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Dear Editor:

Enclosed is the revised manuscript “Predictors of patient satisfaction with hospital health care”, and the response to the reviewers comments. All the changes have been underscored in the text. We hope that this paper is now suitable for publication in BMC Health Services Research.

All authors have contributed to each of three activities: 1) conception/design and/or analysis/interpretation, 2) writing, and 3) approval of final version) and will take public responsibility for the content of the paper. The content has not been published, nor is it being considered elsewhere. No possible conflicts of interest (e.g., funding sources for consultancies or studies of products) exist in this study.

The author to whom all correspondence should be addressed is as follows:
José Mª Quintana, MD, PhD
Unidad de Investigación. Hospital de Galdakao
Barrio Labeaga s/n. 48960 Galdakao, Bizkaia, Spain
Phone: 34-94-400 7105; fax: 34-94-400 7132
Email: jmquinta@hgda.osakidetza.net

Thank you for your consideration. We are looking forward for hearing from you.
Sincerely,

José M. Quintana López MD, PhD
Responses to Reviewer # 1

Minor Essential Revisions.

All the minor essential revisions had been corrected in the text. So: the minor digit errors (“in” first line, double commas, dots etc) in Background.

In Tab 2 was not reported the statistically significance of test utilised. We have included the following footnote: Student $t$ test, or analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the Scheffe’s method for multiple comparisons, or the Kruskal-Wallis test performed.

In Results Section with univariate analysis the Authors mentioned “correlation” but not statistical correlation test was performed or reported. We have included, in parenthesis, statistical test results (p values) for the univariate analysis in Table 2.
Responses to Reviewer # 2

Minor Essential Revisions.

All the misprints had been corrected in the text:
Line 1 ; Line 8 ; Line 23.

page 14 : Discussion : the authors showed that patients who responded to a second or third reminder expressed low satisfaction. This result is inconsistent with the results of Gasquet et al (ref 8). Could you discuss that point?

We have included in the Discussion the following text to discuss the different result of Gasquet et al (ref 8):
“....(6;8) not finding the later differences among delay on response and patients’ satisfaction, but this could be due to the small sample size included in that study compared to ours(between 78 to 254 patients depending on the time when the patient responded to their mailings), little lower response rate, the design of the study, and the use of different satisfaction questions, though they found a tendency similar to ours in the decline in their satisfaction levels.”