Reviewer’s report

Title: National Health Insurance Accreditation pattern among private healthcare providers in Ghana

Version: 1 Date: 08 Feb 2017

Reviewer: Ayele Geleto

Reviewer's report:

Reviewer: Ayele Geleto

Title: National Health Insurance Accreditation pattern among private health service providers in Ghana

Manuscript number: AOPH-D-16-00142R1

Major comments

1. Abstract: abstract should be made more coherent and re-edited for English language. The abstract should present details of how the seven regions in which the study was conducted were selected from all regions available in the region. Describe clear sample size determination and sampling technique and data analysis plan as well. Authors presented healthcare providers as the study population. Did authors assess healthcare providers or healthcare facilities? Make it clear and consider also on your title. The last sentence of the conclusion matches neither the results presented, nor the objective of the study.

2. Background: The background is poorly written for English language. Try to make the background shorter, clear and supported with study findings. Background did not show any gap that requires research. Clearly write the problem statement (Gap) and your research questions (objectives) and rewrite background inline to the title and objective.

3. Method: Study area need to be described detail. Add study period to study design and take the final sentence to sampling technique part. In the "study population" section, readers will be confused by the terms healthcare providers. Are you dealing with healthcare providers or healthcare facilities? The final sentence of study population is not clear (use appropriate English language).

4. Sample size determination and sampling technique needs more detail description. How the regions and the facilities were selected? What was the basis for selecting seven regions from ten regions?
5. The Data collection and management section must include detail data collection method, the tool used and the sources of the tools, the data collectors and also describe how data quality was controlled. How did you contact the facilities for which data was missing at NHIA? Can the information you obtained from these facilities complete the data you obtained from NHIA.

6. Data analysis: the word PHSPs was repeatedly used. Try to minimize it and make the sentences shorter and clear for the first sentence. I suggest replacing PHSPs with private health facilities. The analysis seems simple description. Would you use any inferential statistics to analyze the relation between variables?

7. Result: The first two paragraphs that are described at the start of the result should be described in method part. Here in the result you should describe the findings of your work.

8. Discussion: Discussion should not repeat results. While writing discussion: do not repeat your findings. Just describe the key finding of your survey, compare it with other similar study findings and describe the possible explanation that contributes to the observed differences. In general, this discussion needs to be improved to focus on the results of the study. Few studies are used to support the results, but the authors need to instead provide a deeper analysis of the results and the broad literature context around this issue.

9. Conclusion: You included only seven regions into your analysis but you generalized to ten regions. How did you select the seven regions from ten? Can your finding generalized to all health facilities while you didn't use random sampling method? Your conclusion is not supported with your study findings.

10. List of figures: make titles of the figures self explanatory (answer the questions: what, when and where). Make also the titles of the tables self explanatory (answer the questions: what, when and where). Most of the table presented findings of ten regions. However, in method you said you will assess the data from seven regions. Put the figures in order they were used in the manuscript. I appreciated no difference between table two tables, what is the importance of repeating similar table?

Generally,

Due attention should be given for English language edition

The manuscript requires exhaustive revision before consideration to publication (with special attention given to method and discussion)
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