Reviewer's report

Title: The Impact of Economic and Noneconomic Hospital-Physician Exchange on Customer-Oriented Behavior of Physicians and the Moderating Effects of Professional and Organizational Identification: A Cross-sectional Study.

Version: 1
Date: 7 July 2014

Reviewer: Domenico Salvatore

Reviewer's report:

Dear Author, dear Editors,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript “The Impact of Economic and Noneconomic Hospital-Physician Exchange on Customer-Oriented Behavior of Physicians and the Moderating Effects of Professional and Organizational Identification: A Cross-sectional Study.”

It is an interesting article that, in my opinion, could be further improved:

1. By developing more the theoretical argument (or by simplifying it). I would explain more clearly and discuss more in details the reasons why organizational identification and professional identification should have a relationship with Customer-Oriented Behavior and the reasons why this relationship should not be direct but the moderation described in research question 3 and 4. It is important that these theoretical reasons are explained. Another way to address this issue would be to delete organizational and professional identification from the model (and the article).

2. By showing the discriminant validity of the measurement model. For example, the authors could report a confirmatory factor analysis.

3. By reporting more details on the regressions in table 3. At least the estimates of control variables and intercept, the number of observations and the overall model fit.

4. By writing a paragraph on the implications for practice of the study findings.

I would also suggest the following minor revisions:

5. In the abstract the authors wrote that the study was conducted on 761 physicians. Although correct, this information in the abstract may be misleading the reader. The final sample consisted of 130 physicians.

6. In the manuscript there are many acronyms and it is difficult to remember all of them. Maybe authors could spell out at least those used less often.

7. Among the limitations of the study, authors should also discuss common method variance.
Best regards,
Domenico

**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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