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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer’s report – revised manuscript

The authors made a great effort to revise their paper according to the many comments. Thanks for responding to all of my comments. I think that the manuscript substantially improved. However, I suggest that the authors incorporate some of the relevant explanations and information they provided in the response to the reviewer also into the manuscript. Here are my comments on the revised manuscript.

Minor revisions:

1. Thanks for clarifying the difference between reasons for call and sources of call. I recommend the authors to add the definition provided in the response to the reviewer into the manuscript to clarify it for all readers.

2. Thanks also for the explanation on the assessment of nurse satisfaction, which is clear to me now, but might still be unclear to other readers. Could you please add some information on that aspect in the measurement section, e.g. satisfaction with what?

3. I still think that many of the presented studies in the discussion should have been explained in the introduction, not just by citing them, but by summarizing them in short. Hence, the reader would have a better overview about the state of research from the beginning and the authors could draw back on those studies in the discussion.

4. Concerning comment 21 I am still a bit confused about the term “medical patients”. What exactly is meant by that? Aren’t all patients medical patients?

5. Thank you for responding to my comment on assessing time as a workload indicator (comment nr. 23). I think the idea to assess workload via time spent for patient care during night-shifts in future studies would be worth mentioning in the discussion or conclusion.

6. Thanks for adding a definition of hospitalists in the methods section. However, in the definition the authors still use the term “physician”, although they have stated before that in this study all physicians are residents. Could the authors please clarify that?
7. Wouldn't some of the information the authors provided in their response to comment nr. 15 also be relevant for the discussion section? I think it might be interesting and helpful for understanding the results.

8. I am not sure whether the authors got my point described in comment nr. 18. What I was trying to say was that assessing the residents' responses to calls might not just capture resident workload but rather the residents' patient management, i.e. how patient care is organized. That might be interesting to keep in mind when interpreting the results. Thus, it could be worth mentioning in the discussion section.

Best regards,
Lena Ansmann

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests