

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4431

Title: How to improve a urology outpatient service? A prospective survey of patient satisfaction using the modified SWOPS questionnaire

Reviewer code: 00505633

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-06-29 20:59

Date reviewed: 2013-07-26 16:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is not a scientific contribution to urology, it is about improving management of a customer facility.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4431

Title: How to improve a urology outpatient service? A prospective survey of patient satisfaction using the modified SWOPS questionnaire

Reviewer code: 00505691

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-06-29 20:59

Date reviewed: 2013-07-27 02:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very good idea for evaluation of patient satisfaction

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4431

Title: How to improve a urology outpatient service? A prospective survey of patient satisfaction using the modified SWOPS questionnaire

Reviewer code: 00505635

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-06-29 20:59

Date reviewed: 2013-08-01 15:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting topic as outpatient department service is very important in the diagnostic, therapeutic and follow-up process of many urological pathologies. The authors could expand their Discussion section by including the development of the outpatients department service for the performance of minimal invasive urological procedures. The following references could be included in the revised manuscript: Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 2011 Jan;93(1):27-30. / Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 2012 Jan;94(1):8-11.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4431

Title: How to improve a urology outpatient service? A prospective survey of patient satisfaction using the modified SWOPS questionnaire

Reviewer code: 00505679

Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia

Date sent for review: 2013-06-29 20:59

Date reviewed: 2013-08-03 06:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-There is a problem with the issue of validation of the questionnaire. Since the modified SWOPS questionnaire include questions that do not appear in the original SWOPS. Also used questions in different sections of SWOPS (registration process, Nursing care, Physician care, information, Testing services), so that different alpha values are invalid. It would be necessary to validate the modification of the questionnaire through a study of alpha Cronbach. Results. The results would be easier to understand and more illustrative if tables should be attached with all the information in the first paragraph. -We need to know the details of these claims: Overall statistical analysis did not reveal any significant difference between consultant and registrar led consultation in duration time, delay of consultation, and patient satisfaction. -This statement should appear in the Methodology, not in the Results section. "It is of note, that Wednesday clinic have less patients per doctor per hour and enforces a 1 patient per 15 minute slot with a not over-booking policy, which results into a smooth continuously flowing clinic without significant delays". Discussion. -This statement is a personal opinion and needs the supporting literature. " Our survey participation rate after excluding the ineligible patients was 65% which is a valid acceptable result for this type of survey". -This paragraph is repeated in the Discussion. "We concluded the following from the patient answers (Table 4): Question one demonstrates that a 12-15 minutes outpatient appointment length is acceptable and adequate for the vast majority of patients (97.70%) and only less then 3 percent of the attending patients would require more consultation time". -The discussion should also discuss the results of this study, comparing the results to similar works: 1. Marshall GN, Hays RD. The patient satisfaction questionnaire short form(PSQ-18). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation;1994:p7865. 2. Dawn AG,



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

Lee PP, Hall-Stone T, Gable W. Development of a patient satisfaction survey for outpatient care: a brief report. J Med Pract Manag 2003;19:166-9. 3. The patient satisfaction questionnaire short form (PSQ-18) as an adaptable, reliable, and validated tool for use in various settings. Med Educ Online 20013;18:10.3402. References. -The reference 3 is incomplete. 3. Coulter A. The Autonomous Patient: ending paternalism in Medical Care. London: Stationary Office (for the Nuffield Trust), 2002. Tables. -It is easier to understand if you use the formula Mean \pm SD in the tables. -Noteworthy that the SD in the delayed appointment is very high.