



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
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
New Title:	PERCEPTION AND SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES WITH NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME SERVICES: A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL, IBADAN, NIGERIA
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Major revision comments: 1) Comment 4 was not complied with 2) Explanation given for comment 5 is inadequate, as this could introduce serious bias for a study on clients' satisfaction with services; moreover, the author did not explore separately the level of satisfaction by those not fully registered with the NHIS. 3) Explanation for comment 7 is inadequate because this study used self-administered questionnaire which do not require the respondent to be physically present. 4) On comment 11, the author demonstrated poor research ability by using a sample size so close to the calculated minimum sample size in a study that employed self-administered questionnaire for data collection. Analysis of data from 350 'eligible' questionnaires, below the calculated minimum sample size of approximately 384 has put the results and subsequent interpretations to question 5) Data in figure 1 should be incorporated in Table 1 and Figure 1 should be deleted 6) Figures 2,3,4,5, and 7 should be converted to tables 7) The conclusion on satisfaction derived from this study is flawed because the author did not analyse the data based on established domains of satisfaction 8) Remove the last sentence in section of "Hypotheses of the study" because the sampling method employed did not factor in the Nigerian federal character regimen which is based on quota system. 9) Give citation for the stated objectives of the NHIS 10) Financial constraints do not constitute limitation to a study and should removed 11) Comment 19 was not fully complied with as References 2,3,5,8,10,11,12,13,14,15,16 still need revisions	Thank you for your comments on this manuscript. The comments have been addressed as follows: 1) Comment 4: "among" has been changed to "by" 2) Comment 5: more explanation has been added to the justification of study 3) Comment 7: though this study used self-administered questionnaire which does not require the respondents to be physically present but, due to the poor attitude of employees to research in the study setting especially the aspect of filling questionnaire, the authors did not have choice than to use the employees who met on duty (available) during data collection in order to ensure that the larger number of questionnaires were retrieved. If the data collection was not done in this way most questionnaires might got lost due to the above mentioned issue. 4) Comment 11: though 426 questionnaires including 10% attrition rate were taken to the field, out of which 392 were retrieved. This was not unconnected to the poor attitude of employees to research in the study setting as mentioned above. Because most of the questionnaires were incompletely filled while some could not be retrieved. After data cleaning, only 350 questionnaires were fit for analysis. The authors realized the number was



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

12) The author failed to respond to minor revision comment	below calculated minimum sample size, but then it would be unethical to manipulate data at this level. Hence, reason for analyzing the 350 eligible questionnaires as presented in the study. 5) Data in figure 1 has been incorporated in table 1 and figure 1 has been deleted. 6) Figures 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 have been changed to tables. 7) Domains of satisfaction in this study have been included. 8) The last sentence in section of “hypotheses of the Study” has been deleted. 9) Citation has been given for the stated objectives of NHIS 10) Financial constraint under limitation of study has been removed 11) References 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 have been revised 12) Minor revision comment: relationship between respondents’ marital status and their perception of NHIS services; as well as relationship between respondents’ marital status and their satisfaction with NHIS services has been added. Thank you for your continuous support on the manuscript.
--	--