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I enjoyed reading this well-written paper that presents interesting findings supportive of the positive impact of various factors, notably team cohesion and involvement in decision making, for the job satisfaction of various groups. Whilst not being a statistical expert, the presentation of statistical analyses appears thorough and competently undertaken. Discussion is succinct and relevant to the findings and conclusions are well made, with study limitations acknowledged.

I would not object to publication of the article without revision, but do have a couple of points to raise that the author(s) may wish to address briefly at their own discretion:

1. Given the emphasis upon team cohesion factors and involvement in decision making, I wonder if the authors may care to contemplate more radical conclusions - that more participatory or democratic organisational forms might be a logical extension of the findings here? Some references from a more general sociology of work, specifically critical authors such as Bauman (perhaps for inclusion at reference point 13), make a case for considering an overall degradation of work/working climate and organisation under neoliberalism (with newer forms of public management) that exacerbate the uncertainties and insecurities commented upon as threats to job satisfaction. Mental health nursing commentators like myself have argued that a democratisation of the workplace presents one possible solution to some of this 'liquid modernity' (see Randall, D. & McKeown, M. (2013) Failure to care: nursing in a state of liquid modernity? Journal of Clinical Nursing, 23: 766-767 and other commentary papers). Such a focus also raises possibilities about service user involvement/co-production that also might be played into more sophisticated democratic forms of work organisation.

2. There is little mention of the possibilities for different views amongst team members on the ontological nature of their work - how is mental health/ill-health understood - socially or medically, for instance. In some of my experience in the UK, this can be a source of inter-disciplinary and intra-disciplinary conflict. In this regard, again, I would be interested in the author(s)' view, even if not figuring in the findings.
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