



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_29019
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION AND SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES WITH NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME SERVICES AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL, NIGERIA
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	
Compulsory REVISION comments	*Abstract: Should be more concise & more informative. Needs rephrasing . *Introduction: -Too long with many subheading. Please merge and make it concise (one page) -Hypotheses is not related to study objectives -No hypothesis in the descriptive study. Only research question Methods: -Target population need to be more defined with inclusion/exclusion criteria -What is the language of the study tool? -Nothing was mentioned about reliability, content validity and Cronbach's alpha, of the tool -What about the scoring system of the tool? How the cut off points were defined for the different levels of knowledge and perception? *Results: -In all figures use % in the vertical axis (not numbers) -Fig 7: not clear. Why line diagram for 2 points? Please delete & write its contents as a statement -Merge tables 2 &3 and delete the column "level of significance" Why only these 2 variables were analysed? -Discussion; Superficial, many repetition of the results & failed	Thank you for reviewed the manuscript. The corrections have been effected as follows: Abstract: -Abstract has been re-phrased with more information. Introduction: -Introduction has been reduced to one page and sub-headings have been merged. Methods: -Target population has been modified with inclusion and exclusion criteria. -Language of the study tool was English because the study was conducted among the literates who could read, understand and write English. Hence, there was no need for language translation. -Reliability, content validity and Cronbach Alpha test have been stated. Scoring System: There were fourteen questions under respondents' knowledge and each correctly answered question was assigned 2 score, making the total maximum score obtainable by each respondents to be 28. The mean score of all the respondents was found and it was used as the cut-off point for each respondent. All the respondents who scored above mean score was categorized as having good knowledge of NHIS program while all the respondents who scored below mean score was categorized as having poor knowledge of NHIS program. Results:



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to interpret the few findings presented What are the practical implications of the results? Add study limitation e.g. lack of generalizability Delete the Ethical Committee approval form	-Use of percentages in the vertical axis has been done. -Figure 7 with line diagram for 2 points has been deleted and the contents were written as a statement. -Tables 2 and 3 have been merged and level of significance columns have been deleted. Discussion: -Repeated results have been deleted and the findings of the study were interpreted. -Practical implications of the results were stated. -Study limitations were stated -Ethical Committee approval form was deleted. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		