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Cover letter

Responses to comments and suggestions of journal editor and reviewer

Dear Ms Flory Mae Calumpita

Thank you for your email dated 21/11/2012 with reviewer’s comments and suggestions for further improvement of our manuscript. Based on these comments and suggestions, we made respective changes (highlighted sentences) in the new version of manuscript for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

On behalf of the authors

PHAM NGUYEN HA

--------
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Reviewer's report

Title: Perceptions and factors influencing job satisfaction of health workers working on AIDS response in Vietnam: a qualitative study

Version: 3 Date: 19 November 2012

Reviewer: Nils Gunnar Songstad

Reviewer's report: The manuscript has improved a lot, and I think it is ready to be published. Let me however suggest one minor essential revision and a few discretionary revisions.
**Minor Essential Revisions**

The revised manuscript uses the term ‘hygienic’ factors. Isn’t ‘hygiene’ factors a better term to use? A quick search in Google clearly shows the phrase commonly used, i.e. hygiene factors. The manuscript under revision shouldn't introduce a new concept unless it is clearly discussed how this differs from the original concept.

*Our response: We replaced the word Hygienic with the word Hygiene in page 20 and page 22 of the revised manuscript.*

**Discretionary Revisions**

Abstract:

The Conclusion section could be stated clearer. The sentence “This study demonstrates that the job satisfaction of health workers working on the AIDS response in Vietnam is influenced by factors that have been included in theories and models of job satisfaction” could be replaced by a much firmer statement on the implications of the findings of the study. Don’t waste the very valuable space in the Conclusion part of the Abstract on a sentence offering nothing new to the readers. What is stated in the sentence goes without saying. Use this section for concluding and being assertive about your findings! The Conclusion in the paper itself offers many points that that could be used in the abstract.

*Our response: We deleted the sentence as suggested by reviewer and we revised the whole Conclusion in the abstract using some sentences in the Conclusion in the paper (highlighted sentences) as follows:*

“This study confirmed the relationship between stigmatization of PLHIV and stigma experienced by staff because of association with PLHIV from families, colleagues, and society. The experiencing stigma results in additional work-related stress, low self-esteem, poor views of their profession, and lower income. The study shows the importance of actions to improve staff job satisfaction such as pay raises, supportive supervision, stress management, stigma reduction and workplace safety. Immediate actions could be the provision of more information, education and
communication in mass media to improve the public image of AIDS services, as well as improvement of work safety, therefore making health workers feel that their work is valued and safe”

Background: The word massage (page 5) should probably be message?

*Our response: We replaced the word Massage (page 5) with Message.*

Results: A double comma (page 11) should be corrected

*Our response: We deleted one comma (page 11)*

Discussion: On page 19 the authors refer to my paper based on my (reference 26) research in Tanzania. It is further stated that “The participants in their study were concerned that people in the same jobs earned more money because they were involved in projects that were funded by international organizations.” Please allow me to suggest a revision of this statement. The informants in my study were very concerned about differences in salary level and in particular allowances. The background for this was national and local policies and their implementation and not so much funding by international organizations.

*Our response: We would like to clarify that the statement the reviewer has mentioned, actually intended to refer to opinions of the participants in our study in Vietnam. Thus, we added the words “The participants in the present study...” as follows:*

“The participants in the present study were concerned that people in the same job earned more money because they were involved in projects that were funded by international organizations”

The reviewer suggests that the sub-heading ‘Summing up’ is rephrased. A better sub-heading could be one that indicates the tentative conclusions the authors want to present at the end of the Discussion section.

*Our response: We rephrased the sub-heading ‘Summing up’ with ‘Stigma as a main dissatisfaction factor’ because our study discovered that stigma is the factor which has strongest impacts on the staff. The experiencing stigma leads to increasing work-related stress, low-self-esteem and thus has negative impact on job satisfaction.*