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Reviewer’s report:

General
The paper by Aletras et al reports the development and preliminary validation of a Greek language outpatient satisfaction questionnaire. Patient satisfaction is a major component of quality of care assessment and must be surveyed with validated instruments. The study is well designed and the authors should be commended for their work. The results of this study are of significant importance for the readers of BMC Health Services Research. However, I have three major concerns regarding this paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. As reported by the authors, the final questionnaire is quite similar to published European outpatient satisfaction questionnaires. The authors could have used one of these questionnaires after cultural validation. The rationale for developing an ad-hoc questionnaire is not presented. Are Greek patients very different from other European patients?
2. Patients characteristics are not reported although they were collected. Hence, it is hard to realize for which outpatient population this questionnaire is intended.
3. The authors do not discuss the potential limitations of their study although there is a potential for selection bias (for example, non-reponse bias).

Major recommendations
1. Provide a justification developing a new satisfaction questionnaire
2. Provide a table with patient characteristics
3. Discuss the potential limitations of this study at the end of the Discussion

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Statistical analyses seem appropriate but extensively reported. That makes the paper hard to read.
2. Tables are too heavy.
3. Item descriptions are not reported in Table 2.
4. Some findings are discussed in the Results section. The statistical analysis approach is partly described in the Results section. This is very confusing.
5. Validation is an ongoing process. It is premature to use the term "validation"

Minor recommendations
1. The Results section should be shortened
2. Table 2: report item description, delete loadings<0.40, group items by dimension
3. Delete or simplify Table 5
4. Use preliminary validation rather than validation in title, objective, etc...
5. Be careful with the structure of the article (background, methods, results, discussion)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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