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Reviewer's report:

The authors improved the quality of the paper during this first round of review. This review improved mainly the conceptual consistency of the manuscript.

However the current focus on satisfaction requires a proper link of the findings to the overall literature on satisfaction. This motivates the following comments:

1- In the conceptual framework, the authors mentioned "Drawing upon previous studies...". Can you provide some references of those studies and discuss how you chose them among other to develop this conceptual framework?

2- The conceptual framework should define satisfaction and presents the operational definition adopted for this study.

3- There are many controversies and criticisms about the concept of satisfaction. Some authors suggest the concept of "experience of care" rather than satisfaction (See for instance Salisbury C, Wallace M, Montgomery A. Patient experience and satisfaction in primary care: secondary analysis using multilevel modelling. BMJ2010;341:c5004) . The authors do not need to adopt this perception lens in this study. But they need at least to discuss their findings with regards to this point in the literature on satisfaction.
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