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This reviewer has reviewed the article entitled "Influence of nurse and midwife managerial leadership styles on job satisfaction, intention to stay, and services provision in selected hospitals of Rwanda" with much enthusiasm and scientific interest. The authors conducted a cross sectional study with the objective of discerning the leadership styles of nurse/midwife managers and to assess if the leadership styles of managers influence job satisfaction, intention to stay and quality of healthcare services provided to patient by their direct reports. The design of the study, and application of statistical techniques are valid and correct; however, there several relative minor issues that the authors should respond before this manuscript should be considered for publication.

Concerns

The sub-heading Study Population and Sample Size
The authors have stated "Using this total population of nurses and midwives as the total population and alpha level of 0.05, the sample size was calculated using the Taro Yamane simplified samples size scientific formula cognizant the we had a finite population." This reviewer believes that it is important to report the population size (N), or at least an estimate of the total population size (in this study, the population of nurses and midwives of the five hospitals studied).

Line 150 through 153
Per understanding of this reviewer, the authors seem to contradict their strategy for sampling of the prospective study participants. The paragraph starts with the statement "A multistage sampling strategy to recruit the study participants was used and each of the five hospitals was given a proportional quota based on their nursing and midwifery staff population." This statement is followed by "In each of the five hospitals of the study, a convenience sampling strategy was used to recruit participants meeting the inclusion criteria and consented to participate in the study." These two statements by the authors is very confusing; the authors must explain clearly the sampling strategy of their study participants, was their strategy based on multistage modeling or simply a convenient sampling strategy?
Also, the authors should provide a brief explanation about proportional quota that was based on the nursing and midwifery staff population.
Line 154-155
This piece of information belongs to the Result section.

Under the subheading data collection instrument
Lines 171-173
The authors have stated "To ensure the reliability of the instrument, a pre-test of the research instrument was performed with 10 nurses or midwives in a different hospital, to identify and modify any areas of misunderstanding in the instrument."
This reviewer, per her understanding of the statement above, believe that the authors assessed the validity of their instrument.
Reliability is about the consistency of a measure, while validity is about accuracy of a measure. Per the statement of the authors, they assessed validity not reliability of their instrument.

Line 239: This line belong to the Discussion section of the manuscript. Not the result.
Lines 255-257: Same as above, this is an interpretation of the findings; therefore, this statement belongs to the Discussion section of the article.
Lines 260-261: Same as above.

This manuscript can benefit from editing by an English speaking technical writer.
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