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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript "Predictors of burnout, work engagement and nurse reported job outcomes and quality of care: Retesting models as sensitizing concepts."

This manuscript is well written and the topic is relevant to current issues in nursing. The abstract provides a clear overview of the combined quantitative and qualitative research study, sample population, method, findings, and recommendations. The purpose of this mixed-method study is threefold. The authors' discuss the first purpose is to retest two structural equation models exploring associations between practice environment, and work characteristics as predictors of burnout and engagement as well as nurse-reported job outcome and quality of care. The second purpose is to study staff nurses' and nurse managers' perceptions and experiences of staff nurses' workload. The third purpose is to integrate these two study insights by using studied models as a sensitising concept. The manuscript follows a logical manner. The authors' mention briefly the lack of theoretical frameworks. A literature review was not specifically mentioned in the manuscript, however the authors' discuss multiple studies relating to each topic throughout the manuscript. The manuscript title is wordy, however the title of the manuscript is intriguing. The sample size for the cross-sectional research study includes a large sample size of 751 participants. The sample size for the qualitative research study is small that size included 9 staff nurses and 10 nurse managers. The research design was clearly identified as a mixed method cross-sectional survey design that includes both qualitative and quantitative data. The authors' refer to the two models that were carefully developed and previously tested in numerous studies regarding validity, reliability, and consistency. The authors' discuss the qualitative portion of the study that relates to credibility and confirmability through the use of the two investigators who independently coded the interviews and developed a codebook in consensus. The authors' used the Statistical software version 22.0 and AMOS version 22.0 software for descriptive analyses and computation of Cronbach's alphas and correlation coefficients. The authors' discuss limitations to include the models were based on a cross-sectional study design and should be interpreted with caution. A second limitation includes the qualitative study was conducted at one of the two hospitals. A third limitation includes the study methods were based on nurses perceptions and experiences. The authors' recommend the need for additional need for research. The fourth limitation includes the authors' including the need to replicate the study to support generalizability. This reviewer verified the articles that were not cross referenced or checked to included 16 out of the 64 articles referenced by the authors'.
Suggestions - Perhaps the authors' can answer the following questions:

1) The authors' qualifications are not clear in the manuscript.

2) The authors' refer to two previously tested models with a link in the manuscript, however this reviewer was unable to open the link to review this. This reviewer suggests including a brief overview of the previously tested models for future audiences that are unable to open the link.

3) The authors' briefly mention ethical considerations at the end of the article. This reviewer suggests mentioning ethical considerations earlier in the manuscript rather than at the end of the manuscript.

4) Is it necessary for all 64 references need to be included?

5) The number of articles not cross-referenced or checked included 16 out of the 64 articles referenced by the authors'.

6) Of the 64 references listed - 37 references were older than 5 years (including 2010, now that we are in 2016).

7) This reviewer noticed the references are NOT in APA 6th edition, which made it difficult to research the articles.

8) Reference # 7 is not in the correct reference format

9) Reference # 25 is not in the correct reference format

10) Reference # 28 is not in the correct reference format

11) Reference # 40 is not in the correct reference format

12) Figure 1a. Model 1 - is confusing to this reviewer - perhaps the authors' can develop a model that is less confusing?
13) Figure 1b. Model 2 - is confusing to this reviewer - perhaps the authors' can develop a model that is less confusing?
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