



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7280
Title of the Manuscript:	USERS' SATISFACTION WITH THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE AMONG THE FEDERAL SECRETARIAT STAFF IN SOUTH WESTERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The English text needs to be improved. I would suggest the author(s) to seek the assistance of a native speaker. This would enable them to improve the manuscript. The authors need to add more literature about the determinants of satisfaction with NHIS, waiting time and staff to the Introduction. The author(s) might consider the use of multivariate analysis in their statistical work I would suggest to add some lines about the strengths (maybe the response rate) and weaknesses of the study to the Discussion	The assistance of a native speaker has been sought and used to review grammatical text. Many of the reviewed text are highlighted in red fonts. Additional literature concerning determinants of satisfaction (waiting time, type of health facility and staff attitude) with NHIS has been added to Introduction on lines 31-33. Results of binary and multiple logistic regressions for interaction between dependent and independent variables have been inserted in tables 2, 3 and 4 as appropriate and reported (lines 105 -110, 216 – 221). Comments on strengths and weaknesses in the study have been added (lines 404-416).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	3. Results: 'Out of 417 eligible participants.. '. This is not clear to the reader. I would suggest to clarify 'eligible'.	Eligible participants have been clarified on lines 52-54 in the methodology section as all staff who had been enrolled in NHIS for at least one year preceding the study, utilization of service in the last 3 months preceding the study and whose enrolment was verified by sighting an enrolment card.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		