



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	Author's comment
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Revise title to include Ibadan 2) Line 16: explain 'or without' 3) Line 64: write HMOs in full first time 4) Line 113: 'Justification of study' should come before 'Research Hypotheses' 5) Line 125: Explain why you studied employees who were not fully registered with the NHIS 6) LINE 126: Why and how did you choose eleven of sixty-six departments to study? 7) Line 130: Explain why you used convenient sampling technique; it may have introduced selection bias 8) Line 132: remove '426' 9) Line 152: remove 'and approved by the ethical committee of the study setting' 10) Line 163: remove 'AND DISCUSSIONS' 11) Line 164: indicate the response rate 12) Line 198: It is inappropriate to do this as the respondents' level of education was not captured	Thank you for reviewed the above mentioned manuscript. The corrections have been effected as follows: 1) Ibadan has been included in the title of the study. 2) Line 16: "or without" refers to those employees who have commenced registration process with National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) but have not fully completed their registration. 3) Line 64: HMOs has been written in full for the first time. 4) Line 113: justification of study has been placed appropriately. 5) Line 125: employees who were not fully registered with NHIS were studied in order to determine the factors responsible for that. 6) Line 126: eleven out of sixty-six departments were chosen for the study because of financial constraint to cover the entire study setting. Hence, study was conducted on a proportionate sample representing 1/6th of employees of the institution. The eleven departments were chosen using multi-stage sampling technique. Names of all the sixty-six departments were written separately on a piece of paper, each piece of paper was wrapped to make sixty-six wraps of paper and eleven wraps of papers representing eleven departments were chosen at random through balloting



SDI Review Form 1.6

	13) Line 286-287: This statement is spurious because the researcher did not capture the respondents' level of education. It should be expunged from this manuscript 14) Line 301: Where in Oyo State? This current study took place in Oyo State also 15) Line 301-305: This contrasts findings from current study and should be stated as such 16) Line 322: Change 'opinion' to 'intention' 17) Line 326: Change 'foster' to 'ensure' 18) Line 341: Explain 'Health for All by the year 2030' 19) Line 350: Revise all 16 References to conform to the Vancouver style consistently 20) Italicise the Chi-square sign χ^2 and use small P in p-value wherever they appear in the manuscript 21) Use superscript for citation numbers and remove the brackets enclosing them	system. 7) Line 130: convenient sampling technique was used for the study because most employees of the study setting were on shift duty and it would be difficult to capture some of them especially when they are not on duty. Hence, those employees who were met on duty at the time of administering the questionnaires were used for the study. 8) Line 132: "426" has been deleted 9) Line 152: "and approved by the ethical committee of the study setting" has been deleted 10) Line 163: "AND DISCUSSIONS" has been deleted. 11) Line 164: response rate of 82% has been indicated. 12) Line 198: respondents' level of education has been captured. 13) Line 286-287: respondents' level of education has been included 14) Line 301: the study took place in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. 15) Line 310-305: findings from that study contradict that of the current study; hence it has been stated as such. 16) Line 322: "opinion" has been changed to "intention"
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		17) Line 326: “foster” has been changed to” ensure” 18) Line 341: “ Health for All by the year 2030” is an aim of World Health Organization (WHO) through Primary health Care (PHC) program which all nations including Nigeria should support and work towards to bring quality health care services to the grassroots. Intention of WHO is that by the year 2030, quality healthcare services would have reached the doorsteps of all citizens be it in their homes, schools, offices including health institutions such as the study setting. 19) Line 350: all references have been revised to conform to the Vancouver style. 20) Chi-Square sign X has been italicized and small p was used for p-value wherever they appeared in the manuscript. 21) Superscript was used for citation numbers. Thank you.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) The researcher should explore relationship of the variables with age, marital status and duration of enrolment into the NHIS. These could influence perception and satisfaction with services accessed	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) This is an important and interesting work that could improve more with the suggested revision	