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Reviewer's report:

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)

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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