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Reviewer 1: Ole Norheim

Major compulsory revision:

1) The title, abstract and introduction have been changed to reflect that only laboratory conducting HIV related testing services were involved.

2) The changing word has been done as advised in paragraph one of the introduction

3) Last paragraph in the introduction: This has been changed as requested since the meaning was that there are not so many documented researches on patient characteristics Vs satisfaction.

4) An interview administered semi open ended questionnaires were used to obtain the required information and the satisfaction was measured using the dichotomy method so the indifferent response was not allowed.

5) All asked accepted to be included so the response was 100 percent.

6) Ethical clearance was obtained from National Institute for Medical Research Tanzania. Consent was sought from relevant administration of the hospital surveyed. Detailed information on the purpose of the survey and benefits were explicitly explained to each enrollee and that the participant is free to withdraw from the study at any time they wish to and thus will not have any effect on services. The informed consent was requested from each of personnel who were involved in the study
7) However, there was no statistical significance difference between private and public laboratory service users as regards to their demographic data.

8) Authors were unable to find similar studies done in East Africa and thus make them difficult to make a comparison with this study.

9) The study involved the laboratories that conduct HIV related testing and was representative for the country. However, the dichotomy method that was used instead of Likerts method could somehow brought the limited bias.

10) Probably this could help to explain why private laboratories were more efficient than the public laboratories though more studies are needed.

Review 2: Wilson Pace
1) The issue of response rate has been clarified already as per 1st reviewer.

2) The issue of small sample size per facility and overall small sample size was due to the limited resources that were given. However, Authors think that the findings bring the important information that could lead to a larger scale study.

3) The issue of efficiency of laboratories Vs the findings has been clarified above.

4) As it was stated previously, it was an interview administered questionnaire used to obtain the required information at each facility.

5) In some very few facilities, the number of subjects interviewed was a bit more than 12. This was done just to make sure we approach the sample
size intended. The authors acknowledge that though had no any negative impact on the findings reached.

6) The actual anchors were dichotomous and not likerts scale. The authors acknowledge the limitation of using the dichotomous method.

7) The interview was mainly with satisfaction on laboratory services i.e. How do the patients perceive the services provided at the respective laboratory so authors think that the findings could help policy makers to address some issues that lead to client’s dissatisfaction.

8) The reference to Gadallah article has been added in the reference list.