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Author's response to reviews (1712625865157250 _comment) :

General
The focus of the study on the impact of role stress and job satisfaction on organizational commitment is a potentially interesting one that would add to the body of literature that exists concerning this issue.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Additional clarification is needed concerning how job rotation was measured in this study. This is described as a major dimension of the work at the outset of the paper, but then is not discussed in detail later or in the analysis sections.
   Additional clarification is now described on page 27 (Table 1).

2. The conceptual thinking behind each of the proposed model's components should be spelled out more clearly.
   The conceptual thinking behind each of the proposed model's components is now described on page 27 (Table 1) and Literature Review.

3. Refer the reader to the items for the scales developed to measure constructs. Because the authors (apparently) did not use existing scales to measure organizational commitment and job satisfaction, provide information about the content included in the investigator developed scales and how these items were identified. NOTE: An examination of some of the items used in the scale for job satisfaction suggest these do not measure satisfaction, per se (e.g., I am competent to do my present job [measures skill or possibly self-efficacy]; I get along well with my colleagues).
   The conceptual thinking behind each of the proposed model's components is now described on page 27 (Table 1) and an examination of reliability & validity analysis are also described on page 28-31 (Table 2-4).

4. The authors' description of organizational commitment is a bit confused. They present organizational commitment as one construct, when most authors (including some they have identified in their paper) describe it as three (or two). This discussion needs to be revised for accuracy.
   This discussion is now described on page 27 (Table 1).

5. Page 6, the authors talk about the dimensions of role stress that were mentioned in Piko (2006), which is not the primary source. The Rosenthal (1964) citation is
presumably the original source, but it is not in the reference list. This section needs attention.

6. The logical progression of ideas throughout the manuscript is a concern. Revision is needed concerning flow of ideas and how the components of the investigators' model were identified, defined and measured.

   Additional clarification is now described on page 27 (Table 1).

7. The use of the term "motive" to describe a research aim is unusual. The authors may wish to select more common research terminology (page 9 and elsewhere).

   We have clarified this on page 10 and elsewhere.

8. The hypotheses statements are a bit confusing. This may be the result of the English language problems that appear throughout the manuscript. But, the statements about mediating effects on their job rotation and organizational commitment may be better expressed as between (page 10).

   We have clarified this by consulting an English language specialist for help with the language and grammar.

9. Define "authoritative" medical centers (page 10).

   We have clarified this on page 10.

10. Discuss the focus of the measures in the questionnaire rather than the "nursing personnel directly fill(ing) ...the independent variable and dependent variable sections" (page 10).

    This discussion is now described on page 27 (Table 1), page 11, and page 12.

11. Clarify what is meant by "a concealed approach, not revealing the variables of every aspect" (page 11).

    We have clarified this on page 11, page 12, and page 13.

12. The authors state that "all the question items reached Cronbach's alpha". Generally, this computation refers to the items collectively measuring a consistent theme. Some work is needed here to make this more clear (page 11).

    We have clarified this on page 11, page 12, and page 13.

13. Clarify what factors were used in the construct discriminat validity testing (page 11).

    We have clarified this on Table 3 and Table 4.

14. The section on convergent validity is very difficult to follow (page 11).

    We have clarified this in Table 3 & Table 4.

15. How are internal and external satisfaction defined (page 12)?

    Additional clarification is now described on page 27 (Table 1).

16. Assistance with grammar is needed throughout to assure that ideas and
information presented is understandable to the reader.

We have consulted an English language specialist for help with the language and grammar.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. Place each table and figure on a separate page.
   We have revised each table and figure.
2. Assure all references mentioned in manuscript are included in the reference list.
   We have examined.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next? : Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

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

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited.

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.
Reviewer: Louise Barriball

Author’s response to reviews (1856888492166868 _comment):

General
This paper is interesting and focuses on an important area of nurse employment and merits publication following revision.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached).

1. The definition of role stress needs greater clarity as the approach used is not universally accepted (e.g. in other research role stress has been treated as a separate construct to, for example, role ambiguity and role conflict). Additionally, it is not clear whether the literature drawn on (see p8) to illustrate the relationship between role stress, organizational commitment and job satisfaction adopt the same definition of role stress as in this study.
   
   We have clarified this on page 27 (Table 1).

2. As the paper progresses role ambiguity is interchanged with role stress. However, you make it clear in your review that role ambiguity is one component of role stress. More care needs to be taken.
   
   We have clarified this on page 27 (Table 1).

3. It is clear from the review of the literature that job rotation can be variously defined. However, it is not clear from your analysis what type of job rotation participants were involved in or indeed whether all participants had job rotation. For health service management it would be helpful if type of rotation was clarified as this may be used to inform policy decisions.
   
   We have clarified this on page 27 (Table 1) & page 11.

4. In the conceptual framework job satisfaction is depicted as a possible outcome of job rotation but in the findings job satisfaction is reported as having a mediating effect on job rotation - this needs greater clarification.
   
   We have clarified this in Figure 1.

5. Additionally, in the review of literature the indication is that role stress affects job satisfaction but in your diagram of the framework based on the literature (figure 1) role stress is depicted as a consequence of job satisfaction - this is confusing.
   
   We have clarified this in Figure 1 and Literature Review.

6. Need to be careful about laying claims to the importance of the findings in
relation to reduced burnout, turnover etc as these were not tested for. This occurs both in the literature review and discussion.

We have clarified this in the literature review and discussion.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct).

1. Need to check script for minor errors e.g. efforts is used where it should be effort (not plural) and on one or two occasions patient is used where I think you are referring to participants.

We have revised and examined all the manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable.

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

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.