



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_44055
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors influencing patient satisfaction with waiting time: assessment of out patients' socio-demographic characteristics.
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>)

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	<p>A good research paper in healthcare management area.</p> <p>Some recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More detailed information is required about the questions used in the interview. - Explain why the marital status and religious affiliation were selected as variables in the research. Are there other studies that analyse the correlation between patient satisfaction and marital status and religious affiliation? Why are these issues important to the research? - Even if it is an exploratory study, research questions should be presented. - Some statements are too general and seem to be without a strong scientific base (seem to be a subjective opinion of the authors) - See for example – “<i>This probably could be due to the fact that, the youthful age group might be engaged at work and might consider time spent to be too long</i>”; - Also see – “<i>This means that many women attend hospital than men</i>”; - Or – “<i>This might be due to traditional dogmas where men are supposed to exhibit their masculinity by being tolerant to pain than women; They might have had access to information on how long to wait at the OPD for health services through reading of which those with low or no education would lack</i>”. <p>Highlight better the original contribution of the research to the literature.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Chi-square results are not presented. - Describe the acronym NHIS. - The legend key of the Figure 1 is missing. - Specify the period of conducting the research. 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Is there any prove that the informed verbal consent has been applied by the researcher to the participants? This is an important issue as the demographic personal characteristics of the patients have been used in the questionnaire.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agheorghiesei Daniela-Tatiana
Department, University & Country	"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi, Romania