Author's response to reviews

Title: The relationship between perceived service quality and patient willingness to recommend at a national oncology hospital network

Authors:

Christopher G Lis (Christopher.lis@ctca-hope.com)
Mark Rodeghier (markrod@xsite.net)
Digant Gupta (gupta_digant@yahoo.com)

Version: 4 Date: 10 February 2011

Author's response to reviews:

February 10, 2011

Dear Dr. Norton,

Greetings,

Thank you for your correspondence in connection with our manuscript (MS:199452821373951) entitled “The relationship between service quality measures and patient willingness to recommend at a national oncology provider network” for consideration in “BMC Health Services Research”.

We have addressed the reviewers’ concerns in our revised manuscript, which is being resubmitted to “BMC Health Services Research”. Attached below, for your perusal, is a detailed description (highlighted in red and CAPS) of how we have addressed the reviewers’ comments in our revised manuscript. The changes in the resubmitted manuscript have also been highlighted in red for easy identification.

We thank you once again for your interest in our manuscript. Please let us know if you have any further questions and we will be more than happy to clarify.

We look forward to hearing back from you soon.

Yours Sincerely,

Digant Gupta, MD, MPH (On behalf of all authors)
Cancer Treatment Centers of America
2610 Sheridan Road
Zion, Illinois 60099, USA
Phone (847) 746-4328
Reviewer’s report
Title: The relationship between perceived service quality and patient willingness to recommend at a national oncology hospital network
Version: 3 Date: 1 February 2011
Reviewer: Anna Gagliardi
Reviewer’s report:
The authors have thoroughly addressed all previous suggestions. This reviewer suggests one final discretionary clarification:

DISCRETIONARY
On page 7 under Questionnaire and Survey Administration perhaps the authors could note that they conducted X focus groups with X patients with what characteristics to explore factors they considered important in their treatment decision making (18), and these themes were expanded and refined based on themes collated from other studies evaluating oncology patient information/decision making needs (19-21).

WE DO NOT HAVE THE DETAILED DOCUMENTED INFORMATION ON THE NUMBER OF FOCUS GROUPS CONDUCTED. AS A RESULT, WE WOULD BE UNABLE TO ADDRESS THIS CONCERN.

Reviewer’s report
Title: The relationship between perceived service quality and patient willingness to recommend at a national oncology hospital network
Version: 3 Date: 4 February 2011
Reviewer: Reijo Sund
Reviewer’s report:
Only one minor comment: In the revised manuscript you state (page 13) “Finally, cancer diagnosis was not found to influence patient “willingness to recommend” in the multivariate model.” As all patients had some cancer diagnosis, you probably mean that the type of cancer diagnosis had no influence - so please reword the sentence. AS SUGGESTED, WE HAVE REWORDED THE SENTENCE IN THE FINAL MANUSCRIPT.