

(Research/Review) Article

Personalized and Patient-Centered Care as a Strategic Differentiation Approach

A Systematic Literature Review

Clarissa Siswara¹, Achmad Dheni Suwardhani²

¹ Master of Management Study Program Postgraduate ARS University, Bandung, Indonesia; e-mail : siswaraclarissa@gmail.com

² Master of Management Study Program Postgraduate ARS University, Bandung, Indonesia; e-mail : dheni88@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author : siswaraclarissa@gmail.com

Abstract: Healthcare organizations increasingly compete not only through clinical capability but also through the way care is experienced, understood, and adapted to individual patients. This review examines how personalized and patient-centered care can function as a strategic differentiation approach and how it is associated with patient experience, trust, satisfaction, loyalty, revisit intention, and willingness to recommend. A structured systematic literature review was conducted using peer-reviewed studies published from 2021 to 2026. The synthesis focused on empirical and review evidence concerning individualized or customized care, patient-centered care, patient experience, relational quality, and post-service behavioral intentions in hospitals and other healthcare settings. The evidence shows a consistent pattern: personalization is most convincingly linked to loyalty indirectly rather than as a stand-alone marketing mechanism. Individualized care strengthens the feeling of being recognized as a person, while patient-centered communication, shared decision-making, responsiveness, empathy, and continuity improve experience and trust. Satisfaction and trust then operate as important proximal mechanisms associated with revisit intention, recommendation, and loyalty. Evidence from Indonesia is broadly consistent with international findings, although the strength of individual pathways varies by setting. The review proposes that healthcare differentiation should be built around a coordinated patient-value architecture rather than isolated hospitality initiatives. For managers, the strategic priority is to translate personalization into repeatable organizational routines across clinical, relational, and service touchpoints.

Keywords: Patient-Centered Care; Patient Experience; Patient Loyalty; Personalized Care; Strategic Differentiation.

Received: June 29, 2026

Revised: July 30, 2026

Accepted: August 31, 2026

Published: September 25, 2026

Curr. Ver.: September 30, 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Competition among healthcare providers is no longer settled by technical treatment outcomes alone. From a patient's side, an organization is met through a chain of clinical and non-clinical touchpoints: getting an appointment, communicating with staff, waiting, hearing about the available options, taking part in decisions, being treated courteously, having care coordinated, leaving the hospital, being followed up, and sensing whether the care actually fits one's own circumstances. Hospital managers should not dismiss these encounters as operational minutiae. They shape how patients judge value, whether they come to trust the organization, and whether they would go back or recommend it to others. One systematic review of the business case for patient experience reported that good experiences were repeatedly connected to retention, recommendation, and fewer complaints, and that communication and trust were among the elements most consistently associated with intention to return (Quigley et al., 2021).

The strategic consequence deserves attention. Clinical technologies, professional credentials, and baseline service standards are getting easier to copy, so organizations need a kind of differentiation that cannot be bought in one transaction or produced by a promotional

campaign. Patient-centered care holds that potential, since it depends on professional conduct, information flows, service processes, organizational culture, and the design of the patient journey all working together. Personalized care goes a step further. Rather than treating the patient as an interchangeable recipient of services, it fits care to the individual's needs, preferences, circumstances, and expectations.

Personalization in healthcare is not one single intervention. Minvielle et al. (2021) portray customized care as a field still taking shape, stretching from personalized medicine to patient-centered care, where customization can happen in clinical decisions, in the delivery of services, and in organizational arrangements. On the ground, it may mean registering a person's preferences, tailoring the information given, adjusting how staff communicate, bringing patients into decisions, organizing services around their personal circumstances, or planning follow-up that matches their condition and abilities. Such activities are not the same as mass customization in ordinary consumer markets. Healthcare decisions come with uncertainty, professional judgment, ethical obligations, and unequal access to information.

Recent studies lend support to the idea that individualized care carries relational consequences. In a structural equation model built on data from hospitalized patients, Bilenler and Ates (2024) found that the more patients perceived their nursing care as individualized, the more satisfied they were and the more they trusted their nurses. Shared decision-making has likewise been linked to inpatient satisfaction in large hospital samples, which strengthens the view that participation and the exchange of information are real components of the care experience (Shay et al., 2021). Taken together, the findings hint that personalization may generate value through mechanisms that are clinical, psychological, and relational at once.

The evidence connecting personalization directly to loyalty, however, is fragmented. Research on individualized care commonly centers on satisfaction, trust, quality of life, adherence, or perceived quality, whereas research on patient loyalty and revisit intention frequently takes service quality, patient experience, perceived value, satisfaction, brand image, or trust as its starting point. Take Park et al. (2022): inpatient experience influenced satisfaction and willingness to recommend, and satisfaction accounted for a substantial indirect effect. In Indonesia, Kasena and Antonio (2023) reported that at a private radiotherapy service, patient health engagement was significantly associated with revisit intention and with intention to recommend. Renaldo and Antonio (2024) showed for a private clinic that patient experience influenced loyalty, and that trustworthiness was an important mediator.

The scattered state of this evidence poses a problem for managers. Regard personalization purely as a clinical philosophy and its strategic weight may be underrated. Regard loyalty mainly as a marketing result and the risk runs the other way: money flows into promotions or cosmetic service upgrades, while the clinical and relational processes that actually build trust go unnoticed. A strategic management lens calls for joining the two bodies of literature. Personalization and patient-centeredness should be studied as organizational capabilities, and loyalty-related outcomes read as downstream results of patient value accumulated over time.

Three questions guide the review. The first: which dimensions of personalized and patient-centered care show the most consistent link to a favorable patient experience? The second: by what mechanisms do those dimensions relate to trust, satisfaction, revisit intention, recommendation, and loyalty? The third: how might the evidence be turned into a differentiation strategy for healthcare organizations? None of this is meant to present patient-centered care as a marketing technique. The review asks something else, namely whether an organization's capability to understand and respond to individual patients can carve out a distinctive service position, one that matters to patients and that healthcare providers can sustain.

2. Literature Review

Personalized Care and Patient-Centered Care

Patient-centered care is usually defined as care that respects and responds to each patient's preferences, needs, and values, and that lets those values steer clinical decisions. When hospital patients themselves describe what patient-centeredness means, they point to professionals being present and attentive, being involved in their own care, receiving information they can understand, having good relationships with the professionals treating them, and being seen as a person, not just a diagnosis (Havana et al., 2023). For strategic analysis this viewpoint is especially valuable, because it moves the focus away from what an organization intends and toward the value patients actually experience.

Personalized or individualized care overlaps with patient-centered care, though its emphasis falls on adapting to the specific person. Bilenler and Ates (2024) framed individualized nursing care in terms of two things: patients noticing nursing actions that supported their individuality, and patients perceiving that the care reflected their own situation. Their results revealed significant relationships between individualized care and both satisfaction and trust. Minvielle et al. (2021) likewise showed that customized care has spread across many healthcare domains, although how it is implemented still varies widely. Read together, these studies suggest that personalization is better seen as a capability to adjust clinical and service processes to the individual than as a discrete product.

At the center of this capability lies communication. A systematic review of patient experience factors by Kim et al. (2024) identified a broad range of needs, from practical and informational to psychological, social, physical, and professional. The authors stress that patients and providers can rank the priorities of care differently. Patients lean toward comprehensive, continuous service; providers may put more weight on system efficiency and on the patient-provider relationship. The gap has strategic significance, since an organization can raise its internal efficiency without ever producing an experience that patients feel is tailored to them.

Patient Experience, Trust, and Satisfaction

Patient experience covers what really happens to patients and how they perceive their interactions along the care journey. It is wider than satisfaction, which is an evaluative response colored by expectations. The distinction counts for something: two patients can receive much the same service and still judge it differently, depending on their expectations, past experiences, the communication they received, the fairness they perceived, and how far they trust the organization.

Studies from a range of settings point to a close connection between experience and relational quality on one hand and satisfaction and trust on the other. Park et al. (2022) analyzed 1,555 inpatients at a tertiary hospital and reported that patient experience had a direct influence on satisfaction and on willingness to recommend, with satisfaction mediating a substantial share of the link between experience and recommendation. In Indonesia, qualitative interviews by Noviyani and Viwattanakulvanid (2024) showed that responsiveness, courtesy, empathy, trust, patient-provider relationships, and experiences with complaints all shaped how outpatients perceived service quality, satisfaction, and revisit intention.

Trust carries particular weight in healthcare, because patients frequently have no independent way of judging how good the treatment is technically. They lean, at least in part, on communication, consistency, interpersonal behavior, transparency, and the competence they perceive. Using samples from Spain and the United States, Pérez-Arechaederra et al. (2025) found that informational and interactional justice were associated with loyalty and adherence, and that trust and satisfaction mediated important portions of those relationships. What follows is that patient-centered communication is not just a matter of politeness or how much information is handed over. It also has to do with whether patients feel they were treated fairly, kept adequately informed, and respected.

Loyalty, Revisit Intention, and Strategic Differentiation

Healthcare research captures loyalty through a handful of related outcomes: whether patients intend to return, whether they actually stay, whether they would recommend the provider, whether they prefer the same provider, and how strong their attitudinal commitment is. These should not be treated as one and the same. Revisit intention is a behavioral intention that insurance, referral systems, geography, price, or clinical need may constrain. Recommendation reflects advocacy, whereas loyalty can include repeated behavior and psychological preference alike.

These outcomes remain strategically relevant nonetheless, because they signal whether the value produced during care reaches past a single episode. Quigley et al. (2021) concluded that a positive patient experience has a plausible business case, chiefly through allegiance, retention, recommendation, and fewer complaints. Newer empirical studies reinforce that pathway. Noviyani and Viwattanakulvanid (2025) reported, for Indonesian outpatients, that service quality improved satisfaction and perceived value alike, and that the two were significantly associated with revisit intention. Yirga (2026) likewise reported, for public hospitals, that patient-centered care, responsiveness, and the physical environment fed into patient loyalty, with satisfaction as a mediator.

An organization differentiates itself strategically when it builds a pattern of value that patients see as meaningfully different from the alternatives. In healthcare, the distinguishing feature need not be luxurious or technologically new. Being reliably able to understand the individual, communicate clearly, involve the patient, coordinate care, and respond to concerns can be distinctive in its own right, provided it is embedded consistently across touchpoints. The catch is that this kind of differentiation asks a lot of an organization. It rests on people, routines, information, leadership, and process design, not on one visible feature.

3. Proposed Method

This is a systematic literature review that uses a structured narrative synthesis. The logic of reporting drew on PRISMA 2020, while the synthesis was shaped for a management-oriented review whose included evidence was methodologically heterogeneous. Each published study, and not each patient, served as the unit of analysis.

The review looked at peer-reviewed literature from January 2021 to September 2026. Three clusters of search concepts were used. The first stood for the care approach: “patient-centered care,” “patient-centred care,” “person-centered care,” “personalized care,” “individualized care,” “customized care,” and “shared decision making.” The second stood for how patients appraise care: “patient experience,” “trust,” “patient satisfaction,” “communication,” and “engagement.” The third stood for strategic behavioral outcomes: “patient loyalty,” “revisit intention,” “retention,” “intention to recommend,” and “behavioral intention.” AND/OR logic tied the terms together across the clusters. Priority went to records indexed in PubMed and publisher databases, and the searches were complemented by cross-checking reference lists and relevant healthcare-management literature.

Eligible studies had to satisfy six criteria. They had to (1) examine adult healthcare users or patients, (2) be set in hospitals, clinics, specialty services, primary care, or comparable healthcare organizations, (3) investigate at least one construct tied to personalized, individualized, customized, or patient-centered care, or a closely related patient-experience mechanism, (4) report an outcome relating to experience, trust, satisfaction, engagement, loyalty, revisit intention, retention, or recommendation, (5) be published in English between 2021 and 2026, and (6) give methodological and results information sufficient for interpretation. Empirical work of a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-method kind was included. Highly relevant systematic or scoping reviews were retained too, but as contextual evidence; when causal interpretations were drawn, they did not count as equivalent to primary empirical studies.

Exclusions were made for studies that dealt only with biomedical personalization, such as genomic treatment selection, with no service or patient-experience component; that covered pediatric populations without adult findings that could be separated out; that were editorials or opinion pieces; that had no healthcare service context; or that treated satisfaction without adequately linking it to patient-centered processes or strategic behavioral outcomes. Conference abstracts lacking adequate methodological information were likewise left out of the core synthesis.

For each included study, the extraction captured the author and year, the country or setting, the design, the sample, the principal constructs, and whichever findings spoke to the review questions. Populations, measures, and statistical models were too varied for a meta-analysis, so a thematic synthesis was carried out in its place. Coding started with care attributes and mechanisms that kept recurring. Those codes were later merged into four analytical themes: personalization as recognition of the individual; communication and participation as mechanisms that form the experience; trust and satisfaction as relational bridges; and loyalty-related outcomes as downstream strategic consequences.

Association and causation are deliberately kept apart in this review. Most of the included empirical studies were cross-sectional, and many relied on self-reported intentions instead of observed repeat behavior. For that reason, the synthesis does not presume that personalization directly causes loyalty. What it does is assess how consistent the reported pathways are across different healthcare settings, and it draws managerial implications from those patterns.

4. Results and Discussion

The evidence gathered around one chain. Personalized and patient-centered processes shape how the patient interprets care; that interpretation feeds into relational evaluations, and those evaluations in turn influence later behavioral intentions. Table 1 lists the principal studies behind the thematic synthesis.

Table 1. Selected Evidence in the Review

Study	Setting/Design	Focus	Relevant Finding
Quigley et al. (2021)	USA; systematic review	Patient experience and business outcomes	Communication and trust recurred as eleventh links with return, retention, recommendation, and fewer complaints.
Minvielle et al. (2021)	International; scoping review	Customized/personalized care	Customization runs from personalized medicine through to patient-centered service delivery, and its implementation is uneven and demanding for organizations.
Shay et al. (2021)	China; 2,585 inpatients	Shared decision-making and satisfaction	Inpatients who perceived more shared decision-making were also more satisfied.
Park et al. (2022)	South Korea; 1,555 inpatients	Experience, satisfaction, recommendation	Experience affected both satisfaction and willingness to recommend, and a considerable indirect effect ran through satisfaction.
Mangkornkanokpong et al. (2022)	Thailand; specialty clinic	PCC, quality, satisfaction, trust, revisit intention	Patient-centered care related to revisit intention along pathways that passed through service quality, satisfaction, and trust.
Kasena & Antonio (2023)	Indonesia; 173 radiotherapy patients	Experience, engagement, revisit, recommendation	Antecedents drawn from patient experience predicted engagement, and engagement was significantly related to both revisit intention and intention to recommend.
Havana et al. (2023)	Hospital settings; qualitative systematic review	Patients' experience of PCC	The main themes were professional presence, involvement, information, relationships, and being seen as a person.
Bilenler & Ates (2024)	Turkey; 286 inpatients	Individualized care, satisfaction, trust	Stronger perceptions of individualized care went together with higher satisfaction and higher trust in nurses.
Kim et al. (2024)	International; systematic review	Patient experience and PCC communication	Found patient-experience needs to be multidimensional and pointed to differing priorities between patients and providers.
Noviyani & Viwat-tanakulvanid (2024)	Indonesia; 50 outpatients	Service quality and patient perspectives	Satisfaction and revisit intention were shaped by responsiveness, empathy, trust, complaints, and patient-provider relationships.
Renaldo & Antonio (2024)	Indonesia; 117 private-clinic patients	Experience, trustworthiness, loyalty	Patient experience had a positive influence on loyalty, with trustworthiness as an important mediator.
Pérez-Arechaederra et al. (2025)	Spain and USA; 879 users	Communication, justice, trust, satisfaction, loyalty	Informational and interactional justice were related to loyalty, and trust and satisfaction mediated key pathways.
Noviyani & Viwat-tanakulvanid (2025)	Indonesia; 770 outpatients + 12 interviews	Service quality, value, satisfaction, revisit	Service quality raised value and satisfaction, and both satisfaction and perceived value were positively associated with revisit intention.
Riphah et al. (2025)	Pakistan; 378 participants	PCC and revisit intention	Revisit intention was associated with patient-centered care, and the quality of nursing care was examined as a moderating condition.
Yirga (2026)	Ethiopia; 382 patients	PCC, responsiveness, satisfaction, loyalty	Loyalty was associated with patient-centered care and with dimensions of service quality, and satisfaction served as an important mechanism.
Tambunan et al. (2026)	Indonesia; 100 outpatients	Experience, trust, loyalty	Both patient experience and trust exerted significant positive effects on patient loyalty.

Personalization as Recognition of the Individual

The first theme is about the patient feeling recognized as an individual. Across the literature, personalization went beyond adapting treatment protocols. It took in recognition of preferences, circumstances, informational needs, emotional concerns, and how much the patient wants to take part. Havana et al. (2023) expressed this through the theme “being seen as a person,” and Bilenler and Ates (2024) operationalized individuality via nursing actions together with patients' perception that care had been adapted to them.

The distinction carries strategic weight. A hospital may deliver technically correct care and still leave patients with an impersonal experience. Standardization is needed for safety and efficiency, yet too much of it can leave patients feeling processed instead of cared for. According to the evidence, differentiation does not call for giving up standardized clinical pathways. Organizations can, instead, standardize the capability to personalize itself, for example by eliciting preferences systematically, documenting communication needs, identifying what patients prioritize in decisions, and feeding those data back into care delivery.

Communication and Participation Shape the Experience

Communication and participation form the second theme, and both play a central role. Patient-centered communication takes in understandable information, listening, explanations of alternatives, respectful interaction, and chances to ask questions. Shared decision-making is a more formal expression of participation, yet the wider evidence suggests that even routine communication can shift the way patients evaluate the organization.

Kim et al. (2024) showed that information needs form just one part of a wider architecture of experience, which also holds psychological, social, practical, and physical needs. In radiotherapy, Kasena and Antonio (2023) found informational needs among the prominent antecedents of patient engagement. Pérez-Arechaederra et al. (2025) added that how fairly patients felt informed and treated in interaction was associated with loyalty-related outcomes. All of this supports reading communication not as a peripheral “soft skill” but as a service process that bears on perceived value.

Trust and Satisfaction as Relational Bridges

Between care delivery and loyalty lie mechanisms, and these make up the third theme. Satisfaction turns up repeatedly, yet trust deserves special weight, because healthcare is riddled with uncertainty and information asymmetry. Bilenler and Ates (2024) tied individualized care to satisfaction as well as to trust. According to Park et al. (2022), much of the link between inpatient experience and willingness to recommend passed through satisfaction. Pérez-Arechaederra et al. (2025) reached a comparable conclusion: trust and satisfaction mediated the relationships that perceived fairness had with loyalty.

Managers, these findings suggest, should not treat satisfaction as the final strategic goal. It reads better as one stage in a relational process. A patient can be satisfied with a single encounter and still develop no preference for the provider, let alone loyalty. Trust brings in a forward-looking element, namely confidence that the organization and its professionals will act competently, honestly, and responsively the next time too. In that sense, trust is what helps turn one favorable episode into a lasting relationship.

From Experience to Revisit Intention and Loyalty

Downstream lies the fourth theme, the link to behavioral intentions. Broadly, the studies agree that a favorable experience, satisfaction, trust, engagement, and perceived value tend to go with a greater willingness to return or to recommend. Park et al. (2022) showed both direct and indirect relationships with willingness to recommend. Engagement was connected to revisit and recommendation by Kasena and Antonio (2023). At a private clinic in Indonesia, Renaldo and Antonio (2024) found that the experience-loyalty relationship was mediated by trustworthiness. And in a large sample of Indonesian outpatients, Noviyani and Viwattanakulvanid (2025) identified satisfaction and perceived value as significant predictors of revisit intention.

The pathway, however, is not perfectly uniform. In healthcare, loyalty is shaped by things beyond the service encounter itself: insurance coverage, referral rules, location, the availability of specialists, price, disease severity, and continuity requirements. Recent evidence from Indonesia also indicates that patient-centered care may raise perceived quality or satisfaction without automatically yielding stronger loyalty in every setting. That variation matters, because

it blocks the overly simple conclusion that personalization inevitably brings repeat visits. A more defensible reading is that personalization improves a number of relational conditions, and these make loyalty more likely once structural constraints leave room for choice.

Discussion

If one result stands out, it is that personalized and patient-centered care can underpin strategic differentiation, though it does so indirectly and through the organization itself, not through promotion. No simple formula emerges from even the strongest studies, and certainly none in which personalization instantly turns into loyalty. The picture is more staged. Personalization changes what the service feels like to the patient. That lived experience bears on trust, satisfaction, perceived value, or engagement, and these judgments about the relationship are linked, in turn, to revisit intention, recommendation, and loyalty.

This reading helps bridge two streams of healthcare literature that usually sit apart. Clinical and nursing studies tend to cast personalization as an ethical and quality-oriented approach; healthcare management studies, on the other hand, tend to treat satisfaction, loyalty, and revisit intention as outcomes that matter for an organization's sustainability. According to the evidence, the two perspectives do not compete. Patient-centeredness generates strategic value precisely because patients can perceive the improvement it brings to care. An organization that consistently recognizes the individual, communicates well, and coordinates care around patient needs lets quality and differentiation reinforce each other.

A further suggestion from the review is that the most defensible unit of strategic differentiation is a system of mutually reinforcing routines, not any single service feature. A hospital can open a premium lounge, launch a digital concierge, or start a follow-up program. Features like these are easily copied on their own, and they may accomplish little if communication is poor or patients feel ignored. A coordinated architecture is a different matter. One that captures preferences, supports shared decisions, trains staff in relational communication, cuts unnecessary friction, handles complaints fairly, and keeps continuity across encounters is harder to imitate, since it is built into organizational processes.

In resource-based terms, what is at stake is a capability, not a product. Patient data and well-trained clinicians are not the relevant resource in themselves. The resource is the organization's ability to combine information, professional judgment, service design, and interpersonal behavior into a coherent patient journey. This may be especially valuable in healthcare markets, where patients cannot easily observe technical quality directly. To decide whether an organization is worth choosing again, they turn to relational and experiential cues - clarity, responsiveness, empathy, consistency, trustworthiness, and perceived personalization.

The Indonesian studies add a useful local angle. Kasena and Antonio (2023), Renaldo and Antonio (2024), Noviyani and Viwattanakulvanid (2024, 2025), and Tambunan et al. (2026) jointly indicate that experience, trust, satisfaction, engagement, perceived value, and revisit or loyalty outcomes all carry weight in Indonesian healthcare. The setting deserves a moment of thought. People in Indonesia choose providers within a patchwork of national insurance, private payment, referral pathways, public and private hospitals, and specialty clinics. Differentiation grounded in patient-centeredness therefore stays relevant, but loyalty may look different from one segment to the next. Where patients have little say over their provider, indicators such as recommendation, trust, complaint behavior, and a willingness to come back once there is a choice may say more than repeat utilization alone.

Another implication is that personalization is not a license for limitless customization. Healthcare organizations have to keep hold of evidence-based standards, safety protocols, fairness, and operational efficiency. What they should aim for is selective personalization. Whatever needs to be standardized stays standardized, while flexibility is deliberately created at the points where a patient's preferences and circumstances make a material difference to the experience or the outcome. Think of the format of communication, involvement in decisions, appointment coordination, education, discharge planning, the intensity of follow-up, and room for practical or cultural needs.

Measuring patient satisfaction and managing patient experience are not the same job, and managers ought to tell them apart. A satisfaction survey typically returns one global score after the encounter. It can reveal dissatisfaction, yet says little about which processes caused it. Measuring patient experience should look at concrete touchpoints and behaviors instead: was the information understandable, was the patient invited to take part, did staff listen, were handoffs coordinated, were delays explained, did follow-up reflect individual needs? Measures

of this kind give managers something to act on, and they tie more directly to organizational routines.

The evidence points toward a practical strategic model with four layers. At the base sits patient insight, meaning the identification of preferences, expectations, vulnerabilities, prior experiences, and decision needs. On top of it comes personalized delivery: communication, participation, coordination, and support are adapted, and clinical standards stay intact. The third layer is relational value, where experience, trust, satisfaction, and engagement grow stronger. Strategic outcome forms the fourth, and it covers recommendation, revisit intention, retention, and long-term preference. Because the model is cumulative, a weak early layer can erode the value produced further downstream.

Several caveats apply. Much of the empirical literature is cross-sectional, and that restricts what can be inferred about causes. Many studies also draw on self-reported behavioral intentions instead of observed retention or repeat utilization. Measurement is inconsistent, too: loyalty, revisit intention, recommendation, satisfaction, trust, engagement, and experience overlap but cannot be swapped for one another. Nursing, service-quality, and management studies each operationalize personalization in their own way. Then there is the matter of context. Healthcare systems differ markedly in patient choice, financing, and referral arrangements, so direct comparison across countries is limited.

Out of these limitations comes an agenda for future research. Longitudinal studies ought to test whether patient-centered and personalized processes predict actual return behavior once clinical need, insurance, distance, and price are controlled for. Experimental or quasi-experimental designs could evaluate specific organizational interventions, among them personalized discharge planning, preference-based communication, continuity models, and structured shared decision-making. It also remains to be examined whether personalization brings diminishing returns or adds operational burden. Last, future work should tell apart the segments where personalization is most valuable strategically, for instance elective specialty care, chronic disease management, outpatient services, and competitive private healthcare markets.

5. Conclusions

By the evidence of this systematic literature review, personalized and patient-centered care matters strategically because it shapes the relational groundwork of patient choice. The most consistent pathway does not run straight from personalization to loyalty. Recognition of the individual, along with communication, participation, responsiveness, and continuity, improves the experience patients have and builds trust, satisfaction, perceived value, or engagement. It is these mechanisms that go with a willingness to come back, to recommend the provider, and to stay loyal.

Managers in healthcare can take a practical lesson from this: build differentiation around the patient's journey instead of around one-off promotional features. Personalization carries strategic weight only when it has been woven into routines the organization can repeat, so that patients meet it in the same form at every clinical and non-clinical touchpoint. Hospitals and clinics therefore need systems that record what patients prefer, support shared decisions, strengthen relational communication, coordinate care, and learn from patient feedback.

The review also warns against seeing loyalty as a plain consequence of satisfaction, because financing, referral systems, clinical need, and access limit what patients can choose. Strategic evaluation should therefore set satisfaction beside experience measures, trust, recommendation, revisit intention, complaints, and, wherever possible, actual retention. What future research must do is go beyond cross-sectional intentions and test whether an organization's personalization capabilities lead to durable relationships with patients and to performance benefits that can be measured over time.

References

- Bilenler, Z. K., & Ates, S. (2024). Investigating the relationship between individualized care, patient satisfaction and trust in nurses through structural equation modelling. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 30(6), e13286. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.13286>
- Havana, T., Kuha, S., Laukka, E., & Kanste, O. (2023). Patients' experiences of patient-centred care in hospital setting: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 37(4), 1001–1015. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.13174>
- Kasena, A., & Antonio, F. (2023). Antecedents of patient health engagement in the radiotherapy service (evidence from Indonesia). *Health SA Gesondheid*, 28, 2245. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hsag.v28i0.2245>
- Kim, E.-J., Koo, Y.-R., & Nam, I.-C. (2024). Patients and healthcare providers' perspectives on patient experience factors and a model of patient-centered care communication: A systematic review. *Healthcare*, 12(11), 1090. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12111090>
- Mangkornkanokpong, L., Wingwon, B., & Piriyaikul, M. (2022). Effects of patient-centered care on revisit intention and roles of service quality, satisfaction and trust as transmitting factors in specialty medical clinic. *The Journal of Prapokklao Hospital Clinical Medical Education Center*.
- Marzban, S., Najafi, M., Agolli, A., & Ashrafi, E. (2022). Impact of patient engagement on healthcare quality: A scoping review. *Journal of Patient Experience*, 9, 23743735221125439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23743735221125439>
- Minvielle, E., Fourcade, A., Ricketts, T., & Waelli, M. (2021). Current developments in delivering customized care: A scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 21, 575. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06576-0>
- Noviyani, A., & Viwattanakulvanid, P. (2024). Exploring patients' perspectives on healthcare service quality in outpatient settings at a public hospital in Palembang, Indonesia: A qualitative study. *Belitung Nursing Journal*, 10(6), 703–711. <https://doi.org/10.33546/bnj.3594>
- Noviyani, A., & Viwattanakulvanid, P. (2025). Service quality as a driver of perceived value satisfaction and revisit intention in Indonesia. *Scientific Reports*, 15, 43363. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-29414-3>
- Park, H. N., Park, D. J., Han, S. Y., Tae, J. Y., Jung, K.-H., Bae, E. J., & Yoon, J. Y. (2022). Effect of inpatient experiences on patient satisfaction and the willingness to recommend a hospital: The mediating role of patient satisfaction: A cross-sectional study. *Health Science Reports*, 5(6), e925. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.925>
- Pérez-Arechaederra, D., Briones, E., & García-Ortiz, L. (2025). Communication and relationships: How patients perceive informational and interactional organizational justice can improve patient-centered care, a study with samples from Spain and the U.S. *BMC Health Services Research*, 25, 350. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12461-x>
- Quigley, D. D., Reynolds, K., Dellva, S., & Price, R. A. (2021). Examining the business case for patient experience: A systematic review. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 66(3), 200–224. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JHM-D-20-00207>
- Renaldo, D., & Antonio, F. (2024). The relationship between patient experience and patient loyalty mediated by trustworthiness and outcome quality in healthcare services: A case at private clinic in Batam. *Jurnal Manajemen Kesehatan Indonesia*, 12(3), 239–251. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jmki.12.3.2024.239-251>
- Riphah, U. H., Qayum, A., & Khan, M. H. (2025). The impact of patient-centred care on patients' revisit intention with the moderating role of quality nursing care. *Journal of Gandhara Nursing and Allied Health Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.37762/jgnaahs.149>

- Shay, L. A., et al. (2021). Association of shared decision making with inpatient satisfaction: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 21, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01385-1>
- Sugeng, S., & Achmadi, H. (2023). Analysis of the effect of customer perceived value, service quality, patient experience and patient trust on patient satisfaction as an intervening media and its impact on outpatient loyalty at hospitals in Depok. *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i6.12674>
- Tambunan, B. C., Keni, & Gunawan, S. (2026). Loyalitas pasien ditinjau dari pengalaman dan kepercayaan pasien pada rumah sakit di Depok, Jawa Barat. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmbk.v10i4.38427>
- Yirga, S. (2026). How service quality drives patient loyalty: Testing a satisfaction-mediated model in healthcare settings in public hospitals in Sidama Regional State, Ethiopia. *Future Business Journal*, 12, 128. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-026-00838-1>
- Zebua, L., Irwandy, Pasinringi, S. A., Rivai, F., Sidin, I., & Mumang, A. A. (2024). The impact of marketing mix and patient experience on public patient loyalty in hospitals: Satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.24083/apjhm.v19i1.2267>