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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you to the authors for this paper, and for highlighting a relevant area of work - especially given the limited number of studies in the field of perceived organizational support and moral distress, and nurses serving in Iranian hospital.

Kindly find some suggestion to provide context for the readers (i.e. places where clarification is needed in the text).

---------[Abstract]---------

(1) Please alter wording (pg 1, line 5); "ethically annoying conditions" is a loaded term, I suggest ethically challenging conditions.

(2) Please check the following line (p1, line 14-16), I believe you are referring to P=0.86 and not r=0.86: "Moreover, Statistical analysis showed no significant relationship between perceived organizational support and moral distress (P=0.01, r=0.86)."

---------[Background]---------

(3) Again, please alter wording (pg 1, line 1); "ethically annoying conditions" is a loaded term, I suggest ethically challenging conditions.

---------[Research design]---------

(4) Please fix grammar in Research design paragraph (pg 5, line 10-13), also % sign location is causing confusion (i.e. %10, 120 -> 10,120% or 10%; 120)

---------[Data collection tools]---------

(5) The authors need to specify the key limitation of the tools used. Either in this section, or I suggested a paragraph (sub-section heading) in the Discussions sections that details the overall limitation of the study.
(6) Table 2 on page 7 - please fix capitalisation for one of the variable (e.g. Errors and Total moral distress, should be "r", not R)

(7) Table 3 on page 8 - please fix capitalisation for one of the variable (i.e. Errors, should be "r", not R)

(8) Limitation section: I suggested having a sub-section (limitation in the discussion). For instance, limitations concerning ii) tools used, ii) how the sample mix may have affected the findings, and iii) as well as acknowledging that study was conducted at one point in time.

(9) Please change the terminology in some place (i.e. avoid the use of subject as a term to refer to participants): [pg 5, line 12]; [pg 6, line 16]; and [pg 14, line 12].

(10) The authors detail some of the key demographics connected to the participants (i.e. pg 7, line 2-8). A table with the profile of participants, in addition to the text already in this section, may illustrate to key difference/details to the readers better.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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