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Reviewer's report:

GENERAL COMMENT
This paper is interesting because it describes the development of measuring patient satisfaction with home care in Greece. It also compares, two methods of constructing scales of a questionnaire.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

ABSTRACT
In the method section the word pretest is used, but in the methods cognitive interviewing (p8) is mentioned. A pretest is something different than a cognitive interview. Please use the same wording.

- In my point of view the questionnaire consists of 31 items instead of 33 items.

INTRODUCTION
- There is no research question formulated. Please insert a research question.
- Perhaps the authors can give some indications about the use of patient satisfaction questionnaires in Greece. Is it common, or is it a new research area?

METHODS
- Please give insight into the answering categories of the 5 point Likert-scales.
- Can you restructure the methods and results in such a way that they correspond.

In the methods the following in said:
1) principal component analysis (factor loading > 0.5),
2) two-facto-analysis (Pearson correlation),
3) polychoric correlation matrix (kendall’s Tau b/ Spearman, polyserial correlation)
4) internal consistence reliability measures (Chronbach’s alpha > 0.7)
5) test-retest reliability (retest correlation> 0.50, ICC > 0.7)
6) multi-trait analysis (Pearson, Spearman, polychoric, polyserial correlation)
7) construct validity (inter-scale correlation; Spearman, polychoric, polyserial,
Kendall’s tau)

8) ceiling and floor effect (% responses falling into the highest and lowest possible satisfaction)

In the results:

1) due to high correlation 2 factors are excluded. Look at the mentioned significance here! In think you mean: Correlation between these variables and the overall satisfaction scale were statistically different from zero (p<0.05). In addition, all other relevant inter-item correlations were very low and most were not statistical significant (p>0.05).

2) Table 3 polychoric correlation (which 2 items were excluded???; was bullet 3 in methods)

3) factor analysis with Pearson Correlation (was bullet 1 in methods)

4) Principal axis factoring (was bullet 1)

5) internal consistency (was bullet 4 in methods)

6) test-retest (was bullet 5)

7) multi-trait analysis (was bullet 6)

8) inter-scale correlation (was bullet 7)

9) ceiling and floor effects (in the methods % responses are mentioned, but here mean and median scores are provided. Please make clear in the methods that you also research the mean and median of the scales) (was bullet 7)

As you can see, there is a lot of information. By using the same order you can structure this part.

RESULTS

- Please can you explain the response rate of 68.83%. In my calculation 201/319 make a response rate of 63%.

- p 14. Which two items were excluded?

- In the results you repeat the methodology which you explained in the methods. For example p 16 Multitrait scaling conducted to assess internal consistency reliability….results. Please delete method sections in the results.

- p. 18 median and mean of satisfaction scores need to be explained in the methods.

DISCUSSION

- the questionnaire had 31 items (instead of 33 items)

- I miss the limitations of the study

- Minor Essential Revisions

p 9. The instrument created consists eventually of 33 satisfaction items shown in Table 1, after excluding two questions in this latter phase. 33 must be 31.

- On page 9 it is stated that the sample was approached by trained interviewers
for face-to-face interviews. On page 14 I would change ‘administered questionnaires’ into face-to-face interviews. It is confusing, because you can think the administered questionnaires are paper questionnaires.

-p. 14 observations --> interviews

- Discretionary Revisions

Can you tell something about the representative of the response group. In the amount of women and level of education the same for the population in Greece which use home care?
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