hospitals (34% increase). We subsequently fit a modified regression model using this expanded dataset, excluding finances while retaining the remaining four sentiment aspects (interpersonal factors, operational efficiency, technical quality, and facilities) as predictor variables, following the structure of **Model 2**. This approach enables us to systematically assess whether our primary findings remain consistent across different filtering specifications and sample sizes, thereby evaluating the robustness of our analytical framework and the stability of our coefficient estimates independent of specific filtering decisions.

Multicollinearity. Despite the strong correlation among both the sentiment scores (Figure 5) and across demographic and socioeconomic variables (e.g., median income and poverty rate), we reason it is important to include variables simultaneously in a fully adjusted model to delineate true determinants driving urgent care satisfaction. This approach is admissible in particular thanks to the larger geographical scales and sample sizes of our included hospitals ($n=534$). Similar approaches to simultaneous adjustment for the mutually correlated region- and individual-level covariates have been previously adopted for population health research across diverse geographical areas^[37]. Quantitatively, we assess the impact of multicollinearity by computing the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for each independent variable to ensure the stability and interpretability of the regression estimates^[38]. We observe that, across the five variables, the largest VIF is Interpersonal Factors, suggesting the most moderate impact of multicollinearity in our data (Table 3). The model’s explanatory power is evaluated using R-squared and adjusted R-squared metrics^[39].

Table 3 Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) for Independent Variables in Model 2

Variables	VIF
Sentiment Scores	
Interpersonal Factors	7.982441
Technical Quality	4.193950
Operational Efficiency	5.192045
Finances	1.942998
Facilities	1.727500
Socioeconomic Factors	
Population Density	1.048605
Median Income	1.734290
Rent-to-Income Ratio	1.184145
GINI Index	1.154306
Household Below Poverty Rate	1.808886
No Insurance Rate	1.344027
Unemployment Rate	1.231215

3 Results

The results analysis explores two research questions. For the first research question, we identify patterns in public sentiment across different aspects of urgent care services. We examine two key aspects: the variation in sentiment distribution across different aspects in DMV and FL, and the factors and aspects that have the greatest impact on patient sentiment. For the second research question, we investigate the relationship between geospatial patterns and local socio-spatial factors. Specifically, we analyze key social, demographic, and economic factors associated with public sentiment and identify patterns of public perception across different geographic regions.

3.1 Sentiment Distribution and Geospatial Patterns

Figure 3 shows the distribution of patient sentiment scores in the DMV region and Florida on the five dimensions of interpersonal factors, technical quality, operational efficiency, finance, and facility availability. The GPT-4o mini model is used to score sentiment, ranging from -1 (negative) to 1 (positive). Grouped by region, a box plot is drawn to show the distribution of sentiment scores. We can see that in all dimensions, Florida’s median sentiment is slightly higher than that of the DMV, especially in interpersonal factors and operational efficiency. The sentiment score of the financial dimension is generally low, and both regions have obvious negative emotions. The highest sentiment score is for facilities, indicating that patients have a good overall evaluation of the hospital’s hardware conditions. Outliers indicate that there are extremely negative or positive comments on each dimension.

Figure 4 illustrates the geospatial distribution of urgent care health centers in the DMV and Florida regions, highlighting spatial variations in overall review ratings and aspect-based sentiment scores across five key dimensions. We visualize this by overlaying review data on state maps, where each dot represents an urgent care center. The dot color indicates the average rating or sentiment score, while the dot size represents the number of reviews. We include only urgent care POI with at least 10 reviews and focus on Florida and the DMV region. Our geospatial analysis of urgent care centers in Florida and the DMV region reveals notable trends in patient reviews and aspect-based sentiment scores. Overall, urgent care centers in Florida receive




Figure 3 Distribution of sentiment scores across five key aspects of patient experience by region.




Figure 4 Geospatial distribution among health centers. **a.** Average Rating Score in DMV and FL. **b.** Sentiment Score among Aspects in DMV and FL.

an average rating of 4.31 based on 172,597 reviews in 746 health centers while those in the DMV region have an average rating of 4.14 across 77,293 reviews in 378 health centers. These ratings suggest that patient experiences are generally positive in both regions. However, sentiment analysis across different aspects of care reveals important distinctions, particularly in financial satisfaction and operational efficiency. Financial concerns emerge as the most negatively rated aspect among the five key sentiment categories analyzed. In Florida, sentiment related to cost and billing has an average score of -0.34 across 11,701 reviews, while in the DMV region, financial sentiment is even lower at -0.53 from 5,002 reviews.

Other aspects of care are generally rated positively, though some differences emerge between regions. The sentiment of interpersonal factors, which reflects patient experiences with staff and provider interactions, is higher in Florida (0.59 across 89,357 reviews) than in the DMV region (0.49 across 40,631 reviews). Similarly, the sentiment of technical quality, which captures opinions on the care competency received, is higher in Florida (0.46 across 29,548 reviews) compared to the DMV (0.34 across 13,962 reviews).

Operational efficiency, including wait times and administrative processes, receives lower sentiment scores than other non-financial aspects, with Florida scoring 0.39 from 63,852 reviews and the DMV scoring 0.30 from 30,915 reviews. Meanwhile, facility-related sentiment, which measures perceptions of cleanliness, organization, and availability of medical equipment, received the highest ratings in both regions. Patients in Florida rated this aspect at 0.68 from 18,614 reviews, while those in the DMV region provided a similar rating of 0.61 from 7,755 reviews.

Overall, these findings indicate that urgent care centers in both regions are well-regarded for their interpersonal interactions, technical quality, and facilities, but concerns persist regarding financial transparency and operational efficiency. Florida's centers generally received higher sentiment scores than those in the DMV region, suggesting that patient experiences in Florida may be more favorable across multiple aspects of care.

3.2 Statistical Analysis

All five sentiment scores are intercorrelated amongst each other and with average hospital ratings, suggesting different aspects of urgent care customer experience are typically related and jointly impact overall satisfaction (Figure 5). Specifically, we evaluate the Pearson correlation between the five sentiment aspects (averaged per-hospital) and per-hospital average customer rating, further stratified by geographical region (DMV and Florida) aspect. The five aspects have significant positive intercorrelations with each other ($p < 0.0001$ for all), ranging from moderate (facilities with finance, $r=0.36$ for both DMV and Florida) to strong dependencies (interpersonal factors with operational efficiency, DMV: $r = 0.87$; Florida: $r = 0.89$), suggesting different aspects of patients' urgent care experience are typically related to each other.

The five aspects also have significant positive correlations with hospital ratings ($p < 0.001$ for all). Specifically, interpersonal factors exhibit the strongest correlation with hospital ratings in both DMV ($r = 0.94$) and Florida ($r = 0.93$), followed by operational efficiency (DMV: $r = 0.84$; Florida: $r = 0.87$) and technical quality (DMV: $r = 0.73$; Florida: $r = 0.82$). Finances (DMV: $r = 0.60$; Florida: $r = 0.59$) and facilities (DMV: $r = 0.55$; Florida: $r = 0.60$) show moderate correlations. This pattern is consistent in the two geographic regions, with Florida generally showing slightly stronger correlations for technical quality and operational efficiency. Together, our findings support that interconnected patient experience aspects jointly impact urgent care quality, as evaluated through public reviews and reproduced across two geographical locations.

We further delineate the individual impact of each urgent care experience aspect with a fully adjusted multiple linear regression analysis. Briefly (full details in Methods), we fit two linear regression models on per-hospital average review as the outcome. The first model includes all five sentiment scores as the predictors, thus delineating their individual (conditional) effects while accounting for the impact of other aspects.

The second model additionally incorporates demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of CBGs that hospitals are located at as covariates (7 total; see Methods 2.6 and Table 4) to further adjust for each hospital's regional contexts. Our conditional modeling approach allows us to determine, among inter-correlated per-hospital sentiment scores and area-level SES covariates, determinant factors that independently affect patients' evaluation of the quality of their visit, similar to existing approaches in large-scale population studies of health associations with individual-level and neighborhood-level factors^[37].




Figure 5 Distribution (diagonal cells) and pairwise association (lower triangle), and pairwise correlations between service aspects and ratings for DMV and Florida regions.

Our models establish consistent findings on significant predictors for visit satisfaction; in particular, interpersonal factors and operational efficiency are consistently the strongest determinants (Table 4). As an overall diagnostic, **Model 1** demonstrates the high explanatory power of sentiment scores on hospital rating (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.875$), which is only slightly improved with the additional CBG-level demographic and socioeconomic factors in **Model 2** (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.877$). Among the predictors, interpersonal factors emerge as the strongest predictor of hospital ratings across both models (**Model 1**: $\beta = 1.684$, $p < 0.001$; **Model 2**: $\beta = 1.705$, $p < 0.001$), followed by operational efficiency (**Model 1**: $\beta = 0.303$, $p < 0.001$; **Model 2**: $\beta = 0.289$, $p < 0.001$; Table 4). Notably, technical quality, finances, and facilities do not show statistically significant associations in either model, suggesting these are not major drivers of visit quality once interpersonal factors and operational efficiency are adjusted for. From **Model 2** results, population density is the only significant CBG-level factor, with more densely populated areas demonstrating higher ratings ($\beta =$

0.023, $p = 0.009$). Other SES variables do not show significant associations. Our results thus demonstrate interpersonal factors and operational efficiency as distinctive determinants shaping urgent care experience over other aspects (finance, facilities, technical quality), specifically addressing our **RQ2** (key aspects driving customer satisfaction with urgent care services). These agree with health economics research from other fields that highlight the importance of empathy, respect, and communication effectiveness in health-care facility operations^[40;41]. Our findings, derived fully based on public review data and empowered by novel LLM analytics, thus join existing evidence in underscoring the importance of the “human element” in provider-patient interactions, in particular within the context of urgent care quality and satisfaction.

Table 4 OLS Regression Results for Predictors of Urgent Care Ratings

Variables	Model 1: Sentiment Scores Only	Model 2: Sentiment Scores + Socioeconomic Factors
Sentiment Scores		
Interpersonal Factors	1.684*** (0.091)	1.705*** (0.091)
Technical Quality	0.004 (0.056)	0.004 (0.056)
Operational Efficiency	0.303*** (0.062)	0.289*** (0.061)
Finances	-0.055 (0.031)	-0.056 (0.031)
Facilities	0.033 (0.041)	0.036 (0.041)
Socioeconomic Factors		
Population Density	-	0.023** (0.009)
Median Income	-	0.016 (0.011)
Rent-to-Income Ratio	-	0.000 (0.009)
GINI Index	-	-0.011 (0.009)
Household Below Poverty Rate	-	0.011 (0.011)
No Insurance Rate	-	0.016 (0.010)
Unemployment Rate	-	0.008 (0.009)
Intercept	3.066*** (0.036)	3.058*** (0.036)
Model Fit		
R-squared	0.876	0.880
Adjusted R-squared	0.875	0.877
F-statistic	748.9***	318.5***
Observations	534	534

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. Significance levels: ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$.

All socioeconomic variables in **Model 2** are standardized (mean = 0, standard deviation = 1).

Our findings are robust against regional variations and different model specifications through extensive sensitivity analyses (Methods 2.6). First, by additionally testing for interaction effects between interpersonal factors, operational efficiency, and region-level population density (i.e., those with significant coefficients), we observe no significant geographic heterogeneity in sentiment-rating relationships (interpersonal factors \times population density: $\beta = 0.080$, $p = 0.321$; operational efficiency \times population density: $\beta = -0.087$, $p = 0.301$). Thus, key sentiment aspects consistently influence satisfaction regardless of urbanization levels. Second, to address the intercorrelations among sentiment scores, we evaluate multicollinearity via variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis. As shown in, the VIF values for sentiment aspects are at most moderate and under thresholds deemed reasonable for large-scale studies with correlated predictors as discussed in O’Brien^[38]. Third, we evaluate the impact of our filtering criteria by comparing our primary regression results with an expanded sample analysis (Methods 2.6). This expanded analysis ($n=716$) excludes the

finances aspect from our filtering criteria, which has the lowest availability in reviews and removes the most posts in the primary analyses (n=534). The findings are highly consistent with interpersonal factors ($\beta = 1.64$, $p < 0.001$) operational efficiency ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.001$), and population density ($\beta = 0.018$, $p = 0.024$) still representing the strongest and only significant. Our sensitivity analyses thus confirm the robustness of our primary findings, independent of specific model choices or regional characteristics.

We find that in **Model 2**, interpersonal factors show the largest coefficient of patient satisfaction ($\beta = 1.705$, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, operational efficiency is the second significant factor influencing patient satisfaction ($\beta = 0.289$, $p < 0.001$) towards their experiences with urgent care. On the contrary, despite technical quality showing a strong bivariate correlation with ratings (DMV: $r = 0.73$; Florida: $r = 0.82$), it demonstrates no significant independent predictive power in either multivariate model (**Model 2**: $\beta = 0.004$, $p = 0.941$).

Even after adjusting for demographic and socioeconomic factors in **Model 2**, only population density was significantly associated with hospital ratings ($\beta = 0.023$, $p = 0.009$). The insignificance of other socioeconomic variables, including income, inequality measures, poverty rates, and insurance coverage, suggests that the relationship between patient satisfaction and service quality transcends socioeconomic boundaries within our sample.

4 Discussion

Our study employs ABSA to investigate patient experiences with urgent care services, analyzing Google Maps reviews from the DMV and Florida regions. We extract sentiment scores using two LLMs for five key aspects—interpersonal factors, operational efficiency, technical quality, finances, and facilities—and examine their relationship with overall ratings through regression analysis. Our findings offer fresh insights into patient satisfaction in urgent care, supporting and expanding prior work in health informatics and patient-centered care.

Our analysis shows interpersonal factors most strongly correlate with patient satisfaction (DMV: $r = 0.94$; Florida: $r = 0.93$), followed by operational efficiency (DMV: $r = 0.84$; Florida: $r = 0.87$) and technical quality (DMV: $r = 0.73$; Florida: $r = 0.82$). This emphasizes the role of provider-patient interactions, like empathy and communication, in shaping urgent care quality perceptions, consistent with Boissy et al.'s findings that communication skills training for physicians improves patient satisfaction^[42]. While patients recognize technical competence, their satisfaction is more influenced by interpersonal and efficiency aspects. Regression models confirm interpersonal factors have the greatest impact on ratings (**Model 1**: $\beta = 1.684$, $p < 0.001$; **Model 2**: $\beta = 1.705$, $p < 0.001$), followed by operational efficiency (**Model 1**: $\beta = 0.303$, $p < 0.001$; **Model 2**: $\beta = 0.289$, $p < 0.001$), echoing Mostafa and El-Atawi's study linking reduced wait times to higher satisfaction and improved clinical outcomes in emergency department contexts^[43]. These align with health informatics research on the "human element" in healthcare as demonstrated by Ferreira et al^[44].

Conversely, finances (DMV: $r = 0.60$; Florida: $r = 0.59$) and facilities (DMV: $r = 0.55$; Florida: $r = 0.60$) show weaker correlations with ratings and no significant effects in multivariate models (finances, **Model 2**: $\beta = 0.071$, $p = 0.135$; facilities, **Model 2**: $\beta = 0.032$, $p = 0.463$). This questions traditional assumptions that financial affordability and the quality of medical infrastructure are crucial determinants of patient satisfaction, suggesting instead that these play a secondary role in urgent care. Finances scored negatively (DMV: -0.53 ; Florida: -0.34), but their minor role in satisfaction suggests patients value service quality over cost in urgent care. Positive facility sentiment (DMV: 0.61 ; Florida: 0.68) also fails to predict ratings, showing they matter less to satisfaction.

The focus on interpersonal factors and operational efficiency ties to urgent care's role as a quick, accessi-

ble option for acute, non-severe issues, distinct from primary care’s long-term management or emergency rooms’ life-threatening care. Unlike primary care or emergency departments, patients assume technical competence, making engagement and efficiency more vital to satisfaction. Operational efficiency, including wait times and scheduling, drives convenience—a core urgent care feature—evident in its consistent significance across regions and models.

Geospatial and socioeconomic analyses reveal Florida’s urgent care centers outperform DMV ones (e.g., interpersonal sentiment: 0.59 vs. 0.49; technical quality: 0.46 vs. 0.34), possibly due to regional service or expectation differences. Population density is the only notable socioeconomic factor (**Model 2**: $\beta = 0.023$, $p = 0.009$), hinting urban areas gain from competition or resources, though its small effect limits impact. Other factors like income or poverty show no influence, suggesting satisfaction is consistent across contexts, underlining interpersonal and operational priorities, and exploring how socioeconomic factors influence satisfaction can help tailor services to diverse patient needs.

These findings could help urgent care healthcare providers enhance their patient experiences and health outcomes. By identifying and understanding the patients’ satisfaction regarding urgent care services from various aspects, healthcare providers can gain valuable insights that lead to targeted improvements in service delivery. This is crucial in a healthcare landscape where patient expectations are continually evolving. Moreover, exploring how socioeconomic factors influence customer satisfaction can help urgent care facilities tailor their services to meet the specific needs of patients. Previous research has shown that socioeconomic status can impact access to healthcare and overall health outcomes. Improving urgent care can contribute to a more equitable healthcare system that effectively serves all populations, particularly those minorities.

Our works present several avenues for future research. First, we adopt GPT-4o mini as the backbone model for ABSA, because the marginal performance difference relative to GPT-4o mini is outweighed by its significantly lower cost, making it a more practical choice for large-scale analysis. Given the rapidly evolving landscape of LLMs, future research could explore the performance of alternative LLMs and refine prompt engineering strategies, such as fine-tuning^[45] and chain-of-thought prompting^[46], to further enhance the accuracy and efficiency of ABSA in such a context. Second, prior research suggests that the online user base skews toward younger, more highly educated individuals^[47;48], which may introduce demographic bias into our findings on public perceptions of urgent care services. To mitigate this limitation, future studies could consider integrating data from traditional surveys, to capture more diverse perspectives. Third, this study focuses on the DMV and Florida regions. Future research could extend this analytical framework to a nationwide scale or apply it to other healthcare service domains, such as emergency departments. This allows us to generate a more comprehensive understanding of patient experiences and inform more responsive healthcare strategies tailored to different geographic regions and healthcare domains.

5 Conclusions

We employ ABSA to investigate five key components of patient experience in healthcare systems and their relationships with customer ratings in Google Map Reviews for urgent care services in the DMV and Florida regions. We show the interpersonal factors as the primary predictor of patient satisfaction, with operational efficiency also playing a significant role. Our findings can guide healthcare providers in enhancing patient satisfaction through improved interpersonal interactions and operational processes.

References

- [1] Robin M Weinick, Steffanie J Bristol, and Catherine M DesRoches. Urgent care centers in the us: Findings from a national survey. *BMC Health Services Research*, 9(1):79, 2009. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-9-79.
- [2] Haitao Qin, Victor R Prybutok, Daniel A Peak, and Kwabena G Boakye. Ucperf: An urgent care patient satisfaction instrument. *Quality Management Journal*, 21(3):11–25, 2014. doi: 10.1080/10686967.2014.11918393.
- [3] Emma Knowles, Alicia O’Cathain, and Jon Nicholl. Patients’ experiences and views of an emergency and urgent care system. *Health Expectations*, 15(1):78–86, 2012. doi: 10.1111/j.1369-7625.2010.00659.x.
- [4] Rashid Al-Abri and Amina Al-Balushi. Patient satisfaction survey as a tool towards quality improvement. *Oman Medical Journal*, 29(1):3–7, 2014. doi: 10.5001/omj.2014.02.
- [5] Michelle Howard, James Goertzen, Brian Hutchison, Janusz Kaczorowski, and Karyn Morris. Patient satisfaction with care for urgent health problems: A survey of family practice patients. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 5(5):419–424, 2007. doi: 10.1370/afm.704.
- [6] US Census Bureau. Household pulse survey: Measuring emergent social and economic matters facing us households. Published online, 2024.
- [7] Kerri Wazny. Applications of crowdsourcing in health: an overview. *Journal of Global Health*, 8(1): 010502, 2018.
- [8] Cheng Wang, Lu Han, Gizem Stein, Sophia Day, Cedric Bien-Gund, Allison Mathews, Jason J Ong, Pei-Yun Zhao, Shui Shan Wei, Jennifer Walker, et al. Crowdsourcing in health and medical research: a systematic review. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*, 9:1–9, 2020.
- [9] Daren C Brabham, Kurt M Ribisl, Thomas R Kirchner, and Jay M Bernhardt. Crowdsourcing applications for public health. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 46(2):179–187, 2014.
- [10] Lingyao Li, Jiayan Zhou, Zixuan Ma, Mark T Bensi, Michelle A Hall, and Gregory B Baecher. Dynamic assessment of the covid-19 vaccine acceptance leveraging social media data. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 129:104054, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2022.104054.
- [11] Yuan Hua, Hueichen Jiang, Sheng Lin, Kun Xu, Mingyu Sun, Jingcheng Guo, Kylie Han, Yujie Fan, Yuanzhe Zhang, Michael Liu, et al. Using twitter data to understand public perceptions of approved versus off-label use for covid-19-related medications. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 29(10):1668–1678, 2022. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocac114.
- [12] Su Golder, Karen Smith, Karen O’Connor, Robert Gross, Sean Hennessy, and Graciela Gonzalez-Hernandez. A comparative view of reported adverse effects of statins in social media, regulatory data, drug information databases and systematic reviews. *Drug Safety*, 44(2):167–179, 2021. doi: 10.1007/s40264-020-00998-1.
- [13] Michael A Bentan, David Moffatt, Essam Dawood, and Ryan Nord. Addressing the gaps: What social media tells us about patient experiences with hypoglossal nerve stimulation. *American Journal of Otolaryngology*, 45(5):104419, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.amjoto.2024.104419.
- [14] Lingyao Li, Jiayan Zhou, Zonglin Gao, et al. A scoping review of using large language models (llms) to investigate electronic health records (ehrs). 2024.
- [15] Zonglin Gao, Lingyao Li, Siyuan Ma, Qing Wang, Libby Hemphill, and Rong Xu. Examining the potential of chatgpt on biomedical information retrieval: Fact-checking drug-disease associations. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, 52(8):1919–1927, 2024. doi: 10.1007/s10439-023-03385-w.
- [16] Xiang Yang, Aaron Chen, Newsha PourNejatian, Nathan Bach, Jingcheng Jason Bai, Santiago Balaguer, Avni Gupta, Huiqi Hu, Katharine Jiang, Shayne Longpre, et al. A large language model for electronic health records. *npj Digital Medicine*, 5(1):194, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41746-022-00742-2.

- [17] Ariel E Kornblith, Chandra Singh, Jayne C Innes, Seok Min Han, Julie Gong, and Alfred M McCoy Jr. Analyzing patient perspectives with large language models: a cross-sectional study of sentiment and thematic classification on exception from informed consent. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1):6179, 2025. doi: 10.1038/s41598-025-89996-w.
- [18] Lenard Espinosa and Marcel Salathé. Use of large language models as a scalable approach to understanding public health discourse. *PLOS Digital Health*, 3(10):e0000631, 2024. doi: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000631.
- [19] Michael E Matheny, Jiaping Yang, Joseph Charles Smith, Kristina A Lindsley, James A Nahill, Andrea J Crawford, Timothy S Hudson, Robert A Anderson, Siva J Wang, Ana Szarfman, et al. Enhancing postmarketing surveillance of medical products with large language models. *JAMA Network Open*, 7(8):e2428276–e2428276, 2024. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.28276.
- [20] Xiaowen Ding, Ben Carik, Uma Shankar Gunturi, Valerie Reyna, and Eun Hye Richard Rho. Leveraging prompt-based large language models: Predicting pandemic health decisions and outcomes through social media language. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–20. ACM, 2024. doi: 10.1145/3613904.3642117.
- [21] Munawir, M Donny Koerniawan, and Bart Julien Dewancker. Visitor perceptions and effectiveness of place branding strategies in thematic parks in bandung city using text mining based on google maps user reviews. *Sustainability*, 11(7):2123, 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11072123.
- [22] Kitae Yum and Byungjoon Yoo. Enhancing online reviews: exploring the impact of characteristic-based review system on customer engagement for offline sellers. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1):1567, 2024. doi: 10.1057/s41599-024-04082-2.
- [23] Jiacheng Li, Jingbo Shang, and Julian McAuley. Uctopic: Unsupervised contrastive learning for phrase representations and topic mining, 2022.
- [24] An Yan, Zhankui He, Jiacheng Li, Tianyang Zhang, and Julian McAuley. Personalized showcases: Generating multi-modal explanations for recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2251–2255. ACM, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3539618.3592036.
- [25] John E Ware Jr, Mary K Snyder, W Russell Wright, and Allyson R Davies. Defining and measuring patient satisfaction with medical care. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 6(3-4):247–263, 1983. doi: 10.1016/0149-7189(83)90005-8.
- [26] V. A. Zeithaml, A. Parasuraman, and L. L. Berry. *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. The Free Press, New York, 1990.
- [27] Grant N. Marshall and Ron D. Hays. *The Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire Short-form (PSQ-18)*. P-7865. RAND, Santa Monica, CA, 1994. ISBN 0833022415.
- [28] World Health Organization. *Quality of care: a process for making strategic choices in health systems*, 2006.
- [29] Matthew P. Manary, William Boulding, Richard Staelin, and Seth W. Glickman. The patient experience and health outcomes. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368(3):201–203, 2013. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1211775.
- [30] A. B. Ozcelik and S. Burnaz. Customer experience quality dimensions in health care: perspectives of industry experts. *Journal of Management, Marketing and Logistics*, 6(2):62–72, 2019. doi: 10.17261/Pressacademia.2019.1034.
- [31] Anish K. Agarwal, Kevin Mahoney, Amy L. Lanza, Elissa V. Klinger, David A. Asch, Nick Fausti, Christopher Tufts, Lyle Ungar, and Raina M. Merchant. Online ratings of the patient experience: Emergency departments versus urgent care centers. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 73(6):631–638, 2019. ISSN 0196-0644. doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2018.09.029.
- [32] J. L. Tucker and S. R. Adams. Incorporating patients’ assessments of satisfaction and quality: an

- integrative model of patients' evaluations of their care. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 11(4):272–287, 2001. doi: 10.1108/EUM0000000005611.
- [33] W. Zhang, X. Li, Y. Deng, L. Bing, and W. Lam. A survey on aspect-based sentiment analysis: Tasks, methods, and challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(11):11019–11038, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2022.3230975.
- [34] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901, 2020.
- [35] Jeffrey M Wooldridge. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach 6rd Ed.* Cengage Learning, 2016.
- [36] Michael H Kutner, Christopher J Nachtsheim, John Neter, and William Li. *Applied Linear Statistical Models.* McGraw-Hill, 2005.
- [37] Izzuddin M Aris, Wei Perng, Dana Dabelea, Sheryl L Rifas-Shiman, Kimberly McAllister, Jose Guillermo Cedeno-Laurent, Diane R Gold, Marie-France Hivert, Peter James, and Emily Oken. Neighborhood opportunity and vulnerability and incident asthma among children. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 177(10):1055–1064, 2023.
- [38] Robert M O'brien. A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41:673–690, 2007.
- [39] Joseph F Hair, William C Black, Barry J Babin, and Rolph E Anderson. *Multivariate data analysis*, 2019.
- [40] Enkhjargal Batbaatar, Javkhlanbayar Dorjdagva, Ariunbat Luvsannyam, Matteo Mario Savino, and Pietro Amenta. Determinants of patient satisfaction: a systematic review. *Perspectives in Public Health*, 137(2):89–101, 2017.
- [41] Frans Derksen, Jozien Bensing, and Antoine Lagro-Janssen. Effectiveness of empathy in general practice: a systematic review. *British Journal of General Practice*, 63(606):e76–e84, 2013.
- [42] A. Boissy, A. K. Windover, D. Bokar, et al. Communication skills training for physicians improves patient satisfaction. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 31:755–761, 2016. doi: 10.1007/s11606-016-3597-2.
- [43] R. Mostafa and K. El-Atawi. Strategies to measure and improve emergency department performance: A review. *Cureus*, 16(1):e52879, 2024. doi: 10.7759/cureus.52879.
- [44] D. C. Ferreira, I. Vieira, M. I. Pedro, P. Caldas, and M. Varela. Patient satisfaction with healthcare services and the techniques used for its assessment: A systematic literature review and a bibliometric analysis. *Healthcare*, 11(5):639, 2023. doi: 10.3390/healthcare11050639.
- [45] Zhaoyang Han, Cheng Gao, Jianghai Liu, Juntao Zhang, and Song-Qing Zhang. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for large models: A comprehensive survey, 2024.
- [46] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837, 2022.
- [47] Jonathan Mellon and Christopher Prosser. Twitter and facebook are not representative of the general population: Political attitudes and demographics of british social media users. *Research & Politics*, 4(3):2053168017720008, 2017.
- [48] Zijian Wang, Scott Hale, David Ifeoluwa Adelani, Przemyslaw A Grabowicz, Timo Hartmann, Fabian Florer, and David Jurgens. Demographic inference and representative population estimates from multilingual social media data. In *The Web Conference*, pages 2056–2067, 2019.

A Prompt design

```
1 prompts = {
2   "intro": ""### Sentiment Scoring of Patient Experience in Medical Care
3
4 Patient experience in medical care collected from Google Maps will be analyzed and
   categorized based on the following five key aspects. Each review will be
   classified as positive, negative, or neutral depending on the sentiment
   expressed in relation to these aspects:
5
6 1. Interpersonal Factors
7 - Features of the way in which providers interact personally with patients (e.g.,
   concern, friendliness, courtesy, disrespect, rudeness).
8 - Positive: Empathy, kindness, active listening, respectful communication,
   friendliness, professionalism.
9 - Negative: Rudeness, indifference, lack of communication, dismissiveness,
   impatience, unprofessional behavior.
10 - Neutral: No clear sentiment, factual statements without strong emotional
   cues.
11
12 2. Technical Quality
13 - Competence of providers and adherence to high standards of diagnosis and
   treatment (e.g., thoroughness, accuracy, unnecessary risks, making mistakes).
14 - Positive: Accurate diagnosis, effective treatment, thorough examinations,
   expert medical knowledge, advanced technology use.
15 - Negative: Misdiagnosis, ineffective treatment, lack of expertise, medical
   errors, outdated procedures.
16 - Neutral: Descriptive statements without emotional judgment.
17
18 3. Operational Efficiency
19 - The results of medical care encounters (e.g., helpfulness of medical care
   providers in improving or maintaining health).
20 - Positive: Short waiting times, smooth appointment scheduling, efficient
   emergency response, streamlined administrative processes.
21 - Negative: Long wait times, disorganized processes, difficulty booking
   appointments, lack of coordination among staff.
22 - Neutral: Statements that report processes without clear sentiment.
23
24 4. Finances
25 - Factors involved in paying for medical services (e.g., reasonable costs,
   alternative payment arrangements, comprehensiveness of insurance coverage).
26 - Positive: Reasonable pricing, transparent billing, flexible payment options,
   adequate insurance coverage, financial assistance programs.
27 - Negative: High costs, hidden fees, billing errors, lack of insurance support
   , unexpected medical expenses.
28 - Neutral: Mentions of pricing or payment without emotional context.
29
30 5. Facilities/Availability
31 - Presence of medical care resources (e.g., enough hospital facilities and
   providers in the area).
32 - Positive: Clean and well-maintained facilities, modern medical equipment,
   comfortable waiting areas, availability of essential services (e.g., pharmacies
   , parking).
33 - Negative: Unhygienic conditions, outdated or broken equipment, lack of beds,
   overcrowding, poor accessibility for disabled individuals.
34 - Neutral: Observations about facilities without sentiment.
35
36 Each review will be assessed based on these five aspects to provide a structured
```

```

37 sentiment analysis of patient experiences in healthcare settings.""",
38 "question": ""Can you identify the aspect-based sentiment (i.e., positive,
neutral, negative) based on the patient experience stated in the following
Google Maps review? Only use the following aspects: Interpersonal Factors,
Technical Quality, Operational Efficiency, Finances, Facilities/Availability.
Do NOT create new aspects. If the review does not mention an aspect, do not
include it in the output.
39
40 ### Example 1
41 Review: 'The doctor was very kind and took the time to explain everything to me in
detail. The diagnosis was accurate, and I felt well cared for. The clinic was
also clean and comfortable.'
42 Expected Output:
43 {
44 "Interpersonal Factors": "positive",
45 "Technical Quality": "positive",
46 "Facilities/Availability": "positive"
47 }
48
49 ### Example 2
50 Review: 'I had to wait for more than three hours even though I had an appointment.
The staff was rude and unhelpful. Also, the bill had extra charges that were
not explained to me.'
51 Expected Output:
52 {
53 "Interpersonal Factors": "negative",
54 "Operational Efficiency": "negative",
55 "Finances": "negative"
56 }
57 "",
58
59 "text": "The review content is: {review}\n",
60
61 "output": ""Please provide only a valid JSON response without Markdown code
blocks, text descriptions, or explanations.
62 The JSON structure must strictly follow this format:
63 {
64 "Interpersonal Factors": "sentiment",
65 "Technical Quality": "sentiment",
66 "Operational Efficiency": "sentiment",
67 "Finances": "sentiment",
68 "Facilities/Availability": "sentiment"
69 }
70 Use only "positive", "negative", or "neutral" as sentiment values.
71 If an aspect is not mentioned in the review, do not include it in the output.
72 If the review does not mention any of the defined aspects, return this exact JSON
response: {"None": "None"}.""
73 }

```