JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE SCIENCES

Volume 5 Issue 12 2025, Article ID: JOHS2025001166

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229

e-ISSN: 1658-8967

Review

Enhancing Accessibility and Hospital Accommodations for Patients with Disabilities

Ibrahim Mohammed Alsultan[1*], Hussam Saeed Alasmari[2], Wafa Radhi Al-shaban[3], Abdullah Ali Alshalan[4], Lamia Dakhail Alkahtani[5], Saeed Ahmad AL-Qahtani[6], Anhar Khaled Gazzaz[7]

[1] *Forensic Laboratories, Government Sector, Hail, Saudi Arabia*
[2] *Department of Medical Laboratory, Security Forces Hospital, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[3] *Department of Internal Medicine, Ministry of Health, Dammam, Saudi Arabia*
[4] *AlNassim Central Primary Healthcare, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[5] *Department of Dentistry, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
[6] *Compliance Administration, Ministry of Health, Aseer, Saudi Arabia*
[7] *Medical Administration Clinic, University of Jeddah, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*

Correspondence should be addressed **Ibrahim Mohammed Alsultan**, Forensic Laboratories, Government Sector, Hail, Saudi Arabia, Email : ibrhim261@hotmail.com

Received: 01 December 2025, Accepted: 06 December 2025, Published: 31 December 2025.

Abstract

Hospitals play a crucial role in ensuring equitable healthcare delivery, yet accessibility remains limited for many patients with disabilities. Physical infrastructure often lacks the necessary design features to accommodate mobility aids, sensory needs, and assistive technology, resulting in delayed or compromised care. Beyond physical barriers, communication challenges and limited staff training contribute to misunderstandings, reduced patient engagement, and lower satisfaction. Many healthcare providers report minimal exposure to disability-related education, leading to unconscious biases and clinical decisions that may not align with the needs or preferences of patients with disabilities. Policy frameworks intended to protect the rights of people with disabilities often fall short in practice due to weak enforcement and a lack of integration into hospital protocols. Regulations tend to emphasize basic compliance rather than comprehensive inclusion, leaving gaps in areas such as emergency preparedness, appointment systems, and diagnostic equipment accessibility. Interdisciplinary care models, when effectively applied, can mitigate some of these challenges by fostering collaboration across medical, rehabilitative, and support services. However, institutional silos and rigid workflows often prevent the consistent application of these models. Digital health systems are increasingly shaping the patient's experience but frequently lack accessibility features for users with visual, cognitive, or motor impairments. Many patient portals and electronic forms remain inaccessible, limiting autonomy and self-management. Collecting data on patient outcomes disaggregated by disability status remains rare, which hinders evidence-based interventions and accountability. Addressing these barriers requires a shift in hospital culture, structural investment, and active involvement of people with disabilities in the design and evaluation of care systems. Inclusive healthcare is not achieved through isolated changes but through sustained, system-wide efforts that acknowledge disability as a vital dimension of health equity.

Keywords: *accessibility, Disability Inclusion, Hospital Care, Health Equity, Interdisciplinary Healthcare*

Introduction

Healthcare systems around the world are obligated to provide equitable care to all individuals, yet patients with disabilities continue to experience significant disparities in access, quality, and outcomes. These disparities are often rooted not only in physical barriers but also in systemic limitations, such as insufficient staff training, communication gaps, and inadequate institutional policies. Despite the increasing global recognition of disability rights, particularly under frameworks like the United Nations Convention on the rights of people with disabilities, the healthcare environment frequently remains inaccessible or insufficiently adaptive to the diverse needs of this population (1).

Patients with disabilities represent a large and growing demographic. According to the World Health Organization, over 1.3 billion people globally live with some form of disability, and this number is expected to rise with aging populations and increasing prevalence of chronic diseases. Hospitals, as central hubs of care delivery, play a critical role in meeting the specific needs of these individuals. However, studies have consistently shown that hospitals often fall short in areas such as accessible infrastructure, adaptive communication, and inclusive clinical practices (2). Physical inaccessibility of facilities, such as examination tables, diagnostic equipment, and restrooms, continues to hinder routine care for individuals with mobility or sensory impairments. Moreover, time constraints and limited training leave many healthcare professionals unprepared to provide person-centered care for patients with complex accessibility needs (3).

Communication barriers also pose serious risks to the safety and quality of care. For individuals with hearing, visual, or cognitive impairments, access to clear and comprehensible information is essential for informed decision-making. Yet many hospitals lack trained interpreters, accessible signage, or adaptive communication technologies. Such deficits can lead to misdiagnosis, medication errors, and preventable adverse events. In addition, patients with disabilities frequently report feelings of exclusion or marginalization during clinical encounters, which undermines trust and can discourage future engagement with the healthcare system (4).

Review

Hospitals remain central to delivering equitable care, yet many continue to lack consistent implementation of disability-inclusive practices. Despite the existence of accessibility standards, compliance varies widely across institutions, leading to inconsistent patient experiences. Physical barriers such as narrow doorways, inaccessible examination equipment, and limited signage persist, particularly in older facilities that have not undergone modernization. These structural issues are compounded by limited staff training in disability competency, which can result in unintentional bias, communication failures, and reduced patient satisfaction. In some cases, clinicians may avoid addressing accessibility needs altogether due to discomfort or lack of knowledge, further exacerbating healthcare disparities (5).

Emerging approaches emphasize the integration of universal design and inclusive care models, which aim to create environments usable by all people regardless of ability. These include adaptable clinical spaces, real-time communication aids, and patient-centered policies that involve individuals with disabilities in care planning. While promising, these models require institutional investment, cross-disciplinary collaboration, and clear accountability frameworks to become standard practice. Efforts to improve hospital accommodations must also include feedback mechanisms from patients with disabilities to ensure reforms are both effective and sustainable. Without structural and cultural shifts, hospitals will continue to fall short in providing truly equitable care for all populations (6).

Barriers to Accessible Hospital Care

Accessibility in hospital settings often begins with physical infrastructure, yet it rarely ends there. Many facilities still operate with outdated layouts, narrow hallways, and examination rooms that are too small to accommodate wheelchairs or assistive

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229

devices. Diagnostic equipment such as X-ray machines and exam tables are frequently not height-adjustable, creating logistical and safety issues for patients with mobility limitations. Even in newer buildings, physical upgrades often focus on compliance rather than usability. For example, a ramp might exist, but if it's steep, unmarked, or located far from the main entrance, it fails to serve its purpose effectively. These architectural shortcomings are not merely inconveniences; they directly influence clinical outcomes by reducing the frequency of preventive screenings and increasing the likelihood of missed or delayed diagnoses (7).

Equally limiting are the communication barriers present within clinical interactions. Hospitals often lack systems to support patients with sensory or cognitive impairments in receiving, processing, and expressing information. Patients who are deaf or hard of hearing may not be provided with certified sign language interpreters, instead of being offered written notes or relying on untrained staff. This leads to incomplete exchanges and poor understanding of procedures or medications. Individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities might encounter rushed conversations with few accommodations made to adapt language or pacing. Communication gaps are rarely neutral; they often result in lower adherence to treatment plans and higher readmission rates (8).

Training and awareness among hospital personnel form a less visible but equally impactful barrier. Healthcare professionals frequently report limited exposure to disability-related education during their academic training. The lack of preparedness is reflected in clinical decision-making, where biases affect how care is delivered. There are documented instances where medical staff underestimated the quality of life of patients with disabilities, influencing whether aggressive treatments were offered or even recommended. These interactions often leave patients feeling devalued or ignored. Such experiences are not isolated; they contribute to a broader distrust of healthcare systems, particularly among people with disabilities who have encountered repeated dismissal or insensitivity in clinical contexts (9).

Digital health tools, now integrated into hospital systems, present new access challenges. Patient portals, electronic forms, and appointment systems are often not designed with accessibility standards, making them difficult or impossible to use for individuals with vision impairments or cognitive differences. Usability testing rarely includes people with disabilities, and feedback loops for interface improvements are underutilized. As healthcare delivery becomes increasingly digitized, these barriers risk expanding if not actively addressed through inclusive design principles and user-centered development (10).

Innovative Practices in Disability Accommodation

Hospitals often fail to accommodate the diverse needs of patients with disabilities not only due to physical constraints but also because of systemic limitations embedded in how care is organized and delivered. Policies may claim to support accessibility, yet their implementation is frequently inconsistent or superficial. When healthcare environments treat disability accommodation as optional add-ons rather than integral to quality care, gaps begin to appear across all levels of service. These gaps become most evident during high-stakes emergency care, complex diagnostic procedures, or transitions between care settings; where miscommunication, unprepared staff, or inaccessible equipment can introduce serious risks to patient safety (11).

Misalignment between policy language and clinical workflows is a recurring issue. Staff are expected to provide equitable care but are often left without clear protocols or decision-making tools to adapt routines for patients with sensory, cognitive, or mobility-related disabilities. When frontline workers must improvise without institutional support, the likelihood of unequal treatment increases. In many cases, staff will default to informal solutions, such as relying on family members for communication support or skipping physical exams because the equipment is too difficult to access. These workarounds may seem practical at the moment but often result in fragmented care and long-term health disparities (12).

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229

The structure of hospital care also tends to be rigid, favoring standardization over personalization. Scheduling systems often do not allow extra time slots for patients who require more time due to assistive communication, physical transfers, or cognitive processing. When appointments are rushed, critical information may be misunderstood, omitted, or mis-recorded. Additionally, intake processes are rarely designed with disability inclusion in mind. Forms are typically presented in written formats without plain language alternatives or digital accessibility options. For people with low vision, intellectual disabilities, or limited literacy, this alone creates a significant barrier to entry into the healthcare system. The intake experience sets the tone for the entire encounter, and if patients encounter confusion, inaccessibility, or staff impatience at this stage, it undermines their confidence in the care to follow (13).

Bias plays a quieter but equally damaging role. Many patients with disabilities report being treated as if their disability is their defining health characteristic, regardless of the reason for their visit. This reductive lens may lead to inappropriate assumptions about pain tolerance, communication ability, or mental capacity. Such assumptions shape clinical decisions, sometimes in ways that limit care options or delay treatments. Providers may underestimate patients' capacity to adhere to treatment plans or overestimate the caregiving burden, leading to differential recommendations compared to patients without disabilities. When bias is paired with structural inflexibility, it becomes embedded in the daily routine of healthcare delivery and difficult to detect or correct without deliberate review (14).

Policy, Training, and Interdisciplinary Solutions

Healthcare environments are shaped not only by infrastructure and technology, but also by policy frameworks that influence how inclusion is interpreted and implemented. Disability rights legislation exists in many countries, yet gaps remain between legal standards and actual practice. Policy language often prioritizes nondiscrimination while failing to address operational barriers that prevent meaningful participation. Regulatory bodies may mandate basic accessibility features, but enforcement mechanisms are usually reactive and complaint driven. This leaves individuals with disabilities in the position of advocating for access at the point of care, a task that places unnecessary burden on the patient and is especially difficult during illness or stress (15).

Within hospitals, training programs tend to emphasize clinical efficiency over inclusive communication or adaptive practice. Staff may receive minimal training on disability awareness, often presented as a single module or optional seminar. The result is a workforce that struggles to recognize or accommodate varied functional needs. Misunderstandings during clinical encounters are frequently rooted in knowledge gaps rather than malice. Without exposure to lived experiences of disability or structured opportunities for reflection, many clinicians rely on stereotypes or personal assumptions when making decisions. These assumptions, even when subtle, influence how patients are spoken to, what treatment options are presented, and how care is prioritized (16).

Interdisciplinary collaboration offers a way to close these gaps, yet it remains underused in disability-inclusive care models. Most hospitals operate with rigid departmental divisions that limit communication between roles. When a patient with a disability requires coordinated input from physicians, nurses, rehabilitation specialists, and social workers, fragmentation often slows the process. Information may be repeated inaccurately or lost between handoffs. By contrast, models that emphasize team-based care tend to produce more consistent, personalized outcomes. When rehabilitation professionals and care coordinators are included from the beginning of the patient journey, accommodations can be integrated rather than retrofitted at the last minute (17).

Policy reform alone cannot shift attitudes, but it can set expectations. Licensing standards, accreditation guidelines, and institutional benchmarks can embed disability inclusion into the core of healthcare delivery. When funding is tied to measurable outcomes in accessibility, organizations have a

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229

stronger incentive to move beyond symbolic compliance. Data collection practices also play a role. Disaggregated data that captures disability status alongside health outcomes, satisfaction ratings, or care delays can reveal patterns that remain invisible in general reporting. With evidence, systems can move toward targeted interventions that improve equity and accountability across disciplines (18, 19).

Conclusion

Improving hospital accessibility for patients with disabilities requires more than physical modifications; it demands systemic cultural and operational change. Integrating inclusive policies, interdisciplinary training, and patient-centered design is essential for equitable care. Sustainable solutions must be embedded at both institutional and policy levels. Ongoing collaboration with disability communities will ensure that reforms remain relevant, responsive, and just.

Disclosure

Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Funding

No funding.

Ethical consideration

Non applicable.

Data availability

All data is available within the manuscript.

Author contribution

All authors contributed to conceptualizing, data drafting, collection and final writing of the manuscript.

References

1. Shakespeare T, Bright T, Kuper H. Access to health for persons with disabilities. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2018.

2. Lagu T, Hannon NS, Rothberg MB, Wells AS, Green KL, Windom MO, et al. Access to subspecialty care for patients with mobility impairment: a survey. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2013;158(6):441-6.

3. Lagu T. Physicians' Perceptions Of People With Disability And Their Health Care. 2021.

4. Smeltzer SC. Improving the health and wellness of persons with disabilities: A call to action too important for nursing to ignore. Nursing Outlook. 2007;55(4):189-95. e2.

5. Moscoso-Porras MG, Alvarado GF. Association between perceived discrimination and healthcare–seeking behavior in people with a disability. Disability and health journal. 2018;11(1):93-8.

6. Kirschner KL, Curry RH. Educating health care professionals to care for patients with disabilities. Jama. 2009;302(12):1334-5.

7. McDoom MM, Koppelman E, Drainoni M-L. Barriers to accessible health care for medicaid eligible people with disabilities: a comparative analysis. Journal of Disability Policy Studies. 2014;25(3):154-63.

8. Agaronnik N, Campbell EG, Ressalam J, Iezzoni LI. Accessibility of medical diagnostic equipment for patients with disability: Observations from physicians. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 2019;100(11):2032-8.

9. Tuffrey-Wijne I, Rose T, Grant R, Wijne A. Communicating about death and dying: Developing training for staff working in services for people with intellectual disabilities. Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities. 2017;30(6):1099-110.

10. Wilson-Menzfeld G, Brittain K. Digital exclusion in later life: A narrative review. Vulnerable People and Digital Inclusion: Theoretical and Applied Perspectives. 2022:169-88.

11. Mudrick NR, Breslin ML, Liang M, Yee S. Physical accessibility in primary health care settings: results from California on-site reviews. Disability and health journal. 2012;5(3):159-67.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229

12. Sakellariou D, Rotarou ES. Access to healthcare for men and women with disabilities in the UK: secondary analysis of cross-sectional data. BMJ open. 2017;7(8):e016614.

13. Santos Silva FN, Carvalho Sousa ME, Lourenço CE, Pereira Paiva AV, Correia Monteiro T, Grimaldi MRM. Discrimination and Access to Healthcare for People with Disabilities: An Integrative Literature Review. Aquichan. 2024;24(3).

14. Krahn GL, Walker DK, Correa-De-Araujo R. Persons with disabilities as an unrecognized health disparity population. American journal of public health. 2015;105(S2):S198-S206.

15. Agaronnik N, Campbell EG, Ressalam J, Iezzoni LI. Exploring issues relating to disability cultural competence among practicing physicians. Disability and health journal. 2019;12(3):403-10.

16. Symons AB, Morley CP, McGuigan D, Akl EA. A curriculum on care for people with disabilities: effects on medical student self-reported attitudes and comfort level. Disability and Health Journal. 2014;7(1):88-95.

17. Smeltzer SC, Avery C, Haynor P. Interactions of people with disabilities and nursing staff during hospitalization. AJN The American Journal of Nursing. 2012;112(4):30-7.

18. Bahls C. Achieving equity in health. Health affairs. 2011;34(4).

19. Organization WH. Health equity for persons with disabilities: guide for action: World Health Organization; 2024.

http://dx.doi.org/10.52533/JOHS.2025.51229