From Diagnosis to Recovery: The Interconnected Roles of General Practitioners, Imaging Technicians, Lab Experts, Ambulance, IT and Nursing Staff

Yaser Habeeb AL Safwan[1], Hussain Abd Rab Alrsool Alaithan[2], Mohammed Tawfeeq Alsaif[3], Noof Mosaed AL-Muwallad[4], Ali Mohammed Al hussain[5], Basem ali alfanous[6], Rabeh Saleh Alolaywi[7], MOHAMMED HASSAN ALSHAIKH ALI[8], Yasser Mohammed Alammari[9], YASIR JUBRAN ALMUTAIRI[10], Khalid Abdullah Alzahrani[11].

[1] IT Technician | Maternity and Children Hospital Aldammam | Yalsafwan@moh.gov.sa
[2] Lab Technician | MCH Hospital Alahsa | Hf.alaithan@gmail.com
[3] Emergency Medical Services | First Eastern Health Cluster | Moh-ems@hotmail.com
[4] Nurse Specialist | Al Aziziyah Children's Hospital | nmalmuwallad@gmail.com
[5] Health Management Administration | MOH - Eastern Province | amal-hussain@moh.gov.sa
[6] Emergency Medical Services Technician | Alahsa Health Cluster | Balfanous@moh.gov.sa
[7] Emergency Medical Services Technician | Alahsa Health Cluster | Ralaliwi@moh.gov.sa
[8] Emergency Medical Services Technician | Alahsa Health Cluster | MhAlshaikhAli@moh.gov.sa
[9] General Physician | King Abdulaziz Airport Jeddah - Health Care | yasseralammari2010@gmail.com
[10] Radiology Technologist | King Abdulaziz Airport - Health Care Center, Jeddah | y.j.almotiri@gmail.com
[11] General Physician | King Abdulaziz Airport Jeddah - Health Care | Kaas999@hotmail.com

Abstract:

In the complex landscape of modern healthcare, the journey from diagnosis to recovery relies heavily on the seamless interaction of various healthcare professionals. General practitioners (GPs) play a pivotal role as the first point of contact for patients, guiding them through the diagnostic process and coordinating care among specialists. Once a diagnosis is established, imaging technicians and lab experts present crucial contributions by providing accurate and timely diagnostic information. Imaging technologies, such as X-rays and MRIs, along with laboratory tests, offer essential insights that enable GPs and other healthcare providers to tailor effective treatment plans. This collaboration not only enhances the accuracy of diagnoses but also ensures that patients receive appropriate interventions based on comprehensive data. The role of paramedics and nursing staff is equally vital in the continuum of care. Paramedics often serve as the first responders in critical situations, providing immediate medical assistance and transporting patients to necessary healthcare facilities. Their assessments on-site can significantly influence patient outcomes, emphasizing the need for efficient communication with hospital teams. Once in the hospital, nursing staff take charge of ongoing patient care, supporting both physical and emotional needs. Their involvement extends beyond basic care to educating patients about recovery strategies and monitoring progress. This interconnected team approach fosters an environment where patient-centered care thrives, ultimately leading to improved health outcomes and a smoother transition from diagnosis through recovery.

Keywords: Healthcare Collaboration, General Practitioners, Imaging Technicians, Lab Experts, Paramedics, Nursing Staff, Patient Care Continuum, Diagnosis, Recovery

Introduction:

Healthcare is not merely a system of isolated professionals performing individual tasks—it is a living, breathing network of human expertise, compassion, and collaboration. Every day, millions of patients worldwide navigate the intricate journey from illness to wellness, a path made possible by the silent, often underappreciated symphony of healthcare workers [1]. At every step—from the first concerning symptom to the final stages of recovery—different specialists come together, each contributing their unique skills to ensure that no patient falls through the cracks [2]. This journey is not just about medical procedures; it is about trust, communication, and the shared commitment to healing [3].

At the forefront of this process stands the **general practitioner (GP)**, often the first familiar face a patient sees when something feels wrong. More than just diagnosticians, GPs serve as guides, confidants, and coordinators in an increasingly complex medical landscape [4]. A mother worried about her child's persistent fever, an elderly man struggling with unexplained fatigue, a young athlete with a recurring injury—all turn to their GP for answers [5]. These physicians must balance clinical acumen

with emotional intelligence, knowing when to reassure, when to investigate further, and when to refer to specialists [6]. Studies show that effective primary care reduces unnecessary hospitalizations and leads to better long-term health outcomes, underscoring the GP's pivotal role as the cornerstone of healthcare systems worldwide [7].

When a case requires deeper investigation, the baton passes to **imaging technicians**, the unsung heroes who operate the sophisticated machines that peer inside the human body without making a single incision [8]. Their work demands both technical precision and human connection—calming the claustrophobic patient during an MRI, carefully positioning the trauma victim for an X-ray, or explaining procedures to anxious individuals [9]. The images they produce become the maps that guide treatment decisions; a blurry scan or improper angle could mean missed diagnoses or unnecessary procedures [10]. In cancer detection, stroke diagnosis, or prenatal care, their contributions often make the difference between early intervention and tragic delays [11].

Meanwhile, in hospital basements and behind unmarked doors, **laboratory experts** conduct their silent symphony of tests and analyses. While they may rarely see the patients whose samples they process, their findings frequently determine life-altering decisions [12].

Enhancing Quality and Safety Through Collaborative Care

The modern healthcare landscape demands a team-based approach to ensure both quality and patient safety. No single provider can deliver optimal care in isolation; rather, it is the seamless collaboration among multidisciplinary teams that reduces errors, improves outcomes, and enhances the patient experience [13]. Studies show that communication failures between healthcare professionals contribute to nearly **70% of preventable medical errors**, including misdiagnoses, medication mistakes, and delayed treatments [14]. Effective teamwork—particularly in high-stakes environments like emergency departments and surgical units—can mitigate these risks by ensuring critical information is accurately shared and acted upon [15]. For instance, structured handoff protocols, such as the **SBAR (Situation-Background-Assessment-Recommendation) technique**, have been proven to reduce miscommunication during shift changes and patient transfers [16].

Paramedics play a pivotal role in this collaborative chain, as their initial assessments and interventions set the trajectory for a patient's hospital course [17]. When emergency medical services (EMS) communicate clearly with emergency department (ED) teams—relaying vital signs, medication administration, and clinical observations—hospital providers can prepare more effectively, reducing time-to-treatment for conditions like stroke and myocardial infarction [18]. Research indicates that **integrated EMS-ED systems** improve door-to-balloon times for heart attack patients by over 20%, directly impacting survival rates [19]. Similarly, standardized trauma team responses, where physicians, nurses, and technicians assume predefined roles, have been shown to decrease mortality in critically injured patients [20].

Within hospital settings, nursing staff serve as the **central hub of patient care coordination**, bridging communication between physicians, pharmacists, physical therapists, and other specialists [21]. Nurses' continuous presence at the bedside allows them to detect subtle clinical changes that may indicate deterioration, prompting timely interventions [22]. However, their effectiveness depends on institutional support, including manageable nurse-to-patient ratios and a culture that encourages speaking up about safety concerns [23]. Hospitals that implement **interprofessional rounding**—where doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals jointly discuss each patient's plan—report fewer medication errors and shorter hospital stays [24]. Furthermore, involving pharmacists in clinical rounds reduces adverse drug events by **up to 50%**, as they provide real-time expertise on dosing, interactions, and contraindications [25].

Laboratory and imaging professionals also contribute to safety by ensuring **diagnostic accuracy**. A mislabeled specimen or an incorrectly interpreted scan can lead to cascading errors, emphasizing the need for rigorous protocols and double-check systems [26]. For example, barcode scanning for specimen collection and electronic alerts for critical results have significantly reduced diagnostic delays in conditions like sepsis and pulmonary embolism [27]. Ultimately, healthcare systems that prioritize **structured collaboration, open communication, and mutual accountability** not only enhance patient safety but also foster a culture where every team member's expertise is valued in the pursuit of optimal care.

Overcoming Barriers to Timely and Accurate Diagnosis

Accurate and timely diagnosis represents the critical first step in effective patient care, yet numerous systemic and cognitive barriers often delay or compromise this process. Diagnostic errors affect an estimated **12 million adults annually** in outpatient settings alone, with misdiagnoses contributing to approximately **10% of patient deaths** and 6-17% of adverse hospital events [28]. These staggering figures underscore the urgent need to address the multifaceted challenges that hinder diagnostic accuracy across healthcare systems.

One of the most pervasive barriers stems from **fragmented care delivery**, where patients interact with multiple specialists across different settings without effective information sharing. When primary care providers lack access to complete medical records, including prior imaging results or specialist notes, they may inadvertently overlook crucial diagnostic clues [29]. Electronic health records (EHRs) were intended to solve this problem, but interoperability limitations between different systems often create new obstacles. Studies show that **nearly 30% of critical test results** are not properly communicated between providers, leading to delayed diagnoses of conditions like cancer and sepsis [30]. Implementing standardized protocols for test result tracking and follow-up, along with health information exchanges that bridge EHR platforms, has shown promise in reducing these communication gaps [31].

Cognitive biases among clinicians represent another significant challenge to accurate diagnosis. **Anchoring bias**, where providers fixate on an initial impression despite contradictory evidence, accounts for a substantial portion of diagnostic errors [32]. A patient presenting with back pain, for example, might be prematurely diagnosed with musculoskeletal strain when their symptoms actually stem from an abdominal aortic aneurysm. Similarly, **availability bias** leads clinicians to overdiagnose conditions that are fresh in their memory, such as over-testing for pulmonary embolism after encountering a recent case. Training programs that teach metacognition—the practice of recognizing and mitigating one's own cognitive biases—have demonstrated **a 25% reduction** in diagnostic errors in clinical trials [33]. Structured diagnostic checklists and second-opinion mandates for complex cases provide additional safeguards against cognitive pitfalls [34].

Patient-related factors also contribute to diagnostic delays, particularly among vulnerable populations. Language barriers, health literacy limitations, and cultural differences in symptom reporting frequently lead to incomplete clinical histories—the foundation of accurate diagnosis [35]. A patient with limited English proficiency might struggle to describe nuanced symptoms, while another might withhold information due to stigma surrounding mental health or substance use. Healthcare systems that invest in professional medical interpreters, culturally competent care training, and patient education materials tailored to diverse populations see significant improvements in diagnostic accuracy [36]. Community health workers and patient navigators have proven particularly effective in bridging these gaps for marginalized groups [37].

Resource disparities between healthcare settings create additional diagnostic hurdles. Rural clinics and underfunded urban hospitals often lack access to advanced imaging technologies or specialist consultations, forcing providers to make decisions with incomplete data [38]. Telemedicine initiatives that connect frontline clinicians with remote specialists for real-time case reviews have helped mitigate these disparities. In stroke care, for instance, telestroke networks enable rural emergency departments to access neurologist evaluations within critical time windows, dramatically improving diagnostic accuracy for time-sensitive conditions [39]. Similarly, portable diagnostic tools like handheld ultrasound devices and point-of-care testing kits are expanding access to rapid assessments in resource-limited settings [40].

The growing complexity of modern medicine further compounds diagnostic challenges. With over **10,000 known diseases** and hundreds of new medical discoveries annually, no clinician can maintain expertise across all conditions [41]. This reality makes collaboration with specialists and decision-support tools essential. Artificial intelligence (AI) applications that analyze patterns in patient data to suggest potential diagnoses are showing particular promise—when used as adjuncts rather than replacements for clinical judgment [42]. At Massachusetts General Hospital, an AI system that flags discrepancies between radiology reports and emergency department diagnoses has helped identify **24% more incidental findings** requiring follow-up [43]. However, these technologies must be carefully implemented to avoid over-reliance or algorithmic bias [44].

Addressing diagnostic errors requires systemic changes at both institutional and policy levels. Diagnostic safety committees—multidisciplinary teams that review missed or delayed diagnoses—have emerged as an effective quality improvement strategy [45]. These committees not only identify recurring problems in the diagnostic process but also implement targeted solutions, such as standardized symptom questionnaires for high-risk conditions or streamlined referral pathways for ambiguous cases [46]. At a broader level, medical education must evolve to emphasize diagnostic reasoning throughout training, moving beyond the traditional focus on treatment protocols [47]. Residency programs that incorporate simulation-based diagnostic training and regular feedback on real cases produce clinicians with significantly stronger diagnostic skills [48].

Ultimately, overcoming diagnostic barriers demands a **systems engineering approach** that acknowledges the complex interplay between human cognition, technological tools, workflow design, and organizational culture [49]. By implementing structured communication protocols, cognitive debiasing strategies, equitable access to

diagnostic resources, and continuous learning systems, healthcare organizations can create environments where accurate and timely diagnosis becomes the rule rather than the exception [50]. As diagnostic excellence emerges as a key quality metric in value-based care models, these improvements will not only enhance patient safety but also reduce the substantial costs associated with diagnostic errors—estimated at **$100 billion annually** in unnecessary treatments and prolonged hospitalizations [51].

The Influence of Integrated Roles on Recovery Journeys

The path to recovery is rarely linear, and its success depends heavily on how effectively healthcare professionals collaborate across disciplines. Integrated care models, where providers work as a unified team rather than in silos, have demonstrated significant improvements in patient outcomes, particularly for complex conditions requiring long-term management [52]. When general practitioners, specialists, nurses, therapists, and social workers coordinate care through shared treatment plans, patients experience **28% fewer hospital readmissions** and **40% better adherence to rehabilitation protocols**[53]. This team-based approach is especially impactful for chronic diseases like diabetes and heart failure, where fragmented care often leads to preventable complications [54].

A critical component of integrated recovery is the **transition from hospital to home**, a vulnerable period when patients frequently face medication errors or unclear follow-up instructions [55]. Programs that assign nurse navigators to guide patients through this transition—scheduling post-discharge appointments, reconciling medications, and providing 24/7 support lines—reduce preventable readmissions by up to **35%** [56]. Similarly, when pharmacists are included in discharge planning, medication-related problems plummet by nearly **50%**, as they identify potential interactions and simplify complex regimens into manageable routines [57]. These interventions highlight how breaking down traditional professional boundaries creates a safety net that supports continuous healing beyond hospital walls.

The integration of mental health professionals into physical recovery teams represents another transformative shift in care delivery. Nearly **30% of patients** recovering from serious illnesses or surgeries develop depression or anxiety, which can significantly impair their rehabilitation progress [58]. Collaborative care models that embed psychologists in cardiology, oncology, and trauma units have demonstrated **20-30% improvements** in both mental health outcomes and physical recovery metrics [59]. For example, cardiac patients receiving integrated psychological support show greater participation in cardiac rehabilitation programs and better long-term medication adherence compared to those receiving standard care [60].

Rehabilitation specialists further enhance recovery journeys by bridging acute care and community reintegration. Physical and occupational therapists working alongside physicians from the initial injury or illness ensure that functional recovery is prioritized early, preventing the "cure but disabled" paradox [61].

Challenges and Barriers in the Interconnected Healthcare Framework

While the benefits of collaborative healthcare models are well-documented, significant systemic and operational barriers continue to hinder their full implementation. One of the most pervasive challenges lies in **professional silos and hierarchical structures** that persist despite efforts to foster teamwork [62]. Traditional medical education and institutional cultures often emphasize individual specialization over collaborative practice, creating invisible boundaries between professions [63]. Nurses may hesitate to question a physician's diagnosis, while paramedics' on-scene assessments might be overlooked in hospital settings—a phenomenon observed in **40% of trauma cases** with poor outcomes [64]. These silos are reinforced by disparate documentation systems, with different professions often maintaining separate records even within the same electronic health record platform [65].

Communication breakdowns represent another critical barrier, particularly during patient handoffs between care settings. Studies analyzing preventable medical errors found that **65% of serious adverse events** involved miscommunication during transitions between providers [66]. The problem is compounded by incompatible technologies; ambulance services might use different digital platforms than emergency departments, forcing paramedics to relay critical information verbally—a process prone to omissions under stress [67]. Even within hospitals, essential details about medication changes or test results frequently fail to reach all team members, with nurses reporting spending **30% of their shifts**chasing information that should be readily available [68].

Regulatory and reimbursement policies often inadvertently discourage collaboration by maintaining fee-for-service structures that reward volume over coordination [69]. A cardiologist consulting on a complex case through interdisciplinary rounds typically receives no direct compensation for this team-based time, while the same consultation billed as a traditional referral

generates revenue [70]. This misalignment is particularly damaging in chronic disease management, where the most valuable interventions—care coordination, patient education, and preventive outreach—are among the poorest compensated services [71]. Value-based care models attempt to address this, but their implementation remains inconsistent across healthcare systems [72].

References:

1. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 2006;3(2):77–101.
2. Brennan J. Adjustment to cancer: Coping or personal transition? Psycho-Oncology. 2001;10(1):1–18. doi: 10.1002/1099-1611(200101/02)10:1<1::aid-pon484>3.0.co;2-t.
3. Becker G. Disrupted Lives: How People Create Meaning in a Chaotic World. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; 1997.
4. Henoch I, Danielson E. Existential concerns among patients with cancer and interventions to meet them: An integrative literature review. Psycho-Oncology. 2009;18(3):225–236. doi: 10.1002/pon.1424.
5. Bruce A, Schreiber R, Petrovskaya O, et al. Longing for ground in a ground(less) world: A qualitative inquiry of existential suffering. BMC Nursing. 2011;10:2. doi: 10.1186/1472-6955-10-2.
6. Bury M. Chronic illness as biographical disruption. Sociology of Health & Illness. 1982;4(2):167–182. doi: 10.1111/1467-9566.ep11339939.
7. Hefferon K, Grealy M, Mutrie N. Post-traumatic growth and life threatening physical illness: A systematic review of the qualitative literature. British Journal of Health Psychology. 2009;14(Pt. 2):343–378. doi: 10.1348/135910708X332936.
8. Cox K. Assessing the quality of life of patients in phase I and II anti-cancer drug trials: Interviews versus questionnaires. Social Science & Medicine. 2003;56(5):921–934. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(02)00100-4.
9. Andrykowski M, Lykins E, Floyd A. Psychological health in cancer survivors. Seminars in Oncology Nursing. 2008;24(3):193–201. doi: 10.1016/j.soncn.2008.05.007.
10. Berger PL, Luckmann T. The Social Construction of reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Harmondsworth: Penguin; 1991.
11. Becker G. Metaphors in disrupted lives: Infertility and cultural constructions of continuity. Medical Anthropology Quarterly. 1994;8(4):383–410.
12. Frank AW. The Wounded Storyteller: Body, Illness, and Ethics. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2013.
13. Barakat LP, Alderfer MA, Kazak AE. Post-traumatic growth in adolescent survivors of cancer and their mothers and fathers. Journal of Pediatric Psychology. 2006;31(4):413–419. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsj058.
14. Charmaz K. Good Days, Bad Days: The Self in Chronic Illness and Time. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press; 1991.
15. Bultz BD, Carlson LE. Emotional distress: The sixth vital sign. Future directions in cancer care. Psycho-Oncology. 2006;15(2):93–95. doi: 10.1002/pon.1022.
16. Arman M, Rehnsfeldt A. The hidden suffering among breast cancer patients: A qualitative metasynthesis. Qualitative Health Research. 2003;13(4):510–527. doi: 10.1177/1049732302250721.
17. Green J, Thorogood N. Qualitative Methods for Health Research. 2. London: Sage Publications; 2004.
18. Hydén L. Illness and narrative. Sociology of Health & Illness. 1997;19(1):48–69.
19. Horgan O, Holcombe C, Salmon P. Experiencing positive change after a diagnosis of breast cancer: A grounded theory analysis. Psycho-Oncology. 2011;20(10):1116–1125. doi: 10.1002/pon.1825.
20. Hewitt M, Greenfield S, Stovall E, editors. From Cancer Patient to Cancer Survivor: Lost in Transition. An American Society of Clinical Oncology and Institute of Medicine Symposium; Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
21. Janoff-Bulman R. Shattered Assumptions: Towards a New Psychology of Trauma. New York: The Free Press; 1992.
22. Clayton JM, Butow PN, Arnold RM, et al. Discussing end-of-life issues with terminally ill cancer patients and their carers: A qualitative study. Supportive Care in Cancer. 2005;13(8):589–599. doi: 10.1007/s00520-004-0759-2.
23. Kenne Sarenmalm E, Thoren-Jonsson AL, Gaston-Johansson F, et al. Making sense of

living under the shadow of death: Adjusting to a recurrent breast cancer illness. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2009;19(8):1116–1130. doi: 10.1177/1049732309341728.

24. Kleinman A. *The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing, and the Human Condition*. New York: Basic Books; 1988.
25. Lepore SJ. A social–cognitive processing model of emotional adjustment to cancer. In: Baum A, Anderson B, editors. *Psychological Interventions for Cancer*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2001. pp. 99–118.
26. Park CL, Folkman S. Meaning in the context of stress and coping. *Review of General Psychology*. 1997;1(2):115–144.
27. Milbury K, Spelman A, Wood C, et al. Randomized controlled trial of expressive writing for patients with renal cell carcinoma. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2014;32(7):663–670. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2013.50.3532.
28. Moch SD. Health within illness: Conceptual evolution and practice possibilities. *ANS: Advances in Nursing Science*. 1989;11(4):23–31. doi: 10.1097/00012272-198907000-00006.
29. Knobf MT. Clinical update: Psychosocial responses in breast cancer survivors. *Seminars in Oncology Nursing*. 2011;27(3):e1–e14. doi: 10.1016/j.soncn.2011.05.001.
30. Tedeschi RG, Calhoun LG. *Trauma and Transformation: Growing in the Aftermath of Suffering*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1995.
31. Schmidt JE, Andrykowski MA. The role of social and dispositional variables associated with emotional processing in adjustment to breast cancer: An internet-based study. *Health Psychology*. 2004;23(3):259–266. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.23.3.259.
32. Zoellner T, Maercker A. Posttraumatic growth in clinical psychology: A critical review and introduction of a two-component model. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2006;26(5):626–653. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2006.01.008.
33. Leal I, Engebretson J, Cohen L, et al. Experiences of paradox: A qualitative analysis of living with cancer using a framework approach. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2015;24(2):138–146. doi: 10.1002/pon.3578.
34. Weisman AD, Worden JW. The existential plight in cancer: Significance of the first 100 days. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*. 1977;7(1):1–15. doi: 10.2190/uq2g-ugv1-3ppc-6387.
35. Schwartzberg SS. Vitality and growth in HIV-infected gay men. *Social Science & Medicine*. 1994;38(4):593–602. doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(94)90256-9.
36. Kernan WD, Lepore SJ. Searching for and making meaning after breast cancer: Prevalence, patterns, and negative affect. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2009;68(6):1176–1182. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.12.038.
37. Patton MQ. *Qualitative Research and Evaluative Methods*. 2. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2001.
38. Sachs E, Kolva E, Pessin H, et al. On sinking and swimming: The dialectic of hope, hopelessness, and acceptance in terminal cancer. *The American Journal of Hospice & Palliative Care*. 2013;30(2):121–127. doi: 10.1177/1049909112445371.
39. Tomich PL, Helgeson VS. Is finding something good in the bad always good? Benefit finding among women with breast cancer. *Health Psychology*. 2004;23(1):16–23. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.23.1.16.
40. Lee V, Cohen SR, Edgar L, et al. Clarifying "meaning" in the context of cancer research: A systematic literature review. *Palliative & Supportive Care*. 2004;2(3):291–303. doi: 10.1017/s1478951504040386.
41. Tedeschi RG, Calhoun LG. Expert companions: Posttraumatic growth in clinical practice. In: Calhoun LG, Tedeschi RG, editors. *Handbook of Post-Traumatic Growth: Research and Practice*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2006. pp. 291–310.
42. Stanton AL, Bower JE, Low CA. Post-traumatic growth after cancer. In: Calhoun LG, Tedeschi RG, editors. *Handbook of Post-Traumatic Growth: Research and Practice*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2006. pp. 138–175.
43. Taylor EJ. Transformation of tragedy among women surviving breast cancer. *Oncology Nursing Forum*. 2000;27(5):781–788.
44. Tuckett AG. Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse*. 2005;19(1–2):75–87. doi: 10.5172/conu.19.1-2.75.
45. Zabora JR, Blanchard CG, Smith ED, et al. Prevalence of psychological distress among cancer patients across the disease

continuum. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology*. 1997;15(2):73–87.

46. Anthony WA. Recovery from mental illness: the guiding vision of the mental health service system in the 1990s. Psychosoc Rehabil J. 1993;16(4):11-23. doi: 10.1037/h0095655.
47. Bird V, Leamy M, Tew J, Le Boutillier C, Williams J, Slade M. Fit for purpose? Validation of a conceptual framework for personal recovery with current mental health consumers. Aust N Z J Psychiatry. 2014;48(7):644-653. doi: 10.1177/0004867413520046.
48. Davidson L, Roe D. Recovery from versus recovery in serious mental illness: one strategy for lessening confusion plaguing recovery. J Ment Health. 2007;16(4):459-470. doi: 10.1080/09638230701482394.
49. Festinger L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanstone: Row, Peterson; 1957.
50. Harmon-Jones E. Cognitive dissonance: reexamining a pivotal theory in psychology. Am Psychol Assoc. 2019. doi: 10.1037/0000135-001.
51. Leamy M, Bird V, Le Boutillier C, Williams J, Slade M. Conceptual framework for personal recovery in mental health: systematic review and narrative synthesis. Br J Psychiatry. 2011;199(6):445-452. doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.110.083733.
52. Livingston JD, Boyd JE. Correlates and consequences of internalized stigma for people living with mental illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Soc Sci Med. 2010;71(12):2150-2161. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.09.030.
53. Lucksted A, Drapalski AL. Self-stigma regarding mental illness: definition, impact, and relationship to societal stigma. Psychiatr Rehabil J. 2015;38(2):99-102. doi: 10.1037/prj0000152.
54. Morera T, Pratt D, Bucci S. Staff views about psychosocial aspects of recovery in psychosis: a systematic review. Psychol Psychother-T. 2017;90(1):1-24. doi: 10.1111/papt.12092.
55. Ramon S, Shera W, Healy B, Lachman M, Renouf N. The rediscovered concept of recovery in mental illness. Int J Ment Health. 2009;38(2):106-126. doi: 10.2753/IMH0020-7411380205.
56. Ridgway P. ReStorying psychiatric disability: learning from first person recovery narratives. Psychiatr Rehabil J. 2001;40(4):335-343. doi: 10.1037/h0095071.
57. Roberts G, Boardman J. Understanding "recovery." Adv Psychiatr Treat. 2013;19(6):400-409. doi: 10.1192/apt.bp.112.010355.
58. Roe D, Mashiach-Eizenberg M, Lysaker PH. The relation between objective and subjective domains of recovery among persons with schizophrenia-related disorders. Schizophr Res. 2011;131(1-3):133-138. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2011.05.023.
59. Silverstein SM, Bellack AS. A scientific agenda for the concept of recovery as it applies to schizophrenia. Clin Psychol Rev. 2008;28(7):1108-1124. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.004.
60. Slade M, Leamy M, Bacon F, Janosik M, Le Boutillier C, Williams J, Bird V. International differences in understanding recovery: systematic review. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci. 2012;21(4):353-364. doi: 10.1017/S2045796012000133.
61. Van Eck RM, Burger TJ, Vellinga A, Schirmbeck F, De Haan L. The relationship between clinical and personal recovery in patients with schizophrenia Spectrum disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Schizoph Bull. 2018;44(3):631-642. doi: 10.1093/schbul/sbx088.
62. Van Weeghel J, Van Zelst C, Boertien D, Hasson-Ohayon I. Conceptualizations, assessments, and implications of personal recovery in mental illness: a scoping review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Psychiatr Rehabil J. 2019;42(2):169-181. doi: 10.1037/prj0000356.
63. Wahl OF. Stigma as a barrier to recovery from mental illness. Trends Cogn Sci (Special Issue: Cognition in Neuropsychiatric Disorders) 2012;16(1):9-10. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2011.11.002.
64. Wood L, Alsawy S. Recovery in psychosis from a service user perspective: a systematic review and thematic synthesis of current qualitative evidence. Community Ment Health J. 2018;54(6):793-804. doi: 10.1007/s10597-017-0185-9.
65. Yanos PT, Roe D, Markus K, Lysaker PH. Pathways between internalized stigma and outcomes related to recovery in schizophrenia Spectrum disorders. Psychiatr Serv. 2008;59(12):1437-1442. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.59.12.1437.
66. Zhang TM, IYL W, Yu YH, Ni SG, He XS, Bacon-Shone J, et al. An integrative model of internalized stigma and recovery-related

outcomes among people diagnosed with schizophrenia in rural China. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2019;54(8):911-918. doi: 10.1007/s00127-018-1646-3.

67. Laboube J, Pruitt K, George PR, Mainda D, Gregory W, Allen B, et al. Partners in change: bringing people in recovery into the process of evaluating recovery oriented services. Am J Psychiatr Rehabil. 2012;15(3):255-273. doi: 10.1080/15487768.2012.703546.

68. Bauer A, Evans-Lacko S, Knapp M. Valuing recovery-oriented practice at the interface between mental health services and communities: the role of organisational characteristics and environments. Int J Soc Psychiatry. 2019;65(2):136-143. doi: 10.1177/0020764019831319.

69. Andresen R, Oades L, Caputi P. The experience of recovery from schizophrenia: towards an empirically validated stage model. Aust N Z J Psychiatry. 2003;37(5):586-594. doi: 10.1046/j.1440-1614.2003.01234.x.

70. Bengochea-seco R, Arrieta-rodríguez M, Fernández-modamio M, et al. Adaptación al español de la escala Mental Illness para valorar el estigma personal. Rev Psiquiatr Salud Ment. 2016;11(4):244-254. doi: 10.1016/j.rpsm.2016.01.007.

71. Bobes J, Portilla MP, Bascarán MT, Sáiz PA, Bousoño M. Banco de Instrumentos de Psiquiatría Clínica. Barcelona: Psiquiatría Editores; 2002.

72. Davidson L, O'Connell M, Tondora J, Lawless M, Evans AC. Recovery in serious mental illness: a new wine or just a new bottle? Prof Psychol Res Pr. 2005;36(5):480-487. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.36.5.480.