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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.

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 by 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

Background:

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

Results:

A double comma (page 11) should be corrected

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.

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.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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