



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_39015
Title of the Manuscript:	Satisfaction with quality of health care among teaching hospitals in Kathmandu, Nepal
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	Satisfaction with quality of health care among teaching hospitals in Kathmandu, Nepal It was a pleasure for me to check this paper. I read through this manuscript and I think that this is an acceptable paper. The subject is interesting. I like it. Consequently, I congratulate the authors. I suggest that, please, the authors check the following comments: -Sample: Please provide a flowchart. Was the sample size calculated? -Questionnaire: What was the reliability and validity of this questionnaire? The reliability of a measuring instrument refers to the consistency of the scores obtained by the same individuals when examined with the same instrument at different times, with different sets of equivalent elements or other variables under examination conditions In small studies, if we "invent" a questionnaire and do not value validity and reliability, at least we should do a pilot test of it to refine it. Do the pilot test was done? The importance of this pilot test can be highlighted, to counterbalance it with the lack of validation. -Age Groups: The classes that classify the age groups are not the usual and could hinder the comparison with other studies. To stimulate comparisons of studies, the <i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i> even provides guidelines on forming categories: "grouping should be mid-decade to mid-decade or in five-year age groups (e.g. 35–44 or 35–39, 40–44, etc, but <i>not</i> 20–29, 30–39 or other groupings)." It can be seen more in: Age in epidemiological analysis. J Epidemiol Community Health 2003;57:397. http://jech.bmi.com/content/57/6/397.full	Thanks peer reviewer Sample Yes, I did Questionnaire; Pre-testing of the instrument was done among 20 patients and 10 service providers to assure the context validity and reliability ensuring no contamination of the actual study population. Moreover, these tools has already been widely used in different parts of hospitals setting. Age Groups I omit the age group. Age range and mean is mentioned in paragraph References I did as per journal guidelines



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-References: The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals For example: Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine. NLM Title Abbreviation: J R Soc Med	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>