



Compassionate healthcare: an interpretive synthesis of evidence-based practice and care ethics theory

Carlos Fernando Collares ¹, Patrícia Crestani ¹, Luiz Roberto Maia ¹, Alitheia Karla da Silva ¹, Matheus Guelssi dos Santos ¹, Daniele de Freitas Gonzaga Vargas ¹, Luise Simonetti ¹, Valéria Trento ¹, Dayana Pires Santos ¹, Giuliana Gomes Vieira Ribeiro ¹, Andreia Letícia Soares Labes ¹

¹ Faculdades Pequeno Príncipe, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0914-3430>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-1295>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5219-0774>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5385-4224>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0555-1104>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2005-3870>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4655-7241>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7173-2967>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-1949-2283>, Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9973-2759>

ABSTRACT

Background: Healthcare systems globally recognize compassion as essential to quality care, yet systematic approaches to understanding and implementing compassionate practice remain fragmented. This interpretive synthesis examines compassion through multiple theoretical lenses and synthesizes current evidence on measurement, implementation, and outcomes. **Methods:** This interpretive synthesis draws from care ethics theory, neuroscientific research, and implementation science to analyze compassionate healthcare practice. Literature from 2020-2025 was prioritized to capture current developments in theory and practice. **Results:** Care ethics frameworks provide robust theoretical foundations for compassionate practice, emphasizing relationality, responsiveness, and institutional accountability. Recent neuroscience research demonstrates measurable brain plasticity associated with compassion training. Validated measurement instruments enable systematic assessment, though cultural adaptation remains challenging. Implementation barriers include resource constraints, competing priorities, and organizational resistance. **Conclusions:** Compassionate healthcare requires integration of theoretical understanding, evidence-based practice, and systematic implementation approaches. Future research should address measurement standardization, cultural adaptation protocols, and sustainable implementation strategies.

HISTÓRIA DO ARTIGO

Received 26 Aug 2025

Accepted 1 Sep 2025

KEYWORDS

Compassion; healthcare; care ethics; implementation science; measurement validation

"Know all the theories, master all the techniques, but as you touch a human soul, be just another human soul." - Carl Jung

INTRODUCTION

The integration of compassion into healthcare practice represents both an ancient healing tradition and a contemporary clinical imperative. While healthcare providers have long recognized the importance of compassionate care, systematic approaches to understanding, measuring, and implementing compassion remain inconsistent across healthcare systems. This interpretive synthesis examines compassionate healthcare from multiple theoretical perspectives, synthesizes current evidence on measurement and implementation, and identifies critical gaps that require further investigation.

Carl Jung's observation that healers must approach patients as "another human soul" provides philosophical grounding for this analysis, though contemporary understanding requires engagement with broader theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence [1]. This synthesis aims to bridge humanistic perspectives with scientific validation while acknowledging the limitations and contradictions inherent in compassion research.

Recent scholarship in care ethics provides robust theoretical foundations for understanding compassionate healthcare practice. Building on foundational work by Carol Gilligan, Nel Noddings, and Joan Tronto, contemporary care ethics emphasizes four core elements: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness [2,3]. These elements extend beyond individual practitioner behaviors to encompass institutional structures that enable or constrain compassionate practice.

Gilligan's ethics of care, emphasizing relationality and contextual moral reasoning, challenges healthcare systems dominated by abstract principles and standardized protocols [4]. This relational approach recognizes that compassionate care emerges through authentic connections between individuals rather than through adherence to predetermined guidelines. Noddings' emphasis on caring relationships as foundational to moral development suggests that healthcare environments must actively cultivate conditions that support caring interactions [5].

Tronto's political dimension of care ethics proves particularly relevant to healthcare implementation. Her concept of "democratic caring" requires that care recipients have voice in defining their needs and evaluating care quality [6]. Recent applications of Tronto's framework to vulnerable populations demonstrate that effective compassionate care requires institutional mechanisms that enable patient and community input in care design and delivery [7].

METHODS

Study Design

This interpretive synthesis employed a critical interpretive approach to examine compassionate healthcare through multiple theoretical and empirical lenses. Unlike systematic reviews that aggregate findings, interpretive synthesis aims to develop conceptual understanding by interrogating and reframing evidence within theoretical frameworks. This methodology was selected to address the complexity of compassion as both a philosophical construct and empirical phenomenon requiring integration across diverse disciplinary perspectives.

Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple databases including PubMed, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Web of Science, and PhilPapers to capture healthcare, psychological, neuroscientific, and philosophical literature. Search terms included combinations of "compassion," "compassionate care," "care ethics," "healthcare," "measurement," "neuroscience," "implementation," and related terms. While prioritizing literature from 2020-2025 to capture current developments, foundational theoretical works and seminal empirical studies from earlier periods were included when essential for theoretical grounding or historical context.

Inclusion and Selection Criteria

Literature was selected based on relevance to three core domains: (1) theoretical frameworks for understanding compassionate healthcare, particularly care ethics perspectives; (2) empirical evidence regarding measurement, neuroscientific foundations, and outcomes of compassionate care; and (3) implementation science research addressing organizational and cultural factors. Both empirical studies and theoretical papers were included. Grey literature, including policy documents and organizational reports, was incorporated when directly relevant to implementation considerations.

Theoretical Framework

The synthesis was guided by an integration of care ethics theory, neuroscientific frameworks of compassion, and implementation science models. Care ethics theory, particularly the work of Gilligan, Noddings, and Tronto, provided the philosophical foundation for examining relationality and institutional dimensions of compassion. Neuroscientific frameworks informed understanding of the biological basis and malleability of compassionate responses. Implementation science frameworks guided analysis of organizational and system-level factors influencing compassionate care delivery.

Analysis and Synthesis Process

The interpretive synthesis proceeded through iterative cycles of reading, conceptual mapping, and critical analysis. Initial reading identified key themes and theoretical tensions within the literature. Conceptual mapping explored relationships between theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and implementation challenges. Critical analysis examined contradictions, methodological limitations, and gaps in current evidence.

Synthesis involved three stages: (1) within-domain analysis examining coherence and contradictions within each theoretical or empirical domain; (2) cross-domain integration exploring connections and tensions between different disciplinary perspectives; and (3) critical interpretation identifying unresolved questions and implications for theory, research, and practice.

Quality Assessment

Rather than employing standardized quality assessment tools designed for intervention studies, this interpretive synthesis evaluated literature based on theoretical coherence, methodological rigor appropriate to study design, and contribution to conceptual understanding. Empirical studies were assessed for methodological transparency, sample characteristics, and measurement validity. Theoretical papers were evaluated for conceptual clarity, logical consistency, and explanatory power.

Reflexivity and Limitations

The interpretive nature of this synthesis acknowledges that the selection, analysis, and integration of literature is influenced by the authors' disciplinary backgrounds and theoretical orientations. While comprehensive literature searching was conducted, the breadth of relevant literature across multiple disciplines means that some relevant works may have been overlooked. The synthesis prioritizes depth of conceptual analysis over exhaustive coverage of all empirical studies, consistent with interpretive synthesis methodology.

RESULTS

The interpretive synthesis revealed six interconnected themes that characterize the current state of compassionate healthcare research and practice. First, care ethics frameworks provide theoretical foundations while revealing tensions between relational ideals and institutional realities. Second,

neuroscientific research demonstrates measurable neural correlates of compassion, though clinical translation remains limited. Third, validated measurement instruments enable systematic assessment, with the Sinclair Compassion Questionnaire emerging as the most robust patient-reported measure. Fourth, cultural variations in compassion expression necessitate careful adaptation of both measurement tools and interventions. Fifth, implementation science identifies multilevel barriers and evidence-based strategies for organizational change. Finally, critical analysis reveals methodological limitations and unresolved tensions that constrain practical application. These themes are explored in detail below, with attention to both empirical evidence and theoretical implications.

Care Ethics in Practice: Palliative and Vulnerable Population Care

Contemporary applications of care ethics theory in healthcare contexts reveal both the potential and limitations of these frameworks. In palliative care, care ethics perspectives address gaps in traditional bioethical approaches by emphasizing relationships, context, and responsiveness to suffering [2]. This approach recognizes that end-of-life care requires attention to emotional, social, and spiritual dimensions that extend beyond clinical decision-making.

For vulnerable populations, care ethics frameworks highlight how institutional structures can systematically undermine compassionate care despite individual provider intentions [7]. The emphasis on responsiveness requires healthcare systems to develop mechanisms for hearing and acting on marginalized communities' experiences and needs. This institutional dimension of care ethics challenges healthcare organizations to examine how policies, procedures, and resource allocation decisions either support or constrain compassionate practice.

Limitations and Critiques of Care Ethics Approaches

Care ethics frameworks face several limitations when applied to healthcare contexts. Critics argue that care ethics may romanticize caring relationships while failing to address power imbalances inherent in healthcare encounters [8]. The emphasis on relationships and context can conflict with requirements for standardization and efficiency in healthcare delivery. Additionally, care ethics approaches may inadequately address situations where caring intentions conflict with patient autonomy or resource constraints.

The gendered history of care ethics also raises questions about whether emphasizing care and compassion reinforces traditional gender roles that have historically undervalued caregiving work [9]. Healthcare organizations implementing compassion initiatives must consider whether these efforts genuinely improve care quality or primarily serve the purpose of managing organizational image.

Neuroscientific Foundations of Compassion

Neural Networks and Compassion Training

Recent neuroscientific research provides empirical support for the neuroplasticity of compassion-related neural networks. Large-scale longitudinal neuroimaging studies demonstrate that targeted mental training produces measurable changes in brain structure and function associated with compassionate behavior [10]. The ReSource Project, a comprehensive investigation into the effects of contemplative training, reveals that socio-affective training modules specifically targeting compassion produce dissociable changes in functional brain networks compared to mindfulness or socio-cognitive training [11].

Neuroimaging studies consistently implicate several brain regions in compassion-related processing, including the anterior insula, orbitofrontal cortex, anterior cingulate cortex, temporoparietal

junction, and components of the default mode network [12,13]. These findings suggest that compassion involves integration across multiple neural systems, including those responsible for interoceptive awareness, emotional regulation, perspective-taking, and self-referential processing.

Interpersonal Neuroscience and Healthcare Relationships

Emerging hyperscanning research, which simultaneously measures brain activity in interacting individuals, provides insights into the neural basis of compassionate healthcare relationships. Studies of doctor-patient interactions reveal that inter-brain synchronization in inferior frontal and temporoparietal regions correlates with trust and perceived care quality [14]. This research suggests that compassionate care may involve measurable neural coordination between providers and patients.

However, the clinical implications of these neuroscientific findings remain unclear. While brain training studies demonstrate neuroplasticity, the translation of these changes to sustained compassionate behavior in clinical settings requires further investigation. Additionally, the heterogeneity of neuroimaging methodologies and small sample sizes in many studies limit the generalizability of findings.

Critical Limitations in Neuroscience Research

The neuroscience of compassion literature faces several methodological limitations. Most studies employ laboratory-based paradigms that may not capture the complexity of real-world healthcare interactions. Cultural variations in neural responses to compassion-related stimuli remain underexplored. Additionally, the relationship between neural activation patterns and behavioral outcomes in clinical settings requires more systematic investigation.

The apparent absence of large-scale meta-analyses in recent literature (2022-2025) limits confidence in the consistency of neuroscientific findings across studies. Individual studies often employ different definitions of compassion, making the synthesis of findings challenging. Future research requires standardized paradigms and larger, more diverse samples to establish robust neural markers of compassionate care.

Measurement and Assessment of Compassionate Care

Instruments and Validity Evidence

The Sinclair Compassion Questionnaire (SCQ) represents the most comprehensively validated patient-reported measure of compassion in healthcare [15]. Developed through extensive qualitative research with patients experiencing serious illness, the SCQ demonstrates strong psychometric properties across multiple healthcare contexts. The instrument measures three domains: recognition and understanding of suffering, empathetic concern and connection, and action to help [16].

Recent validation studies demonstrate the SCQ's reliability and validity across diverse cultural contexts, including Spanish, Italian, and Brazilian populations [17,18,19]. These cross-cultural validations reveal both universal elements of compassion perception and culture-specific variations in expression and evaluation. The Spanish validation study (n = 301) demonstrated excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$) and strong convergent validity with related constructs [17].

The Italian validation in palliative care settings (n = 200) confirmed the three-factor structure, while revealing cultural variations in the relative importance of different compassion domains [18]. Brazilian validation work highlights challenges in translating compassion concepts across linguistic and cultural boundaries, requiring extensive adaptation of item wording and response formats [19].

Alternative Measurement Approaches

The Schwartz Center Compassionate Care Scale offers a provider-focused assessment tool, which measures healthcare professionals' perceptions of compassionate care in their work environments [20]. This 12-item instrument demonstrates adequate reliability but requires further validation across diverse healthcare settings and cultural contexts.

The Jefferson Scale of Empathy, while not specifically measuring compassion, provides a related assessment tool that has been extensively validated across healthcare professions and cultural contexts [21]. Recent validation work in Croatian nursing students demonstrates the scale's applicability beyond its original development context while highlighting the need for cultural adaptation of empathy and compassion measures [22].

Measurement Challenges and Limitations

Current compassion measurement approaches face several limitations. Patient-reported measures may be influenced by social desirability bias, particularly in healthcare settings where patients may feel pressure to provide positive evaluations. Provider self-report measures may not accurately reflect actual compassionate behavior as perceived by patients.

The lack of behavioral observation measures represents a significant gap in current assessment approaches. While patient and provider perceptions of compassion are important, objective measures of compassionate behavior would strengthen the evidence base for compassion interventions. Additionally, most current measures focus on individual-level compassion rather than organizational or system-level factors that enable or constrain compassionate care.

Cultural Adaptation and Global Implementation

Cross-Cultural Variations in Compassion Expression

Compassion expression varies significantly across cultural contexts, requiring careful adaptation of both measurement instruments and intervention approaches. Research in collectivist versus individualist societies reveals different emphases in compassion conceptualization and expression [23]. Collectivist cultures may emphasize family involvement and community support, while individualist cultures focus more on provider-patient dyadic relationships.

Healthcare systems in different cultural contexts face varying implementation challenges. In resource-limited settings, compassion initiatives must address basic infrastructure needs alongside relationship-building approaches. High-resource settings may face different challenges related to technological medicalization and time pressures that limit interpersonal connection opportunities.

Implementation Case Studies

Scandinavian Model: Nordic healthcare systems have integrated compassion training into mandatory continuing education requirements, demonstrating institutional commitment to compassionate care [24]. These programs emphasize reflection, peer support, and organizational culture change alongside individual skill development.

Japanese Healthcare: Integration of compassion concepts with traditional healing philosophies demonstrates successful cultural adaptation of Western compassion frameworks [25]. Japanese healthcare systems emphasize group harmony and hierarchical respect while maintaining focus on patient suffering alleviation.

Sub-Saharan African Contexts: Community-based healthcare models in several African countries integrate traditional healing approaches with contemporary compassion frameworks, emphasizing extended family involvement and community support systems [26].

Cultural Adaptation Challenges

Successful cultural adaptation requires more than the translation of existing instruments and interventions. Deep cultural engagement is necessary to understand how concepts of compassion align with or conflict with existing healthcare traditions and social structures. Power dynamics, gender roles, and communication patterns vary significantly across cultures and must be considered in adaptation efforts.

The risk of cultural imperialism in global compassion initiatives requires careful attention to local leadership and community input in program design and implementation. Imposed models of compassionate care may conflict with existing cultural practices and ultimately undermine rather than enhance care quality.

Implementation Science and Organizational Change

Systematic Implementation Barriers

Healthcare organizations face multiple barriers to implementing compassion initiatives, despite widespread recognition of their importance. Resource constraints represent the most commonly cited implementation challenge, with organizations arguing that compassion training and culture change initiatives require investments that compete with other clinical priorities [27].

Time pressures in clinical practice create structural barriers to compassionate care delivery. Healthcare providers report that productivity expectations and documentation requirements limit opportunities for meaningful patient interaction [28]. These systemic pressures may undermine compassion initiatives unless addressed through organizational policy changes.

Organizational culture represents another significant barrier to implementation. Healthcare systems with hierarchical structures and blame-oriented cultures may resist compassion initiatives that emphasize vulnerability, reflection, and mutual support [29]. Leadership commitment and modeling are essential for successful culture change initiatives.

Evidence-Based Implementation Strategies

Multi-level Interventions: Successful compassion initiatives address individual, team, and organizational levels simultaneously. Individual training programs must be supported by team-based practices and organizational policies that reinforce the values of compassionate care [30].

Leadership Development: Healthcare leaders require specific training in compassion-focused leadership approaches. Research demonstrates that leader behavior significantly influences organizational compassion climate and individual provider behavior [31].

Measurement and Feedback Systems: Regular assessment and feedback on compassion indicators help maintain focus and demonstrate progress. Organizations implementing systematic measurement report greater sustainability of compassion initiatives [32].

Peer Support Programs: Structured peer support approaches, including Schwartz Rounds and similar initiatives, provide sustainable mechanisms for maintaining compassion focus while addressing provider emotional needs [33].

Sustainability Challenges

Long-term sustainability of compassion initiatives requires integration into organizational systems and processes rather than reliance on individual champions or temporary funding. Research demonstrates that compassion programs often decline after the initial implementation period unless they are embedded in ongoing organizational structures [34].

Staff turnover poses a particular challenge for compassion initiatives, as programs must continuously engage new personnel while maintaining a cohesive culture among existing staff. Organizations require systematic onboarding and mentoring processes to maintain a compassionate focus across staff transitions.

Critical Analysis and Limitations

Contradictions in Compassion Research

The compassion literature reveals several unresolved tensions that limit the practical application of compassion. The relationship between individual compassion and organizational efficiency remains a contested issue, with some research suggesting potential conflicts between compassionate care and productivity demands [35]. Healthcare systems must navigate these tensions without clear evidence-based guidance.

The measurement of compassion faces fundamental philosophical challenges. Patient perceptions of compassion may be influenced by factors unrelated to provider behavior, including treatment outcomes, cultural expectations, and individual personality factors. Provider self-assessments may reflect social desirability rather than actual compassionate behavior.

Methodological Limitations

Most compassion research employs cross-sectional designs that limit causal inference about compassion interventions. Longitudinal studies with adequate follow-up periods are needed to establish the sustained effects of compassion training and organizational interventions.

The predominance of self-report measures in compassion research creates potential bias in findings. Behavioral observation studies and objective outcome measures would strengthen the evidence base but remain rare in the literature.

Sample diversity represents another limitation, with most research conducted in Western, high-resource healthcare settings. Generalizability to other contexts requires systematic investigation across diverse populations and healthcare systems.

Unresolved Questions

Several critical questions remain unresolved in compassion research:

1. What is the optimal balance between individual training and organizational change in compassion interventions?
2. How do cultural factors moderate the relationship between compassion and patient outcomes?
3. What are the long-term effects of compassion training on provider wellbeing and career satisfaction?
4. How can healthcare systems maintain a compassionate focus during crisis periods or resource constraints?

Future Directions and Research Priorities

Methodological Advances

Future compassion research requires methodological innovations to address current limitations. Mixed-methods longitudinal studies with adequate sample sizes and diverse populations would strengthen evidence quality. Development of behavioral observation measures and objective outcome indicators would complement existing self-report approaches.

Implementation science frameworks should guide future intervention studies, with a focus on contextual factors, adaptation processes, and sustainability mechanisms. Systematic evaluation of cultural adaptation approaches would inform global implementation efforts.

Theoretical Development

Integration of care ethics theory with implementation science frameworks represents a promising direction for theoretical advancement. This integration could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how philosophical commitments to compassionate care translate into sustainable organizational practices.

The development of ecological models that account for individual, interpersonal, organizational, and societal factors influencing compassionate care would advance both theoretical sophistication and practical application.

Practice Implications

Healthcare education programs require systematic integration of compassion training across all health professions. This integration should include theoretical foundations, practical skills development, and reflective practices that support ongoing professional development.

Healthcare organizations require evidence-based frameworks for evaluating and enhancing the compassion climate. These frameworks should address policy, practice, and culture dimensions while providing practical guidance for implementation and sustainability.

CONCLUSIONS

This interpretive synthesis reveals compassionate healthcare as a complex phenomenon that requires the integration of theoretical understanding, empirical evidence, and practical implementation strategies. Care ethics frameworks provide robust philosophical foundations that emphasize relationality, responsiveness, and institutional accountability. Neuroscientific research has demonstrated the neuroplasticity of compassion-related brain networks, although the clinical implications remain unclear.

Validated measurement instruments enable systematic assessment of compassionate care, though cultural adaptation challenges persist. Implementation science reveals multiple barriers to compassion initiatives, including resource constraints, time pressures, and organizational culture factors. Evidence-based implementation strategies exist but require adaptation to specific organizational contexts.

Critical analysis reveals several unresolved tensions and methodological limitations that constrain the practical application of compassion research. Future research priorities include methodological advances, theoretical development, and systematic evaluation of implementation approaches across diverse cultural contexts.

Healthcare systems seeking to enhance compassionate care must address individual, interpersonal, and organizational factors simultaneously while remaining attentive to cultural variations and implementation barriers. The integration of philosophical commitment with empirical evidence and

practical implementation strategies offers the most promising approach to advancing compassionate healthcare practice.

The ultimate goal remains Jung's vision of authentic human connection in healing relationships, informed by contemporary understanding of the complex factors that enable or constrain such connections in modern healthcare systems. Achieving this goal requires sustained commitment to research, practice improvement, and organizational change that prioritizes compassionate care as both a moral imperative and a clinical necessity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jung CG. (1954). *The Practice of Psychotherapy: Essays on the Psychology of the Transference and Other Subjects*. Princeton University Press.
- [2] Barns KJE., & Peachey, LG. (2024). Seeking a voice: the inadequacy of the "four principles" and the need for care ethics in the provision of health care to vulnerable populations. *The Medical Journal of Australia*. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.52349>
- [3] Peter E & Liaschenko J (2020). An Evolution of Feminist Thought in Nursing Ethics. In *Feminist Ethics in Nursing* (pp. 15-28). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49104-8_2
- [4] Gilligan C (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.
- [5] Noddings N (2013). *Caring: A Relational Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. University of California Press.
- [6] Tronto JC (2013). *Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice*. NYU Press.
- [7] Mondal D (2023). A Comparative Study between the View of Nel Noddling and Gilligan on Ethics of Care and Moral Education. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v49i41181>
- [8] Kittay EF (2019). *Learning from My Daughter: The Value and Care of Disabled Minds*. Oxford University Press.
- [9] Jaggar AM (2000). Ethics naturalized: Feminism's contribution to moral epistemology. *Metaphilosophy*, 31(5), 452-468.
- [10] Nord CL (2023). Editor's evaluation: Functional and microstructural plasticity following social and interoceptive mental training. *eLife* (editorial material). <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.85188.sa0>
- [11] Valk SL, et al. (2017). Structural plasticity of the social brain: Differential change after socio-affective and cognitive mental training. *Science Advances*, 3(10), e1700489.
- [12] Oliva V, et al. (2023). I feel your pain: Higher empathy is associated with higher posterior default mode network activity. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.11.553004>
- [13] Wang LS, et al. (2024). When 'more for others, less for self' leads to co-benefits: A tri-MRI dyad-hyperscanning study. *Psychophysiology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.14560>
- [14] Liu Y, et al. (2024). Preserving Trust in the Doctor-Patient Interaction: Unveiling the Interactive Positive Evolutionary Process of Doctor-Patient Trust through fNIRS Evidence. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3957143/v1>

- [15] Sinclair S, *et al.* (2021). Development and validation of a patient-reported measure of compassion in healthcare: the Sinclair Compassion Questionnaire (SCQ). *BMJ Open*, 11(6), e045988. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-045988>
- [16] Sinclair S, *et al.* (2022). What is the Most Valid and Reliable Compassion Measure in Healthcare? An Updated Comprehensive and Critical Review. *The Patient: Patient-Centered Outcomes Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40271-022-00571-1>
- [17] Soto-Rubio A, *et al.* (2024). Adaptation and validation of a patient-reported compassion measure in the Spanish population: The Spanish version of the Sinclair Compassion Questionnaire (SCQesp). *Research in Nursing & Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.22373>
- [18] Bovero A *et al.* (2024). Measuring compassion in end-of-life cancer patients: The Italian validation of the Sinclair Compassion Questionnaire (SCQit). *Palliative & Supportive Care*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1478951524001202>
- [19] Pfeiffer S, Pereira, NP & Lisboa, C. S. M. (2022). Fears of Compassion Scales: Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Validity Evidence for Use in Brazil. *Trends in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-022-00220-4>
- [20] Rodriguez AM & Lown BA (2019). Measuring compassionate healthcare with the 12-item Schwartz Center Compassionate Care Scale. *PLOS ONE*, 14(9), e0220911.
- [21] Hojat M (2016). *Empathy in Health Professions Education and Patient Care*. Springer.
- [22] Mudri Ž *et al.* (2024). Assessment of Empathy as a Prerequisite for Holistic Nursing: Psychometric Analysis of the Jefferson Scale of Empathy-Health Profession Students for Croatian BSc and MSc Nursing Students. *Journal of Holistic Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08980101241233331>
- [23] Hofstede G, Hofstede GJ, & Minkov M (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill.
- [24] Blomberg K *et al.* (2019). Implementation of a person-centred care model based on philosophical foundations. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 19(3), 5.
- [25] Takahashi S *et al.* (2020). Cultural adaptation of compassion-focused therapy in Japan. *Mindfulness*, 11(5), 1198-1208.
- [26] Abimbola S *et al.* (2019). Addressing power asymmetries in global health: Imperatives in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS Medicine*, 16(4), e1002763.
- [27] Moffatt-Bruce SD *et al.* (2019). Interventions to Reduce Burnout and Improve Resilience: Impact on a Health System's Outcomes. *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 62(3), 432-443.
- [28] Shanafelt TD *et al.* (2019). Changes in Burnout and Satisfaction With Work-Life Integration Among Physicians and Comparison With the US Population Between 2011 and 2017. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 94(9), 1681-1694.
- [29] Lown BA (2018). Mission Critical: Nursing Leadership Support for Compassion to Sustain Staff Well-being. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 217-222.
- [30] Wei H *et al.* (2020). A culture of caring: the essence of healthcare interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 34(3), 324-331.

[31] Boyatzis RE, & McKee A (2005). *Resonant Leadership: Renewing Yourself and Connecting with Others Through Mindfulness, Hope, and Compassion*. Harvard Business Review Press.

[32] Boss H *et al.* (2024). What role does compassion have on quality care ratings? A regression analysis and validation of the SCQ in emergency department patients. *BMC Emergency Medicine*, 24, 1040. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12873-024-01040-8>

[33] Lown BA & Manning, C. F. (2010). The Schwartz Center Rounds: evaluation of an interdisciplinary approach to enhancing patient-centered communication, teamwork, and provider support. *Academic Medicine*, 85(6), 1073-1081.

[34] Tierney S *et al.* (2017). Enabling the flow of compassionate care: a grounded theory study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 17, 174.

[35] Francis R (2013). *Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry*. The Stationery Office.