

Answers to Reviewers

Answer to reviewer 00505633

We would like to thank you for your evaluation of our manuscript. However we disagree with the rejection suggesting that this is not a scientific contribution. Evaluation of patient satisfaction is a significant requirement by healthcare professionals and patients, also mandatory by NICE and NHS guidelines in order to improve health and safety outcomes. With our article we would like to emphasise the regular need and demand and moreover we would like to create an example of how it can be performed in an outpatient setting without disrupting a busy service.

Answer to reviewer 00505691

Many thanks for your comments and your time spent reviewing our article. Highly appreciated.

Answer to reviewer 00505635

Many thanks for your constructive comments. They are very much appreciated. We made the following correction in the manuscript highlighted in yellow in the discussion part, also the two suggested references were added.

Answer to reviewer 00505679

Many thanks for your constructive comments. They are very much appreciated. All the changes made are highlighted in the manuscript in red.

In terms of validation, we used the SWOP questionnaire on purpose, since we did not want to develop a new questionnaire, which as you very rightly suggested needs an alfa Cronbach's validation. Therefore we chose the SWOP as it allows users to select questions whilst maintaining validity as the researchers who constructed it suggest. All the questions, which we used can be find in the questionnaire. We also tried to emphasise that this is a modification, in a real time environment in a busy NHS hospital, patient and staff will not have time to go through the original long questionnaire. A new table was added including the overall statistical analysis

between consultant and registrar led consultation in duration time, delay of consultation, and patient satisfaction. The paragraph which was repeated in the discussion section was deleted.

Discussion. - "Our survey participation rate after excluding the ineligible patients was 65% which is a valid acceptable result for this type of survey". Was changed to "Our survey participation rate after excluding the ineligible patients was 65%"

The following section and the suggested references were added to the discussion section: "Alternatively for the measurement of patient satisfaction the Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form (PSQ-18) can also be used, which is an adaptable, reliable, and validated tool that may be applied to various settings, as well as comparing interventions[13,14]."

Furthermore \pm SD were corrected as suggested. Reference No.3 was completed.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Evangelos Mazaris