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A tree model comparison of the relationship between quality, satisfaction and loyalty: an empirical study of Chinese healthcare system, Lei et al.

General comment

This is a well written manuscript that addresses an important healthcare issue. The methods used are relevant and sound and appropriate for answering the question being asked. The results are well represented and well discussed. Relevant published work have been properly cited and discussed on the light of the findings of the study.

Minor Issues

1. The manuscript is repetitive in many places; e.g.; the “Theoretical background and research hypothesis” needs to be shortened as much of its contents has already been mentioned in the “Background” Section.

2. The “sampling frame” is vast yet the sample of respondent is very small!! In addition, there is no mentioning how this sample was chosen! Was this a “purposive” or a “random” sample? The difference is important given the vast potential number of possible respondents.

3. The author mention that “patient satisfaction consequence was used as an indicator for patient loyalty”- Measures section. Why patients were not directly asked about their loyalty? How valid to use patient satisfaction as a “surrogate” for patient loyalty?

4. What is the implication of choosing “hospitals that had fairly good reputations in the Shanghai public healthcare market”? How representative these hospitals to the public healthcare facilities? How generalizable the findings to the overall public health service in China, as the title of the manuscript suggests?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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