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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:
a few articles for you to review and include:
1. Stewart et al 2010 Journal of Rural Health 27(1) 103-113 Moving on? predictors of intent to leave among rural and remote registered nurses
2. Kulig et al 2009 Public Health Nursing 26(5) 430-439 Work setting, community attachment and satisfaction among rural and remote registered nurses

After review of these articles, it would be important to revise, strengthen and enhance your article (literature review and discussion)

Under background, 3rd paragraph, reference 6, how applicable is it to PNG? You need to be more clear of the context of the international literature and the connection to your study.

Literature on job satisfaction was not as well laid out by rural and urban as it could be.

The reference to your own qualitative study needs further clarification in terms of sample size, how it was conducted etc.

How many questionnaires were distributed at the training session?

What are purpose developed scales?

Your sample went from 1302 to 344 useable, this is a huge change. what could you have done differently during the distribution of the same to prevent at least some of this discrepancy?

Would strongly suggest a table to illustrate the types of work climate, and the facilities where people work. See fourth paragraph under results, it was hard to keep this straight.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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