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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: * What is your overall impression of the study?

This is a fairly well-written manuscript on development and validation of measurement tools for user experience evaluation surveys in the public primary health care facilities in Greece describes the development and validation of a tool to assess the experiences of clients with public primary health care facilities in Greece and adds to the literature about this rarely studied area of research.

* What the authors’ have done well?

The Background and Methods Sections of the paper are fairly well-written and coherent. The authors reviewed the literature well, provided adequate justification for the study and had a clear study objective and a good description of the study Methodology.

* In what ways does it not meet best practice?

The Results and Discussion Sections of the paper needs to be further improved. I feel there is a limited description of what constituted the final questionnaire. Also, the Discussion of the tool needs to be further strengthened. I have suggested some revisions which will assist the authors in improving their manuscript.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

BACKGROUND
"In recent years, the interest of both health policy and research stakeholders has centered upon healthcare users' experiences in order to monitor and evaluate the implementation of patient-centered services and whether these fulfill their needs, preferences and values. In the USA, the evaluation of the quality of ambulatory health services for the largest insurance funds has been conducted through surveys and protocols of the CAHPS (Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems) and HEDIS (Healthcare Effectiveness and Data Information Set)."

Comment: Please, provide a reference/s for this statement. Also, please change "fulfill" to "fulfil"

"The aim of this study was to develop a valid and reliable measurement tool for conducting periodic user experience evaluation surveys in public Primary Health Care facilities in Greece such as outpatient clinics of public hospitals and health centers."

Comment: Please, this (the study objective) should be the last sentence of the Background Section

METHODS

This is generally well-written, adequate description of the approaches used for both face and construct validation of the questions were given.

Comment: The literature review somehow missed a very important tool that would have been very useful in the design of locally relevant questionnaire for assessing patient experiences with health care services in Greece. This tool is the responsiveness questionnaire of the WHO Multi-country Survey Study on Health and Health System's Responsiveness (MCSS). The Responsiveness component of the questionnaire had 8 domains on: "access to family support" and "confidentiality", "prompt attention" (short waiting times), "dignity" (respectful treatment), "communication" (clarity of communication by providers), "autonomy" (involvement in decisions), "choice of provider" (patient choice of providers), and "quality of basic facilities" (clean facilities for patients' convenience). This would have strengthened the study.

RESULTS SECTION

This is fairly-well written but could be made clearer.

Comment: There is a need to highlight or list the questions that constituted the final validated questionnaire that should be used for patient survey of PHC services in Greece.

Comment: There is a need for clarity of the domains covered by the final questionnaire after final analysis

DISCUSSION
Comment: This section is relatively weak. There is a need to compare the final questionnaire developed to other questionnaire being used in earlier surveys in Greece. What domains are now more important to patients in Greece from the final questionnaire?

Comment: As the WHO questionnaire on Health and Health System's Responsiveness is currently the standard tool used to assess health system responsiveness and experiences of the client with the health system, I feel that there is a need to discuss how your final questionnaire compares with the WHO questionnaire in terms of number of questions and domains covered. In addition, there is a need to discuss the strengths and limitations of your questionnaire in comparison with the WHO questionnaire.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Please, they are as highlighted in the commentary above.

**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.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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