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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewers Report (all minor but essential revision please)

1. The question is posed as an aim, which is understandable, but could be improved if set out as several objectives, rather than a long sentence before the Methods section.

2. The methods are well justified – perhaps a few more details about distribution would increase transparency of the study.

3. The data seem sound. They are reported clearly, but I have not scrutinised the numbers. I have assumed that the mathematics is correct and that there are no errors.

4. The article uses a standard reporting structure. Seems valid and reliable. Reporting the results in the Abstract should be only factual. I would suggest removing the extraneous words that add a human tone here. The place to do this is in the Discussion.

4a. The paragraph on respondents is confusing in the way ‘n:’ is include. Either use just a number if it comes after a percentage e.g. 50% (50) [referring to 50 people in the sample of a total of 100] or later on ‘n=x’, if referring to a group, such as male/ female.

5. The discussion and conclusions have adequate depth. Conclusion in the abstract does not make sense and needs to be rephrased ‘lack of skills…increased experience’.

6. Limitations of the work are clearly stated.

7. No acknowledgment of work they are building (this is in the criteria for review, although I do not see how this is essential).

8. Title and abstract convey the results.

9. The writing can be improved, but just in terms of editing for the English language. Overall, I believe it is well written. The entire paper has been carefully constructed.

10. The reference to Magnet Theory is incorrect, I believe. Hospitals in the US were assessed according to their retention rates of nurses. The better hospitals which were able to retain staff were given recognition as Magnet Hospital. I am not aware that there is a theory attached to this. Please clarify in the paper.
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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