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The data presented in table 1 en 2 are in my view not so surprising. Are these the so called unique 'idiosyncratic nurses' specifications on rewarding in hospitals', as you mention on p. 6? Nurses in rest or nursing homes or semi professionals in the broader social profit sector perceive perhaps the same? Maybe it is useful to include a critical note on this.

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests' below