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Reviewer’s report:


My recommendation is major revision and reconsideration

The paper deals with an important topic but should be subject to a major revision before a final evaluation can be carried out.

Major Compulsory Revisions

The Abstract corresponds poorly with manuscript. First, in the Abstract no good rational for why the study is considered necessary is revealed but later this is taken care of in the body text, i.e. that there is a need for culturally adapted scales for developed and developing countries. Moreover, the Abstract does not reveal how the participants were selected and the attrition rate and the rough internal distribution of the various professional groups. Neither is the statistical methodology described even though all this information is included in the body text of the manuscript. Hence, the Abstract should be completely rewritten.

The Introduction could be more condensed and focused. Moreover, on page 5 the authors write ‘Studies in Africa have been primarily qualitative [23] and have generally emphasized the determinants of motivation [24]. The reference number 23 deals with North Vietnam and reference number 24 cannot be considered being a review so actually this sentence is poorly substantiated by cited studies. Additionally the stages from stage 1 to 4 of Figure 1 are not detailed enough described and as a reader it is impossible to know how one has ended up in the various developmental stages.

More details about the QUARITÉ data should be delivered although I realize that the references cited are expected to take care about this but anyhow even this manuscript should comprise more details on the data and especially the potential selection that has taken place during the recruitment for the study as well as the internal distribution between various professional groups in the data should be given.

The description of the statistical method on page 8 ‘The discriminant validity between the different dimensions is demonstrated if the correlation coefficient is less than one minus two times the standard error of their correlation coefficient’ should be substantiated by some citation.
How do the authors comment upon the extremely high participation rate 97.7%?

Minor Essential Revisions
Although well known the abbreviations RMSEA, CFI and ICC should be explained.
Although the English in general is of quite good quality the paper would benefit from additional language editing.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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

Declaration of competing interests:
No competing interests