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Reviewer's report:

This is an important, interesting and extremely well-written and well conducted study illuminating the need for continuous score of patient satisfaction; my congratulations to the authors.

I have very few comments - and besides a few linguistic flaws, which are easily corrected - I have a few questions to the authors. The incorporation of the answers into the manuscript would improve it further:

1) Title: I would suggest to use a title indicating the findings, i.e.: Satisfaction with care after total hip or knee replacement predicts self-perceived health status after surgery.

2) LOS was a mean of 13.5 days, which is extremely long today where accelerated tracks and evidence-based optimisation of the clinical pathway leads to LOS in the area of 1-3 days for the majority of patients. The authors should comment on this and especially comment on whether their results regarding HRQoL are thought to be valid for these patients as well (that is: patients with much shorter LOS)?

3) Why do the authors think that HRQoL peaked and reached a plateau at 6 months? This is contradictory to what most surgeons tell their patients (and what studies find, e.g. function, ROM, pain) - that they should expect to progress until at least 1 year post surgery.

4) A Cochrane analysis has shown no impact of preoperative information on LOS or on patient satisfaction after THR or TKR, which also has been found by other studies (Husted H et al) - which makes it interesting that the authors find communicative skills to be a core skill, do the authors have an explanation?

Major Revisions:
None

Minor Revisions:
page 7, line 15: ...12 months (the delta should be 12-1 instead of 6-1)

Language: excellent, a few flaws:
page 4, line 5: ...dimensions with ANY health care process...
With 20% OF patients POTENTIALLY EXPECTED lost...

Discretionary Revisions:
None

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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