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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This study used WHOQOL-BREF, GHQ and ERI to probe the relationship between job stress on psychological morbidity and quality of life in healthcare workers. The relationship of effort-reward ratio and overcommitment and QOL was also investigated. The authors found the negative correlation between the ERI and QOL.

While I appreciated the interest topics and the “heavy” works involving the many participants and the use of three “mature” tools in studying healthcare providers’ well-being, there are several major concerns that need clarification or correction.

1. The three hospitals and the personnel were actually convenience sample, thus the results cannot well represent the whole situations. The statement should appear in a “limitation” paragraph.

2. This study did not explore the impacts of neither reorganization nor accreditation, and the authors overstated the relationship between “reorganization and/or accreditation” with healthcare providers’ mental physical well-being. The word of “reorganization” appeared in title may give audience the impression on its impact on QOL. Similarly, “when health policy makers are making decisions about reorganization and accreditation ranking of hospitals, they should consider…” is an inappropriate conclusion.

3. For comparison of scores derived from the three tools, the authors picked up the individual background information as independent variables: “job category, educational level, marital status, smoking history, alcohol-drinking history, history of hypnotic drug. However, it has been reported physicians’ well-being and psycho-emotional morbidity are closely related with heavy workloads, long work hours and fatigue. It is especially important when suffering from manpower shortage in a nation. Further, this study enrolled four professionals: physicians, nurses, administrative personnel, and specialized personnel who worked in different environments and under different degree of stress from clinical works. They data should not be mixed for interpretation. Also, to achieve appropriate interpretation, the authors should describe the background information of the three hospitals, such as bed number, service volume, and manpower. The average work hours per week for the four groups should also be provided.

4. As the statement in page 4, last para, job stress and social support are widely
considered related to health status. Therefore, the comparisons made among different jobs, across different hospitals, or in different stages of “reorganization” would be better understood. The author should provide reasons underlying the use of demographic and personal information as independent variables.

5. The manuscript needs English correction for grammatical errors and structure problems.

6. It is necessary to provide a statement on IRB approval and its code number.

7. Some horizontal lines should be removed from Table 4.

8. Please indicate if the data in normal distribution or not.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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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