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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory revisions

1. Please provide detail on response rates in terms of the sampling frame. That is, were any providers who were randomly selected from either the public or private lists not available for/refused to participate in the survey? The sentence in the Discussion: “In AP and UP, it may also be that those workers for whom remuneration is most important may be more likely to be absent from work in order to pursue other sources of income, particularly in the public sector” suggests that there may have been some number of respondents randomly sampled but unavailable for interview (and, methodologically, what happened if someone was unavailable?). It’s unclear whether the reader should be concerned that the final sample suffers from selection bias or whether that is not likely to be affecting results. If, in fact, response/respondent availability rates were particularly low by any of the provider characteristics highlighted in the study (e.g., AP vs UP, public vs. private, by type of facility), please also comment on how that may affect/bias results.

2. Please provide detail JDI instrument completion rate (i.e., were all questions answered by all respondents?) and how authors treated missing data, if any.

3. Please provide slightly more detail on the logistic regression methodology described in the Methods section as well as how Tables 3 – 5 relate to those models. In terms of detail on the logistic regression methodology, a simple presentation of the estimating equation should be sufficient (I take it that a dummy variable was included to represent public or private providers with the other group omitted?). In terms of how Tables 3 – 5 relate to the logistic models, do “significant differences” refer to the coefficients from the estimating equation?

Minor essential revisions

1. Please clarify construction of the dichotomous discordant variable: does “Important” refer to categories 3 and 4 while “not present” refer to categories 0 – 2? The preceding sentence beginning “We conducted exploratory analysis…” appears to imply this but it’s not entirely clear.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Please briefly state the empirical reliability of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (e.g., provide a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient) both in its previous/original applications and for the current study. Does this reliability differ by State?
2. It would be interesting to know if PCAs stratified by public/private sector providers yielded results similar to those of the pooled analysis presented in the report or exhibit any particularly interesting differences in terms of factors/factor loadings.

3. Was there a theoretical motivation for choosing orthogonal rotation for the factors? If not, are there any qualitative changes to results if an oblique rotation is used instead?

4. Table 1 suggests that inherent differences are likely to exist between public and private providers in each State, particularly in terms of age (i.e., private providers tend to be younger) and position (i.e., private providers more likely to be nurses). While the logistic regression models account for these kind of observable differences, there may be remaining unobservable differences that are not entirely correlated with the observable differences affecting results. Were any matching techniques considered to explore that possibility (e.g., propensity score matching)? If not, this reviewer suggests exploring that possibility so the authors can be reassured about the robustness of their findings.
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