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Reviewer's report:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

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.

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 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.

Page 7, in the section 2 of results, the title 'association between satisfaction level and determinant factors' does not described 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.

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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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