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Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for your encouragement. The following answers refer to the questions point-by-point you required in your feedback of the 4th of November, 2012. Thank you for the consideration of the resubmission to your journal. Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have any problems or questions regarding our new manuscript. We wish these corrections will improve the quality of our article.
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Abstract: the conclusion part should include context (China). I would also like to see one sentence about implications of findings in the conclusion part, something like: "This implies that the measurement of patient experiences should include topics of importance for patients' satisfaction with health care services"

Thank you for this question! We added this point in the conclusion part:

"Conclusions: In this study, we test and compare three theoretical models of the quality–satisfaction–loyalty relationship in the Chinese healthcare system. Findings show that perceived quality improvement does not lead directly to customer loyalty. The strategy of using quality improvement to maintain patient loyalty depends on the level of patient satisfaction. This implies that the measurement of patient experiences should include topics of importance for patients’ satisfaction with health care services.”

Discussion: the limitation part should be placed before conclusions.

Reliability of difference scores (ref Prakash): I found the reference (40), but it was used for another topic. I originally wanted comments relating to the lower reliability for difference scores (two measurements), but I now understand that expectations and perceptions were measured at the same time. Then you face another problem, namely the response shift problem - adjustment of expectations to experiences. This should be mentioned in the limitation part.

You are right. Thank you! We agree. We have added this point in the limitation part:

“Fifth, as expectations and perceived quality were measured at the same time, study results might suffer from a response shift problem [60]. A response shift problem might have occurred because adjustments could have occurred between expectations and perceived quality experiences.”

Measures: 10-point versus 5-point questionnaires: you write that "ten point scales were preferred...", but is this the correct reference? Also, I am not sure if this is true, see the following study:
Thank you for this question. We have modified the text and provided a more precisely explanation:

“Despite the existing controversy regarding their respective properties [40], 10-point scales were preferred to the usual 5-point scales because in health care satisfaction studies, as they show higher validity and explanatory power than 5-point scales and the same non-response rate [41].”


p. 8

$500-$750 and 10 percent of the patients had a monthly income of more than $750. .

Yes! Thank you! We have corrected.

THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE NEEDS CLARIFIED

All participants were asked to confirm their agreement to participate before the actual survey was administered and most of them agree.

Thank you for this comment. You are right. We have cut and reorganize the text in a more logical way.

“All participants were asked to confirm their agreement to participate before the actual survey was administered and all of them confirmed.”

P. 11

Indexes (INDICES?)

Yes, thank you! We have corrected.

p. 13

RMSER was .052 (RMSEA)

Yes, thank you very much! We have corrected.