## **Peer Review Report**

# Review Report on Patient satisfaction with healthcare service quality and its associated factors at one polyclinic in Hanoi, Vietnam

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Duong Duc

Submitted on: 19 Aug 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605055

#### **EVALUATION**

#### Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

This article shows the patients satisfactions in a polyclinic in Hanoi. However, it should be clearly stated the type of the clinic (private or public) then added further outcomes

## Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This is not a new topic in Vietnam. The English writing of the paper is ok but not their strengths. The results are focusing on validity of the tools rather than the outcomes and its associated factors.

I think, the authors should add further outcomes with better discussion!

Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Abstract: The number of patients in this study and how they were counted should be clearly stated. And do they out-patient or in-patient or mix?

Contribution to the field: Should be noted only strengths and new findings of the study. The current is similar to a copy of results

Introduction: There needs some further information about this polyclinic (where? name? private or public?). Further, the real reason to do the study is not clear to me... Is it only "since 2017, there have no studies on patient satisfaction?"

Methods: The study sampling should indicate how you choose (randomly? conveniently?) and inclusion criteria (all patients or patients who use some of the services?)

Results: There should have further analysis on associated factors to the final outcomes of the study Conclusions: Not very related to the results of the study

## PLEASE COMMENT

#### Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Not very concise to the content about validity

#### Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Should be added Vietnam, private or public polyclinic

## Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

| ok             |  |                 |             |        |            |      |
|----------------|--|-----------------|-------------|--------|------------|------|
| Q 7            | Is the quality of the figures and tables satis | sfactory?       |             |        |            |      |
| No.            |  |                 |             |        |            |      |
|                |  |                 |             |        |            |      |
| Q 8            | Does the reference list cover the relevant li  | terature adequa | tely and in | an unb | iased mann | er?) |
| OK             |  |                 |             |        |            |      |
| QUALITY        | ASSESSMENT                                     |                 |             |        |            |      |
| Q 9            | Originality                                    |                 |             |        |            |      |
| Q 10           | Rigor  |                 |             |        |            |      |
| Q 11           | Significance to the field                      |                 |             |        |            |      |
| Q 12           | Interest to a general audience                 | l l             |             |        |            |      |
| Q 13           | Quality of the writing                         | l l             |             |        |            |      |
| Q 14           | Overall scientific quality of the study        | ı               |             |        |            |      |
| REVISION LEVEL |  |                 |             |        |            |      |
| 0.15           | Please make a recommendation based on v        | our comments:   |             |        |            |      |

Major revisions.