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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I have a few suggestions as follows:

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?

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.

Page 5: "One facilitator (MCM Wong) facilitated". Is this person one of the authors? If so please mention the facilitator is one of the authors.

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

"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.

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

"treatment" should be "orthodontic treatment".

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.
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.

Yes

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:
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