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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
No - there are major issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Abstract
Minor point: please put a hyphen between "nurse physician" on line 45.

Background:
Page 3, line 7: why is Perception capitalized?
Page 3, line 23: citation needed
There needs to be a greater review of the background literature to demonstrate the need for the study.
You have provided a rather superficial overview of the issue. While there is a dearth of literature in the Ethiopian context, consider supporting why patient perceived experience is important with health services in your background review.

Methods

Page 4, line 56-57: Provide the psychometric properties of the Quality of Nursing Care Questionnaires-Patient of Safford & Schlotfeldt and explain why this is the best measure for your study.

Page 6, line 10-11: Please explain who the data collectors were and what training they were provided (if any).

Page 6, line 18-19: Are there any psychometric studies on the translated questionnaire? If yes, please report them, if no, please state it in this section.

Page 6, line 37-42: Why was the 7 days selected as the minimum length of stay in the hospital? What was the definition of mental illness for the exclusion criteria?

Aside the descriptive results, why weren't any inferential statistics included? It would be interesting for example to know what the predictors of patient satisfaction are from their perspective

Results
There should be some inferential statistics reported

Discussion

The results need to be analyzed in greater detail than what is provided in this section. For example, page 11, line 23-33. The authors state that their mean scores were different (lower) than a recent Ethiopian study but why are some the possible explanation for these differences? Also, this should be followed for the other subscales.

More broadly, how does the studies advance our understanding of patients perceived satisfaction of care provided by nurses? How can nurses, organizations and patients work together to improve the quality of care provided and ultimately patient satisfaction with that care?

The discussion is also missing a limitations section.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Overall, the study has some good merits but requires major revisions if it is to be accepted for publication in a reputable peer-review journal. I would encourage the authors to review my itemized revisions. The authors also need to expand their analysis beyond descriptive summaries of the scales.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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