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General Comments
This paper is interesting because it focus on patient satisfaction of acute healthcare in Morocco, which is the first study about patient satisfaction in Morocco. It looks at a translated questionnaire EQS-H and the determinants of patient satisfaction.

Major Compulsory Revisions

ABSTRACT.
-In the methods a prospective survey is mentioned. In the document later on, they mention the method was face-to-face interviews (p8). Please make clear in the abstract that the used method was interviews.

-I miss the Cronbachs alpha in the results. They only mention that the Arabic version has excellent internal consistency.

-The conclusion is a sum of the results. Can the researchers make a general conclusion.

INTRODUCTION.
-There is no research question formulated. They stated an aim of the present study. Please insert a research question.
- I miss the connection with the translated EQS-H questionnaire.

MATERIALS AND METHODS.
-see comment about introduction: A prospective survey or interview?

-!! p.5 instrument. You declare that the five-point scale range from 0-4. If this is correct the dimension range is 0-32 and final score is 64. Later on it becomes clear that the five point scale range from 1-5 so the dimension score is 4-40 and the final score is 80 (with minimum of 8). Please clarify this point.

RESULTS.
-In the results you refer to SQ 3times in stead of MI. Please stay consequent in abbreviations.

-p. 9. I do not understand the sentence ‘the highest values (3.61) was observed for RS dimension’. The range of a dimension is 4-40.
In table 2 the authors declare that there is a difference for MI dimension for residence (P=0.001). The results show the same scores for residence urban and rural (namely 20.9 +/- 6.5). The results are not correct or the P values is not correct. Please clarify this point.

DISCUSSION.
- The discussion is very long. You can be more to the point. The discussion about data collection methods is irrelevant. You decided to have face-to-face interviews. You can put this in the methods. You can make a remarks about the variables of patient characteristics and significant factors!
- I miss the connection with the EQS-H questionnaire. Are there differences between the results of these questionnaire?

Minor Essential Revisions
- title. Perhaps the title can be reframed. A suggestion: Satisfaction of patients with acute healthcare in Morocco.

- use the same spelling of words: Morocco- Moroccan (p2, 4)?; inpatient- impatient (p. 2);

- Capital letters in a sentence: Satisfaction (p 7), Assessed (p 2, 14)

- reperted -> reported (p7), ghideline (p8) -> guideline

- sentence about ‘it was hypothesized that a two factor solution would be obtained with eigen values greater than 1’. Eigen values > 1 is a assumption which indicate a factor. This sentence has no added value (p 7).
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