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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   In my opinion, the topic is interesting for the scientific research, but it needs a most exhaustive literature revision. I think that the authors should to reference more literature relevant for the topic. A conceptual model could help to understand the logic and the focus of the research.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   I think that there’re enough information about methods and tools used in the research.
   In this point, I assume that the level of analysis is individual, but the size of the sample (n= 172) is not enough to do multivariate analysis.

3. Are the data sound?
   The results seem logic but I suggest to link more with the literature and other relevant outputs.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, the paper talk about interest topics about well-being and job satisfaction of physicians in Xina.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   I think that the authors need to include more literature in the discussion. Also, the conclusions could be developed more than now.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   They need to talk about “method variance” in this type of research.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Good

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Good

CONCLUSION:
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)