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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Slack-Smith,

Sincerest thanks for your affirmation of our work. I truly appreciate your help and patience in correcting our manuscript in details and kindly with a corrected version.

As your requirement, the point-to-point response letter to the reviewers’ comments is attached. Sorry we have not uploaded it successfully during last major revision and actually we have prepared it seriously in responding to the reviewers’ extensive and insightful comments, and have finished several weeks before.

I have checked the references again and keep consistency in the format of the journal.

Thank you again for your valuable time and we hope this will make the revised manuscript to be acceptable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Pei Liu
Please kindly find here below of our responses to the reviewers’ comments point-by-point. We have highlighted all the changes in revised manuscript (R1).

Dr. Ha Hoang (Reviewer 1)

Comments to the Author:

1. Page 4, lines 4-5: The research question is not in the form of a question. Suggest the research question should be: What were aspects that patients usually considered when evaluating the satisfaction of dental care?

Response: We agree with the reviewer and have used the question words accordingly.

2. Page 4: "The eligible patients were contacted by phone". The reader would also like to know how did you obtain the eligible patients' phone numbers and who contacted the patients by phone.

Response: The phone numbers were obtained from the patients’ folders and our research assistant contacted the patients by phone. This information has been added in the revised manuscript.
3. Page 5: "One facilitator (MCM Wong) facilitated". Please mention the facilitator is one of the authors.

Response: We have amended this information. Thanks.

4. Please give the justification for video recording the group discussions. I noticed you have not mentioned how you analyzed the videos recorded.

Response: Thanks for picking this up, both the audio and video recordings were used in the verbatim transcription with non-verbal communicative behaviors between participants added in the transcripts. This information has been added.

5. "The transcriptions were reviewed by two analysts (YN Luo & P Liu)". Are they the authors of the paper? If so please clarify in your manuscript.

Response: Yes, the two analysts are the authors of the paper. We have amended this information. Thanks.

6. Table 1: "periodontal treatment 2 orthodontic" should be "periodontal treatment 2" "treatment" should be "orthodontic treatment".

Response: We have revised this in Table 1.

7. Table 2: Themes, subthemes and items derived from focus groups. How were items/statements made? They were not mentioned anywhere in the data analysis section. Please clarify.

Response: The items/statements were derived by the authors generalized from the selected quotations. This information is added in the data analysis section.
Dr. Leonardo Marchini (Reviewer 2)

Comments to the Author:

1. The manuscript entitled "Patients' Satisfaction on Dental Care: A Qualitative Study to Develop Satisfaction Instrument" is a well-planned and well executed qualitative research about patient satisfaction in a dental hospital in Hong Kong. The topic is of significant importance, and the manuscript brings new data that might be useful for future research.

Response: Thank you very much for the positive comments. We hope this manuscript will bring new data for the satisfaction questionnaire in dental field and be applied in future research.

2. As stated in the manuscript, Cantonese was the primary language used by the study participants, and possibly by the authors. Consequently, the entire manuscript needs proofreading by a native English speaker to improve readability.

Response: As your recommendation, we have asked a native English speaking doctor to revise the English in this manuscript to improve readability.

3. Of even greater importance, transcriptions of participants' statements should be back translated to Cantonese to check for accuracy of the translation, necessary corrections made to the English version, then back translated to Cantonese one more time for final accuracy checking. This process should be described in the Material and Methods section of the manuscript. Can authors consider if this would assist the revision of the paper.

Response: Thank you very much for highlighting this important methodology issue in the qualitative study. Following your comments, we have asked a research assistant who have not involved in this study to back-translate all the segments quoted in the text and compared the back-translated Cantonese version with the original Cantonese transcription. Several differences in the vocabularies used were identified and revisions have been made to maintain the accuracy in the meaning. Thank you again for reviewing our work and valuable comments.