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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Samina Ismail (Reviewer 1):

1. In methodology the authors need to mention how sample size of 120 was calculated. What was the method of sample collection, was it consecutive or convenient sampling? as the method of sample collection can cause a bias in the results in such type of satisfaction studies as authors can intend to approach patients who would give better results.

Response:-

• We have used a one month data of every patients which were 120 so that we didn’t had sampling technique

2. Statistic method was a descriptive whereas p-value would provide a better comparison.

Satisfaction score needs to be added.

Response:-

• Totally acceptable comment and now we revise the document and P-value is added.

3. What questions were asked from the patients as many things can affect the satisfaction which may not be related to anesthesia? With poor patient education, many would not understand anesthesia services.

Authors need to mention what specific questions were asked at which satisfaction was non-satisfaction was expressed
Response:-

• This is also very valuable comment; we educate the patients before they get in to the operation room about anesthesia service and participants/ participants requested to respond on different questions deals about the perioperative anesthesia stay. And now we include the detail information on the method section.

Fitsum Sebsibe Teni (Reviewer 2): The authors of the manuscript have worked on a very interesting topic contributing to the literature in the area in Ethiopia.

I believe that, for the current manuscript to play the mentioned role, it needs to be revised extensively as indicated in the specific comments below.

In general, the manuscript requires a thorough revision of its English across the different sections to make it more readable.

Abstract

Page 3 line, Dissatisfaction arises if the patient fells… could be corrected as 'if the patient feels

Line 9, the phrase 'inconsistency between predictable and delivered care' could be corrected as 'inconsistency between expected and received'

In the background section of the abstract there is no objective stated at the end of the background statement. Please consider adding it as it is a crucial component to the section.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and I made all the corrections

Introduction

Page 4, line 12, there is a mention of the fact that measuring patient satisfaction with anesthesia is difficult. It would make it clearer for readers if the authors consider adding explanations for the statement.

Response:-

• The rationale for the statement is included in the mentioned section of the introduction section

In the paragraph, page 4 lines 34 to 39, it would be clearer to readers if the authors specifically indicate which of the cited references reported the findings ('87 % of patient was satisfied, 0.5 %
dissatisfied and 12.5% had no opinion'). In addition, it would be useful to provide context on the study in terms of where it was conducted and its design.

In the same paragraph the reference cited from WHO 2000 report (reference number 14) is not specifically described in the references list, it cannot be found. Please consider adding the full title and link to the file.

Response:-

• There was problem on referring in the above point mentioned and We made correction on it

In the last paragraph of the introduction section, it would be very helpful to described if there have been any studies done on the topic or similar area in Ethiopia before. If there is no such study, describing that fact could be very helpful in indicating the gap the authors are working to close.

Response:-

• We tried to justify the important of this study at the end of the introduction section.

Methods

As a general comment on the structure of the methods part, it would provide readers of the manuscript a clear idea of the methodological aspects of the study if it can be organized in general subsections including the following as a suggestion;

Study area and period, study design, sampling, data collection and management and data analysis

Response:-

• Great comment and we separate the method to different section as recommended by the reviewer II

Page 5 line 7; it would be better understandable for readers if ASA physical status is defined and the possible five/six categories described in the methods part in the form of operational definition/definition of terms.

Response:-

• We include the ASA classification definition in the definition of term section

Page 5, line 13; the exclusion criteria;

- history of mental illness, as long as patients are capable of conducting interview currently what is the rationale in excluding based on history of mental illness?
- The other exclusion criterion used was, previous operation at the hospital; please describe the rationale behind this exclusion

Response:-

• Valuable comments but

  o On actual data collection time we were excluding patients if they were diagnosis currently with psychotic problems, so we make correction.

  o But if the patient had operation before the patient will automatically compare it with the previous one and the response might be biased

Page 5, line 18-33, in the development of the questionnaire used in the study has back translation of the Amharic and Tigrigna versions of the questionnaire to English been done? If so, please describe it here.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and I made all the corrections in the methodology part

Adding the data collection instrument used in the study as a supporting file with the manuscript would be very helpful for readers interested in the detailed content of the instrument as well as other researcher who may consider to use it in their studies.

Looking at the analysis done in this study, it focused on presenting summary and descriptive aspects of the findings. I believe the authors could make better arguments and find interesting relationships if they conduct statistical analyses which look into the relationships among different variable. One example could be to conduct a binary logistic regression analysis to assess the relationship between demographic and other related variables with being satisfied or not in the services. Alternatively, tests like chi-squared test comparing proportion of satisfied and not satisfied patients across different demographic and related variables.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and P-Value is added
Results

In the first and second paragraphs of the results section of the manuscript, it would make the text more readable if only the most interesting results were reported without listing all. An example could be, if the proportion of women in the study is described there is no need to describe the proportion of men. Similarly in the other variables also the most interesting results can be mentioned and the rest can be read from the tables and figures.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and we tried to make more readable by mentioning only important information

Page 7, in the section 2 of results, the title 'association between satisfaction level and determinant factors' does not describe what was presented below in my opinion. This is because the analysis done was purely descriptive and no association between satisfaction and the possible factors was not assessed statistically.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and we add P-value to make more statically impressed.

Discussion

In the discussion section, it would be useful to readers as a context to interpret the findings if the limitations of the study were provided at the end of the discussion section.

Response:-

• Valuable comments and limitation of the study is included