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Reviewer's report:

1. Major Compulsory Revisions

The case study is interesting, easy to read and methodologically sound – though the sample size is rather small. My main concern is with the two figures (Fig. 1 and Figure 2) that are used to depict the two frameworks. The differences between the original and the revised conceptual framework - in terms of the impact factors or components that drive/inform dual practice are neither clear nor properly explained. I found the two diagrams confusing with some of the same factors being presented in each diagram, with evidence-laced (from interviews and literature) but poorly explained distinctions in terms of their influence on intent to stay.

Clearly, there is need for more empirical evidence to understand this relationship – as this is a major gap in the literature thus far. But while the case study methodology and the conceptual framework make a bold and potentially useful attempt to construct a reliable frame of analysis to bridge the current gap between theoretical frameworks (and their predictions) and empirical evidence in the literature on this topic, and the wider job satisfaction and retention inquiry approaches, the resulting revised framework falls rather short.

The results of the study also tend to point towards a number of policy implications that warrant further discussion - and these need to be highlighted in the Conclusion section – examples include differences in job characteristics (in public and private settings); the allocation of time between sectors and how this is regulated or not; or even the ability of the private and public sector markets to reward performance as factors that can potentially influence “stay/leave” decisions. I think the way these two markets function, especially in South Africa, is an important issue that can inform any case study on moonlighting.

2. Minor Essential Revisions

The article contains many run-on sentences in multiple places, which of course can be fixed easily with good copy editing.

3. Discretionary Revisions

None.
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.
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