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Reviewer's report:

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.

2) The conceptual thinking behind each of the proposed model's components should be spelled out more clearly.

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).

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.

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.
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).

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).

9) Define "authoritative" medical centers (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).

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

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).

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

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

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

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

---

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.

2) Assure all references mentioned in manuscript are included in the reference list.

---

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.
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