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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The variables – and especially the dependent variable (COBSB) - should be better explained.
   There are two issues here.
   One is that the influence of the two main independent variables (DJ and POS) are obviously different across the three components of COBSB, but the authors never define what are exactly these three COBSB components.
   Another issue is that I suspect some potential endogeneity or multicollinearity here. For instance, there may be some multicollinearity between POS and OI. More elaborated descriptions of the variables would help dispelling these concerns.

2. We need some guarantees regarding the “convenience sample”.
   It is a bit worrying that not much data is provided on the sample. We know this is a “convenience sample”, but how representative is this ? More precisely, are the demographic characteristics in the sample (age, tenure, gender… to stick to the most basic ones) consistent with those for the overall population of self-employed doctors working in hospitals ? The authors should make an effort to collect data for performing this very basic check.

3. There is a complete lack of details regarding the context.
   Are these self-employed doctors the only category in hospitals (no salaried doctors ?) ? If not, what are the other categories ? What are the numbers here ?
   It would be interesting to also have some basic description of the typical financial / legal arrangements between these doctors and their hospital.
   Why these doctors chose to work (I guess part time) in a hospital ? How much do they earn for these hospital practice ? Do they have other sources of revenues ?
   Are they different from other hospital doctors, in terms of education, specialization… ?
   Without these details, it is very difficult to assess whether the authors asked the right questions. It is even more difficult to interpret their results.
Minor Essential Revisions
N/A

Discretionary Revisions

4. The authors should acknowledge alternative paths of research on the issue of professional/organizational identification.

The authors have chosen a highly quantitative (and – I must say - rather dry) to explore this key issue of identification and performance among hospital doctors. I do not have a comprehensive knowledge of this approach, but most of the papers I have read on it (when applied to hospitals) are not very convincing. A mixed-method approach (including qualitative surveys) is – in my view – much more promising (see for instance Pratt 2006). Could the authors acknowledge these alternative approaches?

Building on previous comments, it seems the approach proposed by the authors could have been applied to any setting (hospital or not). I do not think we are ready for such a “size fits all” approach. For instance, as documented by many authors, a major motivation driver for doctors is the ability (provided by the institution they work for) to “enact” their professional skills and competence. How is this captured in the proposed approach? In the POS variable? But, from the paper, we do not much about its content.
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