Pain and satisfaction: the case of isolated COVID-19 patients of Pakistan

Wajiha Haq [Corresp., 1] , **Siddrah Irfan** [2] , **Syed Hassan Raza** [3] , **Waqar Ahmed** [4] , **Mian Alam** [5] , **Samia Wasif** [6] , **Muhammad Wasif Malik** [7] , **Saeed Ahmad** [8]

[1] School of Social Sciences and Humanities, National University of Sciences and Technology, Islamabad, Punjab, Pakistan

[2] Department of Behavioral Sciences, National University of Sciences and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan

[3] School of Economics, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

[4] District Health Authority, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

[5] Corona Management Centre, Rawalpindi Institute of Urology & Transplantation, Rawalpindi, Pakistan

[6] Department of Humanities, COMSATS University, Islamabad, Pakistan

[7] Field Epidemiology & Disease Surveillance Division, National Institute of Health, Islamabad, Pakistan

[8] Public Health England, Islamabad, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: Wajiha Haq
Email address: dr.wajihahaq@s3h.nust.edu.pk

Background

Over 3 million people lost their lives across the globe due to the COVID-19 related pandemic. The unprecedented restrictions on mobility have imposed in the form of isolation, quarantines, and lockdowns to curb the profound effects of the pandemic and retain physical health. This study examined the relationship between various pain levels, demographic variables and patient satisfaction with COVID-19 during isolation.

Methods

The primary data in this study were collected from isolated patients during their isolation and treatment in a public hospital. We obtained information from patients with COVID-19 (N=100) about their demographic characteristics, varying levels of pain, and satisfaction with the services provided during the isolation period. We computed the descriptive statistics to explain the profile of participants, ANOVA was used to find out the difference between various groups on patient satisfaction, and structural equation modeling was performed to examine the link between pain levels, demographic factors, and patient satisfaction. This analysis was performed with STATA and SmartPLS-3.

Results

The findings of this study ascertained that respondent's education (Beta,β=2.961, p=0.003), assets such as possession of a house (β=4.563, p=0.000), perception of income adequacy during the lockdown (=2.299, p=0.022), and negligence in prevention (β=1.975, p=0.049) significantly affects patient satisfaction during the isolation period. Moreover, satisfaction with life, physicians and medicine, income adequacy, and fear of the participants was significantly linked to the pain level (Model F-stat=86.323, p=0.0001). Patients who were satisfied with their treatment had significantly lower odds of having pain (OR 0.023, 95% CI: 0.001-0.0452). Patients who had enough income to meet their basic necessities were found to have significantly lower odds of having pain (OR 0.155, 95% CI: 0.032-0.740.

Discussion and Conclusion

We conclude that a higher level of education, low income, and living in a rented house contributes significantly to the feeling of more satisfaction with the provided services. This implies that people with more affluent backgrounds are less likely to be satisfied with the provided services as low-income and living in rented house groups are more satisfied during isolation than others. The pain level is also affected by subjective factors such as fear and satisfaction which need to be considered while doing patient management. This study can be helpful in improving the delivery of public services of isolation centers by considering various characteristics and demographic factors of patients.

1 Pain and satisfaction: the case of isolated COVID-19 patients of

2 Pakistan

3 Wajiha Haq[1*], Siddrah Irfan[2], Syed Hassan Raza[3], Waqar Ahmed[4], Mian Awais Alam[5], Samia
4 Wasif[6], Muhammad Wasif Malik[7], Saeed Ahmad[8]
5
6 [1] School of Social Sciences and Humanities, National University of Sciences and Technology,
7 Islamabad, Pakistan
8 [2] Department of Behavioral Sciences, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, National
9 University of Sciences and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan
10 [3] School of Economics, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan
11 [4] District Health Authority, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
12 [5] Corona Management Centre, Rawalpindi Institute of Urology & Transplantation, Rawalpindi,
13 Pakistan
14 [6] Department of Humanities, COMSATS University, Islamabad, Pakistan
15 [7] Field Epidemiology & Disease Surveillance Division, National Institute of Health, Islamabad,
16 Pakistan
17 [8] Public Health England, Islamabad, Pakistan
18
19 *Corresponding author
20 Wajiha Haq, PhD
21 National University of Science and Technology,
22 School of Social Sciences and Humanities, H-12, Islamabad, Pakistan
23 Email address: dr.wajihahaq@s3h.nust.edu.pk

25 Abstract

27 Background

28 Over 3 million people lost their lives across the globe due to the COVID-19 related pandemic.

29 The unprecedented restrictions on mobility have imposed in the form of isolation, quarantines, and

30 lockdowns to curb the profound effects of the pandemic and retain physical health. This study

31 examined the relationship between various pain levels, demographic variables and patient

32 satisfaction with COVID-19 during isolation.

33 Methods

34 The primary data in this study were collected from isolated patients during their isolation and

35 treatment in a public hospital. We obtained information from patients with COVID-19 (N=100)

36 about their demographic characteristics, varying levels of pain, and satisfaction with the services

37 provided during the isolation period. We computed the descriptive statistics to explain the profile

38   of participants, ANOVA was used to find out the difference between various groups on patient

39   satisfaction, and structural equation modeling was performed to examine the link between pain

40   levels, demographic factors, and patient satisfaction. This analysis was performed with STATA

41   and SmartPLS-3.

42   **Results**

43   The findings of this study ascertained that respondent's education (Beta,β=2.961, p=0.003), assets

44   such as possession of a house (β=4.563, p=0.000), perception of income adequacy during the

45   lockdown (=2.299, p=0.022), and negligence in prevention (β=1.975, p=0.049) significantly

46   affects patient satisfaction during the isolation period. Moreover, satisfaction with life, physicians

47   and medicine, income adequacy, and fear of the participants was significantly linked to the pain

48   level (Model F-stat=86.323, p=0.0001). Patients who were satisfied with their treatment had

49   significantly lower odds of having pain (OR 0.023, 95% CI: 0.001-0.0452). Patients who had

50   enough income to meet their basic necessities were found to have significantly lower odds of

51   having pain (OR 0.155, 95% CI: 0.032-0.740.

52   **Discussion and Conclusion**

53   We conclude that a higher level of education, low income, and living in a rented house contributes

54   significantly to the feeling of more satisfaction with the provided services. This implies that people

55   with more affluent backgrounds are less likely to be satisfied with the provided services as low-

56   income and living in rented house groups are more satisfied during isolation than others.

57   The pain level is also affected by subjective factors such as fear and satisfaction which need to be

58   considered while doing patient management. This study can be helpful in improving the delivery

59   of public services of isolation centers by considering various characteristics and demographic

60   factors of patients.

61

62   **Keywords:** COVID-19; isolation; satisfaction; fear; pain

63

Introduction

65   The COVID-19 pandemic has jolted the whole world. The outbreak started in China in late 2019

66   and turned into a pandemic due to its highly transmittable nature (Lu, Liu, & Jia, 2020). In

67   Pakistan, until October 18, 2020, 323,019 persons contracted the disease, whereas 6,654 persons

68   died due to COVID-19 (Ministry of National Institute of Health, 2020). However, mRNA vaccines

69 are fully developed to combat the severe consequences of COVID-19 by producing antibodies to

70 combat the disease. The longevity of antibodies and their effectiveness against different variants

71 of the virus remains a mystery. The most effective method to reduce the viral spread of highly

72 transmittable diseases has been community-wide containment through quarantines and isolations

73 (Prevention, 2020). The practice of timely quarantine and isolation during previous outbreaks has

74 shown results curtailing the spread of the disease (Giubilini, Douglas, Maslen, & Savulescu, 2018).

75 It is often argued that quarantine and isolation are two sides of the same coin, but there are two

76 folds of dissimilarity in terms of definition. Quarantine means isolating the persons who have

77 been potentially exposed to the virus and are not sick yet to observe the virus's symptoms and

78 reduce the potential spread of the disease. On the contrary, isolation is the separation of confirmed

79 infected patients (Brooks et al., 2020). The incubation period of the virus is 1-14 days

80 (Organization, 2020). This created worry for the public about the isolation and management of

81 isolation. Therefore, quarantine and isolation facilities are established across the world. In

82 Pakistan, hundreds of places converted into temporary quarantine centers to facilitate quarantine

83 and in hospitals, separate isolation wards were made for COVID-19 patients.

84 Quarantines and isolations of patients have played a vital role in controlling the spread of the

85 disease. On the one hand, they facilitate in reducing the infection, but, on the other, cause many

86 side effects, which is recently argued as shadow pandemic. The psychological side effects of

87 isolation include anger, depression, anxiety, loss of patient satisfaction and mental wellbeing, and

88 loss of self-control (Abad, Fearday, & Safdar, 2010; Rees, Davies, Birchall, & Price, 2000).

89 Quarantine is also known to create a cardiovascular risk due to social isolation and depression

90 (Mattioli, Puviani, Nasi, & Farinetti, 2020). Due to the known effects of isolation, it is deemed

91 important to investigate the socio-psychological effects of isolation on COVID-19 patients. Thus,

92 the isolation experience can be improved so that the positive effects dominate the negative side

93 effects. These negative psychological effects also hinder the care and treatment of the patient by

94 creating an overall negative impact on the patient's mind and body.

95 Developing countries are already struggling with the scarce health facilities and services to combat

96 the disease. Where a patient in isolation experiences fear, anxiety, and depression (Maunder et al.,

97 2003). Due to limited resources, a negative experience of the isolation wards can add to the

98 discouragement of people to come to hospitals for recovery and may also cripple their belief in the

99 health system of the country. Past studies provide evidence that pain management practices

100 improve the health of a patient (including patients with chronic diseases) experience (Amol Soin
101 et al., 2020; Anthony Jnr, 2021a) and innovative methods such as digital care can be helpful during
102 pandemic (Anthony Jnr, 2021b), but the COVID-19 may lead to aggravated perceived pain of
103 individuals (Song et al., 2020). The negative experience is quite evident during isolation.
104 Therefore, there is a need to investigate the factors that may help improve the isolation experience
105 of patients and factors that, if controlled, can reduce the perceived pain of the patients of COVID-
106 19. Additionally, the need is to investigate the experience of COVID-19 patients so that their
107 experience can be improved in the future and pain can be mitigated. Factually, reduction in pain
108 improves patient satisfaction (Baker, Van der Meulen, Lewsey, & Gregg, 2007; Scher, Meador,
109 Van Cleave, & Reid, 2018). To address this research question, we focused on the experiences of
110 the patients isolated in the COVID-19 ward. We hypothesized that patient's satisfaction during
111 isolation might differ according to the distinct demographics of the patient. Besides, it may also
112 be affected by different levels of pain and other factors. Whereas fear and other factors may affect
113 the pain levels (Asmundson, Vlaeyen, Vlaeyen, & Crombez, 2004; Keefe, Abernethy, & C.
114 Campbell, 2005). Secondly, we focused on investigating the difference in patient satisfaction of
115 COVID-19 patients with distinct demographics. Later, we investigated the effect of different
116 factors on isolation, pain level, and patient satisfaction in separate models. The specific research
117 questions are:

118 • Does patient's satisfaction during COVID-19 isolation differ among demographic groups.

119 • What are the factors affecting the pain level (subjective) of the COVID-19 patient during
120 isolation?

121 • What are the factors affecting patient's satisfaction during COVID-19 isolation?

122 The introduction section is followed by materials and methods, explaining data collection, sample,
123 and data analysis technique. The third section includes descriptive statistics, patient satisfaction
124 among patients, factors affecting pain level, and factors affecting patient satisfaction. Results are
125 followed by discussion and conclusion.

126

127 Materials & Methods

128 This study relies on primary data collection for making inferences. We conducted a cross-sectional
129 survey to collect the information from the COVID-19 patients who were isolated in the
130 government centers. The study focused on the investigation of patient satisfaction and their pain

131 perception of isolated patients. The variable of fear comprises of 7 dimensions. The questionnaire
132 adopted the fear scale from the study conducted by Ahorsu et al. (2020). The pain level was
133 measured using 5 point measurement scale based on literature (Huskisson, 1974). Patient
134 satisfaction is based on the scale based on Likert type scale. The questionnaire was developed
135 based on literature (Abad et al., 2010; Rees et al., 2000; Tang et al., 2020) and was validated by
136 experts, hospital management, and people working in isolation wards with COVID-19 patients.
137 Patient satisfaction has been operationally defined in this study as the satisfaction of COVID-19
138 patients with the services provided in the public isolation center. Patient satisfaction is measured
139 by asking questions about satisfaction with overall services, nurses, doctors, medicine, food,
140 cleanliness, and behavior of peer patients. The Cronbach alpha for the patient satisfaction scale for
141 the current study is excellent (i.e., 0.93), and the fear of covid scale is moderate (0.61). The
142 benchmark of Cronbach alpha is according to the literature (Taber, 2018)). Since we measure pain
143 through one item, Cronbach alpha was not calculated for this item (Bland & Altman, 1997).

Data collection

145 The sample was collected from COVID-19 patients who were isolated in COVID-19 isolation
146 wards. The sample data was collected from the patients during their isolation using purposive
147 sampling. Purposive sampling is a selective sampling where the population with certain
148 characteristic is selected. Based on the objective of the study, only the COVID-19 patients were
149 purposively selected for the study. However, at next stage, the COVID-19 patients to be included
150 in the sample were selected randomly (for more details on purposive sampling, see Tongco
151 (2007)). Due to the highly transmittable nature of the virus, it was very difficult to get permission
152 to access isolated patients. The isolated patients did not have their digital gadgets as well. With the
153 help of paramedic staff, the data were collected from patients during their isolation to avoid the
154 forgetting bias in reporting their responses. The paramedic staff who helped in the collection of
155 the data was first trained to collect the data. Due to reservations imposed by the nature of the
156 disease, we could only access the patients of one hospital in Rawalpindi. Rawalpindi Institute of
157 Urology and Transplantation hospital has one of the largest isolation centers in Pakistan with 50
158 designated beds for COVID-19 patients and is equipped with the necessary equipment, including
159 ventilators. The hospital gave ethical clearance for conducting the research (Ethical approval Letter
160 Ref No. 201). No one could go into isolation wards except for the staff. The staff working in
161 isolation wards of the Rawalpindi Institute of Urology and Transplantation, Rawalpindi, helped us

162   to get the questionnaires filled from the patients. The data were collected during June-August 2020

163   in Rawalpindi when COVID-19 was at its peak. Patients were briefed about the purpose of the

164   research, confidentiality of the responses and right to withdraw at any time during the research.

165   Patients participated in the research with their voluntary consent knowing the purpose of the

166   research. A separate written consent was not taken; however, verbal permission was taken by

167   asking their willingness to give the data and filling out the questionnaire showed their informed

168   consent. The questionnaire stipulated the purpose of the research and assured anonymity. In

169   addition, the questions, revealing their identity were not asked.

170   **Sample**

171   The sample size for this study was calculated through G-power software by selecting parameters

172   including the effect size, which was 0.15, error probability being 0.05, power as 0.95, and a total

173   number of predictors were 5.   The required calculated sample required was 107. However, a

174   questionnaire booklet was distributed among 110 participants. Among them, six refused to

175   participate, and four booklets were 90 percent incomplete, so their responses were discarded. The

176   response rate was 90.9%. Therefore, the final analysis was done on 100 participant's responses.

177   **Data Analysis Technique**

178   Two software, including STATA and SmartPLS-3, were used to test the hypotheses of this study.

179   Smart PLS is software for variance-based structural equation modeling (SEM) using the partial

180   least squares (PLS) path modeling method. The benefits of the PLS approach consist of

181   measurement settings, theoretical settings, practical attention, and distributional attentions (Falk

182   & Miller, 1992).   The PLS approach relies on the data and is an exploratory methodology. For the

183   present study, SmartPLS was beneficial due to its prediction-oriented approach and did not need

184   large sample sizes (Chin & Newsted, 1999). Moreover, PLS is used to determine the latent

185   variables. Chin and Newsted (1999) stated that the PLS approach uses a weighted sum of indicators

186   for creating component scores of latent variables. Normality was checked through skewness and

187   kurtosis through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).   Results showed that data were

188   normally distributed for all the variables as the values of skewness and kurtosis were found to be

189   in in the acceptable range (skeweness: $\pm$ 2, kurtosis: $\pm$ 3) between 0.005-2.203 and no

190   multicollinearity among variables was observed. Furthermore, a one-way analysis of variation

191   (ANOVA) was used to test for the differences in patient satisfaction across the categories of

192   training levels and marital condition.

193 To analyze various factors affecting the level of pain, an ordered logistical regression was used.

194 Due to the orderly nature of the responses of the pain variable, that technique was chosen.

195 The general model of ordered logistic regression is:

196 $$\mathrm{Prob}(y_i = j) = \mathrm{B}(z_{j+1} - X_i \text{Ø}) - \mathrm{B}(z_j - X_i \text{Ø})\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\text{eq 1}$$

197 Substituting the value of B

198 $$\mathrm{Prob}(y_i = j) = \frac{\exp(z_{j+1} - X_i \text{Ø})}{1 + \exp(z_{j+1} - X_i \text{Ø})} - \frac{\exp(z_j - X_i \text{Ø})}{1 + \exp(z_j - X_i \text{Ø})}\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\text{eq 2}$$

199 where "i" is the number of observations. "j" is 1,…,5 and represent the values for y. "X" is the

200 vector of independent variables, "Ø" is the coefficient vector and z_j are the cut points of the

201 distribution. The independent variables include fear, age, satisfaction with medicine during

202 isolation, sufficiency of income, satisfaction with life and satisfaction with the doctors.

203 Structural equation modeling was applied to see the relationship of factors with patient satisfaction.

204 For the analyzing patient satisfaction, structural equation modelling (SEM) was used. The

205 underlying model of SEM is linear model. The general linear model in vector form is given below:

206 $$y_i = y_i \Omega + \mu$$

207 where "y_i" is a vector of outcome variable and "Ω" is a matrix of parameters constrained according

208 to the association of variables. The independent variables for the pain satisfaction model are age,

209 number of dependants, household size, education, house ownership, marital status, income

210 adequacy, negligence and pain level. PLS software was used because it provided reliable results

211 even with a small sample size and is suitable for predicting. Following Hair et al., (2013) criteria,

212 the structural model has been assessed via bootstrapping procedure by looking at the values of

213 beta, R-square, and corresponding t-values in the research model among latent constructs. In

214 addition, Hair and colleagues (2013) have also suggested ways of determining effect size (f-

215 square). The predictive power of the research model was determined by the R-square value of the

216 dependent variable, while the trajectory coefficients assess the strength of the hypothetical

217 relations.

218 **Results**

219 **Descriptive statistics**

220 As illustrated in Table 1, the mean age of the sample is 38 years, ranging between 19 and 76 years.

221 Most COVID-19 patients were homeowners and heads of families. Most of the respondents

222 reported that they were happy before the eruption of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, most

223 of the participants who remained in an isolation center were graduates (n=31) or postdoctoral

224 (n=23) in full-time employment (n=62).

225 **Patient satisfaction among patients**

226 Patient satisfaction is the perception of medical facilities and paramedic care (Lochman, 1983).

227 We have tested whether patient satisfaction is different among the different levels of education,

228 marital status, and gender. To achieve the objective, ANOVA is used, and the results are shown in

229 Table 2. The first hypothesis is not supported for this data, which implies that quarantine

230 satisfaction is similar across all variable categories. Overall, the mean values indicate that non-

231 married persons are more satisfied with the isolation facility than married, widowed or divorced

232 persons, but the difference in patient satisfaction across categories is not significant. On the other

233 hand, those who have done graduation reported high-level satisfaction compared to those who

234 have primary, secondary, or college-level education, and the difference between the categories is

235 not significant. Furthermore, there is no difference in mean score in levels of satisfaction between

236 females and males, which is in agreement with the literature where patient satisfaction is found to

237 not vary with demographics (Karaca & Durna, 2019). Hence, from these results, it is evident that

238 patient satisfaction does not vary in people with different demographics, keeping other things

239 constant, which raises the need to investigate other factors apart from medical care that may affect

240 patient satisfaction and may eventually improve the experience of patient satisfaction the COVID-

241 19 patients.

242 In the next section, we will see the factors affecting the pain level, whereas pain and other factors

243 also affect the patient satisfaction of individuals.

244 **Factors affecting Pain Level**

245 The level of pain is a subjective phenomenon and therefore affected by subjective factors beyond

246 objective reasons. We examined the effect of fear and other factors on the level of pain and

247 attempted to model the subjective component of pain. The respondents were asked about the pain

248 level on a five-point scale ranging from no pain to unspeakable. The results have been analyzed

249 using ordered logistic regression and shown in Table 3. Based on literature, the variables were

250 identified. The significance of the variables is analyzed through t-test and the model through F-

251 test. The robustness of the model is checked through adding and dropping of variables and the

252 final model was selected based on Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information

253 Criteria (BIC). The AIC and BIC criteria suggests Model 1 as the final model and is significant

254   which is tested through F-test. According to the findings, when the respondent is neutral with
255   respect to fear rather than disagreeing, there is a higher probability of having a higher level of pain.
256   This suggests that patients being neutral about fear raises the likelihood of having a higher level
257   of pain. In addition, as satisfaction with the medication supplied in the isolation facility increases,
258   the probability of experiencing pain decreases. This indicates that if a person is satisfied with the
259   treatment, then the sensing of pain will also be less as the patent will be anticipating to get better
260   before long. The probability of having higher pain reduces if a person can afford some necessities
261   compared to the situation where the income is not adequate. Income adequacy suggests the
262   affordability of treatment and better, treatment may reduce pain and pain perception. An interesting
263   result came out of the data, suggesting that patients with COVID-19 who are more satisfied with
264   their lives are more likely to have more pain. People having contended life are more likely to report
265   a higher level of pain subjectively. COVID-19 is known to be lethal. People with higher life
266   satisfaction might fear the loss of life, and thus these emotions might interpret as higher pain. If
267   the COVID-19 patients are neutral about satisfaction with the doctors as compared to disagreeing,
268   the probability of perceiving higher pain is lower.

Factors affecting patient satisfaction

270   Based on the literature, the pain level, and other demographic variable factors, significantly affect
271   patient satisfaction. Results indicated that the model fits the data (SRMR= 0.049, Chi
272   square=182.36, NFI=0.812). Bootstrapping is used to test this hypothesis. Results in Table 4 show
273   that age, education level, house possession, income adequacy during the lockdown, negligence in
274   preventing from corona, and levels of pain have a significant direct effect on patient satisfaction
275   in public isolation centers.

276   The results indicate that patient satisfaction decreases with the increase in age. It was found that
277   people with higher education were more satisfied with the isolation facilities. With the increase in
278   the level of education, awareness can increase, and so the realization of the efforts of doctors and
279   staff and the facilities provided make people more satisfied. Furthermore, people possessing their
280   own home have lower satisfaction from isolation centers than people living in a rental home.
281   People feel better about isolating themselves at home. In addition to this, the results illustrated that
282   those individuals who had enough income to meet their expenses during lockdown reported a low
283   level of satisfaction while having inadequate money increase isolation centers' satisfaction. Those
284   who perceived that they were suffering from COVID-19 due to their negligence displayed a high

285   level of satisfaction. Neglect has been operationally defined as the carelessness in taking steps to
286   protect themselves from COVID-19. People whose income is adequate are less satisfied with
287   patients. Similarly, having a high level of pain enhances the level of satisfaction at the isolation
288   center. They feel satisfied when they get medical facilities and other services in public isolation
289   centers, which otherwise was not possible at home while facing a high level of pain. On the other
290   hand, several dependents, household size, and marital status are not significantly related to the
291   satisfaction of isolation centers. As a result, the second assumption is partially supported. Table 4
292   shows the t-values, standardized path/ beta coefficients, and outcomes. Overall, the bootstrap
293   analysis indicated that demographic variables added to the model explained 30.4% of the variance
294   in quarantine satisfaction.

Discussion

296   The COVID-19 pandemic has jolted the whole world with infectious disease by spreading the
297   sickness and causing mortalities. According to WHO guidance, quarantine and isolation are among
298   the primary methods to reduce the spread of the disease. The literature has shown that isolation
299   may have negative effects on the patients (Mattioli et al., 2020), so it is very important to improve
300   patients' experience by providing them a better environment to recover quickly.

301   Pain is a subjective experience (Koyama, McHaffie, Laurienti, & Coghill, 2005; Raja et al., 2020).
302   The subjective factors affecting pain are fear, satisfaction with life, income adequacy, satisfaction
303   with doctors and medicine. The age also affects the pain level, but the effect size is very low as
304   the odds are close to 1. The literature says that pain might be due to fear (Crombez, Viane,
305   Eccleston, Devulder, & Goubert, 2013; Markfelder & Pauli, 2020). Fear of pain aggravates the
306   feeling of pain (Crombez et al., 2013), and this study found the same on COVID-19 patients. The
307   satisfaction with the doctors and medicine decreases the perception of pain as the person trusts the
308   quality of care given. Similarly, income adequacy brings the affordability of the treatment and less
309   worry about the finances, and hence, perceived income adequacy affects the pain (Crombez et al.,
310   2013). Compared to those who strongly disagree, if a person demonstrates that they are satisfied
311   with their life, the likelihood of experiencing greater pain is high. The individual's satisfaction
312   corresponds to his overall cognitive assessment of life (Bergefurt et al., 2019). Literature reported
313   that more social people tend to report higher satisfaction, happiness (McCarthy & Habib, 2018).
314   Loneliness not only affects life satisfaction, but also affects health (Bergefurt et al., 2019; Hwang,
315   Rabheru, Peisah, Reichman, & Ikeda, 2020). The isolated patients having higher life satisfaction

316 face amplified effects of isolation in terms of emotional and health, wellbeing, which is translated
317 into reporting a higher level of pain.
318 Sprang and Silman (2013) found that individuals in isolation had more post-traumatic disorders
319 than those who were not in isolation. Based on the primary data collected from the COVID-19
320 patients, we found that their satisfaction was not significantly different among people with varying
321 education, gender, and marital status. Outcomes are consistent with patient satisfaction literature.
322 An estimated 40% of people are satisfied with the isolation facility. Patient satisfaction is affected
323 by income adequacy, house ownership, age, education, negligence, and pain level. Age has a direct
324 effect on patient satisfaction. Patient satisfaction was low among younger patients, as it was not
325 frequent that they were ill or hospitalized. People with adequate income tend to have better health
326 and expect to get high-quality care, and in case there is a discrepancy in the car, they get more
327 dissatisfied than those who do not have a higher financial status. People who do not have adequate
328 income are already negligent of health and health care and do not perceive higher dissatisfaction
329 (Karaca & Durna, 2019). Education gives awareness and the ability to cope with the disease and
330 positively relates to patient overall satisfaction (Dzomeku, Ba-Etilayoo, Perekuu, & Mantey, 2013;
331 Wudu, 2021). Negligence in taking preventive measures for COVID-19 has an important effect
332 on patient satisfaction. Highly negligent people taking preventive steps to protect themselves from
333 COVID-19 have higher patient satisfaction as the medical facilities and services make them feel
334 in a safe environment that they were missed in the first place. Patient satisfaction is extremely
335 important for hospital patient satisfaction literature proves that people with a lower perception of
336 quality care tend to complain more about the hospital (Stelfox, Bates, & Redelmeier, 2004).
337 This study has far-reaching implications for the health care system and patients. The healthcare
338 system needs to improve their isolation facilities though struggling with scarce resources. It will
339 help them to reduce the pain level of patients and improve their experience. With closed borders
340 and a ban on foreign travel, local treatment is the only option for COVID-19 patients. The
341 improved isolation experience will help patients to spread good word of mouth, which will help
342 regain the nation's trust in doctors, paramedic staff, and the health care system despite having
343 scarce resources. This will also help them ensure that the best is being provided to them. They will
344 eventually enjoy the isolation experience, which will not help them recover, but their safe isolation
345 will also protect others from the spread of the disease. Other countries can also derive lessons from

346   this study by focusing on the factors identified to improve isolated patients' experience in isolation

347   centers.

348   The data collection from isolated COVID-19 patients during isolation was a big hurdle. We did

349   not want to ask patients about their experience after isolation to avoid the bias of forgetting

350   affecting our results. Due to the stated hurdle of access to patients isolated in centers, we could not

351   collect large data. Further research can be done with a large data sample and in different countries

352   to investigate individuals' isolation experience and see the country-specific factors.

353

354   Conclusions

355   The novelty of COVID-19 has not only brought issues in the disease treatment and management,

356   but also the overall medical care and related services. We cannot ignore the importance of

357   treatment, recovery and prevention in this pandemic. The patient experience is extremely

358   important in isolation centers to build patient confidence in paramedics and physicians. A better

359   experience will also contribute to reducing pain for patients. The factors affecting the pain level of

360   patients are satisfaction with doctors and medicine, satisfaction with life, income adequacy, and

361   fear. An improved isolation facility with quality of doctors and medicine can help to reduce the

362   pain level of the patients.

363   It is important to maintain isolation facilities for patients by providing a comfortable environment

364   to patients where they can recover and feel satisfied and perceive less pain. Improving the patient

365   experience may improve the overall quality of hospitals and, as a result, hospitals will face fewer

366   complaints. Being a developing country, income adequacy is also an important factor affecting

367   pain and patient satisfaction. Satisfaction with medical care helps the individual to perceive less

368   pain.

369   Creating public isolation facilities and equipping them with the latest available facilities is a great

370   initiative, especially in developing countries where masses cannot afford these facilities at an out-

371   of-pocket expense. The focus on the provision of services can improve their experience and thus

372   patient satisfaction. However, patient satisfaction is not significantly different between the distinct

373   groups of the population. Improving overall facilities may help to increase the patient satisfaction

374   of patients. Reduction of fear through proper counseling and media awareness may help to bring

375   down the perceived pain of patients. Improving isolation experience will also help decrease

376   negligence in other patients about their diseases and approach the hospitals for isolation, believing

377   that they are in trusted hands.

378

379   **References**

380   Abad C, Fearday A, and Safdar N. 2010. Adverse effects of isolation in hospitalised patients:
381   a systematic review. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 76:97-102. DOI:
382   10.1016/j.jhin.2010.04.027

383   Ahorsu DK, Lin C-Y, Imani V, Saffari M, Griffiths MD, and Pakpour AH. 2020. The fear of
384   COVID-19 scale: development and initial validation. *International Journal of Mental*
385   *Health and Addiction*.

386   Amol Soin, M., Srinivas Vuppala, M., Gregory Surfield, M., Ricardo Buenaventura, M., Mark
387   Malinowski, D., Rajaratnam, A., . . . Aarti Singla, M. (2020). Ohio response to
388   COVID-19 and its impact on interventional pain management practices. *Pain*
389   *physician, 23*, S439-S447.

390   Anthony Jnr, B. (2021). Implications of telehealth and digital care solutions during COVID-19
391   pandemic: a qualitative literature review. *Informatics for Health and Social Care,*
392   *46*(1), 68-83.

393   Anthony Jnr, B. (2021). Integrating telemedicine to support digital health care for the
394   management of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Healthcare*
395   *Management, 14*(1): 280-289. doi: 10.1080/20479700.2020.1870354.

396   Asmundson, G. J., Vlaeyen, J. W. S., Vlaeyen, J. W., & Crombez, G. (2004). *Understanding*
397   *and treating fear of pain*: Oxford University Press, USA.

398   Baker P, Van der Meulen J, Lewsey J, and Gregg P. 2007. The role of pain and function in
399   determining patient satisfaction after total knee replacement: data from the National
400   Joint Registry for England and Wales. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery British*
401   *volume* 89:893-900.

402   Bergefurt L, Kemperman A, van den Berg P, Borgers A, van der Waerden P, Oosterhuis G,
403   and Hommel M. 2019. Loneliness and Life Satisfaction Explained by Public-Space
404   Use and Mobility Patterns. *International journal of environmental research and*
405   *public health* 16:4282. 10.3390/ijerph16214282

406   Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1997). Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *British Medical*
407   *Journal, 314*(7080), 572.

408   Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, and Rubin GJ.
409   2020. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of
410   the evidence. *The Lancet*.

411   Centre for Disease Control and Protection. 2020. Quarantine and isolation. Available at
412   https://www.cdc.gov/quarantine/index.html (accessed April 2021)

413 Crombez G, Viane I, Eccleston C, Devulder J, and Goubert L. 2013. Attention to pain and fear
414   of pain in patients with chronic pain. *Journal of behavioral medicine* 36:371-378.

415 Dzomeku V, Ba-Etilayoo A, Perekuu T, and Mantey R. 2013. In patient satisfaction with
416   nursing care: a case study at kwame nkrumah university of science and technology
417   hospital. *International Journal of Research in Medical and Health Sciences* 2:19-
418   24.

419 Giubilini A, Douglas T, Maslen H, and Savulescu J. 2018. Quarantine, isolation and the duty
420   of easy rescue in public health. *Developing world bioethics* 18:182-189.

421 Huskisson EC. 1974. Measurement of pain. *The Lancet* 304:1127-1131.

422 Hwang T-J, Rabheru K, Peisah C, Reichman W, and Ikeda M. 2020. Loneliness and social
423   isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Psychogeriatrics* 32:1217-
424   1220. 10.1017/S1041610220000988

425 Karaca A, and Durna Z. 2019. Patient satisfaction with the quality of nursing care. *Nursing*
426   *Open* 6:535-545. DOI: 10.1002/nop2.237

427 Keefe FJ, Abernethy AP, and C. Campbell L. 2005. Psychological approaches to
428   understanding and treating disease-related pain. *Annu Rev Psychol* 56:601-630.

429 Koyama T, McHaffie JG, Laurienti PJ, and Coghill RC. 2005. The subjective experience of
430   pain: where expectations become reality. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
431   *Sciences* 102:12950-12955.

432 Lochman JE. 1983. Factors related to patients' satisfaction with their medical care. *Journal of*
433   *Community Health* 9:91-109. DOI: 10.1007/BF01349873

434 Lu C-w, Liu X-f, and Jia Z-f. 2020. 2019-nCoV transmission through the ocular surface must
435   not be ignored. *Lancet (London, England)* 395:e39.

436 Markfelder, T., & Pauli, P. (2020). Fear of pain and pain intensity: Meta-analysis and
437   systematic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 146*(5), 411.

438 Mattioli AV, Puviani MB, Nasi M, and Farinetti A. 2020. COVID-19 pandemic: the effects of
439   quarantine on cardiovascular risk. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*:1-4.

440 Maunder R, Hunter J, Vincent L, Bennett J, Peladeau N, Leszcz M, Sadavoy J, Verhaeghe
441   LM, Steinberg R, and Mazzulli T. 2003. The immediate psychological and
442   occupational impact of the 2003 SARS outbreak in a teaching hospital. *Canadian*
443   *Medical Association Journal* 168:1245-1251.

444 McCarthy S, and Habib MA. 2018. Investigation of life satisfaction, travel, built environment
445   and attitudes. *Journal of Transport & Health* 11:15-24.

446 Ministry of National Institute of Health. 2020. Islamabad, Pakistan. Available at Retrieved from:
447   http://covid.gov.pk/ (accessed Jan 2021)

448 Raja, S. N., Carr, D. B., Cohen, M., Finnerup, N. B., Flor, H., Gibson, S., . . . Sluka, K. A.
449   (2020). The revised International Association for the Study of Pain definition of pain:
450   concepts, challenges, and compromises. *Pain, 161*(9), 1976-1982.

451 Rees J, Davies HR, Birchall C, and Price J. 2000. Psychological effects of source isolation
452   nursing (2): patient satisfaction. *Nursing Standard (through 2013)* 14:32.

453 Scher C, Meador L, Van Cleave JH, and Reid MC. 2018. Moving beyond pain as the fifth vital
454   sign and patient satisfaction scores to improve pain care in the 21st century. *Pain
455   Management Nursing* 19:125-129.

456 Song, X. J., Xiong, D. L., Wang, Z. Y., Yang, D., Zhou, L., & Li, R. C. (2020). Pain management
457   during the COVID-19 pandemic in China: Lessons learned. *Pain Medicine*, *21*(7),
458   1319-1323.

459 Sprang G, and Silman M. 2013. Posttraumatic stress disorder in parents and youth after
460   health-related disasters. *Disaster medicine and public health preparedness* 7:105-
461   110.

462 Stelfox HT, Bates DW, and Redelmeier DA. 2004. Quality of Care and Satisfaction Among
463   Patients   Isolated   for   Infection   Control—Reply.   *JAMA*   291:420-422.
464   10.1001/jama.291.4.421-b

465 Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research
466   instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education, 48*(6), 1273-
467   1296.

468 Tang, F., Liang, J., Zhang, H., Kelifa, M. M., He, Q., & Wang, P. (2020). COVID-19 related
469   depression and anxiety among quarantined respondents. *Psychology & Health*, 1-
470   15.

471 Tongco, M. D. C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany
472   Research and applications, 5*, 147-158.

473 World Health Organization. 2020. Statement on the second meeting of the International
474   Health Regulations (2005) Emergency Committee regarding the outbreak of novel
475   coronavirus (2019-nCoV).

476 Wudu, M. A. (2021). Predictors of Adult Patient Satisfaction with Inpatient Nursing Care in
477   Public Hospitals of Eastern Amhara Region, Northeastern Ethiopia, 2020. *Patient
478   preference and adherence, 15*, 177.

479

Demographics of the respondents

1   **Table 1. Demographics of the respondents**

Variables	Categories	Frequency
Age	Mean=38	88
	Standard deviation= 13.1	
House possession	Own	52
	Rent	40
	Other	8
Head of Family	Yes	53
	No	47
Feel Happy Before Pandemic	Not very happy	16
	Not happy	12
	Neutral	17
	Happy	32
	Very Happy	23
	Strongly Disagree	2
Education	Primary	12
	Secondary	4
	High School	14
	College	15
	Graduate	31
	Post Graduate	21
Employment Status	Full time	62
	Part time	5
	Unemployed	21
	Full time student	4
	Retired	8

Analysis of variance estimating the difference in patient satisfaction between categories of demographic variables

1 **Table 2. Analysis of variance estimating the difference in patient satisfaction between**
2 **categories of demographic variables**

	N	Mean (SD)	F	P-value
Marital Status			1.379	0.254
1. Unmarried	27	2.872(0.931)		
2. Married	68	1.500 (1.211)		
3. Widow	2	2.071 (0.707)		
4. Divorced	2	2.857 (1.111)		
Education level			1.673	0.149
1. Primary	12	2.214 (1.336)		
2. Secondary	4	2.320 (0.513)		
3. High School	15	2.666 (1.072)		
4. College	15	3.019 (1.292)		
5. Graduate	27	3.218 (1.084)		
6. Postgraduate	22	2.871 (1.020)		
Gender			0.119	0.730
1. Male	48	2.816 (1.023)		
2. Female	51	2.896 (1.125)		

Ordered logistic regression showing effect of different factors affecting pain level

1   **Table 3: Ordered logistic regression showing effect of different factors affecting pain level**

VARIABLES	Odds ratio	
	Model 1	Model 2
Fear		
Strongly agree	12.64	2.686
	(0.389 - 410.1)	(0.115 - 62.79)
Agree	10.25	5.870
	(0.430 - 244.3)	(0.327 - 105.3)
Neutral	39.55**	66.72***
	(1.792 - 872.7)	(3.196 - 1,393)
Disagree	0.186	0.387
	(0.00869 - 3.975)	(0.0213 - 7.009)
Base category: strongly disagree		
Age	0.940**	0.963**
	(0.889 - 0.994)	(0.915 - 1.014)
Satisfaction with medicine during isolation		
Dissatisfied	0.01000**	0.131*
	(0.000108 - 0.929)	(0.0150 - 1.149)
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0.00389**	0.0476**
	(4.47e-05 - 0.338)	(0.00386 - 0.587)
Satisfied	0.0230**	0.0734**
	(0.00117 - 0.452)	(0.00856 - 0.630)
Very satisfied	0.0541**	0.193
	(0.00427 - 0.686)	(0.0250 - 1.494)
Base category: Very dissatisfied		
Sufficiency of income		
Can meet necessities	0.155**	0.376**
	(0.0324 - 0.740)	(0.0876 - 1.616)
Can afford somethings	0.499	0.370
	(0.109 - 2.283)	(0.0885 - 1.545)
Can afford everything	5.131	1.645
	(0.547 - 48.13)	(0.292 - 9.276)
Afford everything and still save money	2.040	4.389e+11
	(0.01 – 0.02)	(0.01 -0.02)
Base category: Not at all adequate		
Satisfaction with life		
Disagree	122.0***	39.77***

	(6.887 - 2,162)	(2.846 - 555.7)
Neutral	744.9***	47.88***
	(19.59 - 28,329)	(3.103 - 738.7)
Agree	61.06**	8.329
	(2.556 - 1,458)	(0.614 - 113.0)
Strongly agree	12.63	5.612
	(0.0634 - 2,514)	(0.0641 - 491.4)
Base category: Strongly disagree		
Satisfaction with the doctors		
Disagree	8.997	
	(0.233 - 348.1)	
Neutral	0.0315*	
	(0.000656 - 1.515)	
Agree	0.806	
	(0.0933 - 6.967)	
Strongly agree	0.97	
	(0.1 - 1)	
Base category: Strongly disagree		
Constant cut1	0.141	
	(0.00226 - 8.758)	
Constant cut2	2.515	
	(0.0458 - 138.2)	
Constant cut3	24.55	
	(0.420 - 1,435)	
Constant cut4	320.1***	
	(4.730 - 21,668)	
Pseudo R square	0.323	0.269
F statistics	86.323	71.90
F statistics p-value	0.000	0.000
AIC	230.279	238.693
BIC	292.213	293.194
Observations	88	88

2   Dependent variable: Pain level
3   *p-value<0.1, **p-value<0.05, ***p-value<0.01

Summary of Construct's R square, Beta Coefficient, t-value and Significance level

Summary of Construct's R square, Beta Coefficient, t-value and Significance level

1 **Table 4: Summary of Construct's R square, Beta Coefficient, t-value and Significance level**

Hypothesis	Path/Beta Coefficient	t-value	p-value
Age	-0.222	2.231	0.026**
Number of dependents	0.024	0.236	0.813
Education	0.276	2.961	0.003***
Household size	0.097	0.820	0.413
House ownership (own house)	-0.404	4.563	0.000***
Base category: rented house			
Income adequacy	-0.237	2.299	0.022**
Marital Status (married)	-0.084	1.005	0.315
(Base category: unmarried)			
Negligence	0.201	1.975	0.049**
Pain Level	0.348	3.420	0.001***

2 Dependent variable: Patient satisfaction
3 *p-value<0.1, **p-value<0.05, ***p-value<0.01