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Reviewer's report:

General: Significant improvement but three major issues remain (1) Focus of article. What points is the author trying to get across? (2) Discussion or data and results: Statistical anlysis? (3) Conclusion
The are many typos and grammatical errors in the report which are probably more of an editorial issue

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
(1) What points are being emphasised in the discussion? No real discussion of issues raised in Tables including interpersonal skills, culture, perception of being respected, compliance with advice (competency? ability to work as part of a team?), personality traits, communication gaps (difference between MD and RN), attitudes toward work, responsiveness etc. other than repeating results. These are key issues that need to be addressed.
(2) I do not under the statistical outcomes in the p values. Is it more the difference between MD and RN responses being measured or should it be the combined agreement on the relative importance of the factors? I agree with the importance of staff shortages, but to focus on the social interation outside work in deference to the other items makes no sense.
(3) Conclusion: Should leave the reader with a quick summary of key findings and thoughts about what should be done about it. I didn't feel like that was accomplished.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Table III uncoperative attitude does not add up

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes
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