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Reviewer's report:

Comments on revisions to manuscript

Original comments

1. (point 1) The main issue raised on documentation of the search has been attended to by (a) additional file 1 with full search strategy (b) table 2 with excluded articles. Minor point: The McDonald et al paper did not include Dentists and it, among others, specifically looked at how trust is formed and what improves trust.

2. (point 2 and 3) The clarification of the purpose of the review has been made. This is a major shift in purpose as it now shifted from “evaluating and synthesising the links” to “whether workplace trust is identified as a () factor. In addition the review will elucidate “if and how the four trust relationships () are found to influence motivation”. The former is a mapping exercise, but the latter is the more interesting and useful aspect (more about that later).

The methods are now aligned to the purpose of the review, by taking out thematic analysis.

3. (point 4) Ok, yes limitations have been stated.

Discretionary revisions

1. Ok, accepted, given revised purpose.
2. Ok it is now clear, in additional file 1.
3. Revisions accepted
4. See comments later
5. Ok
6. Though the purpose has changed it still required more interpretation. See additional comments.

Additional comments

1. Is there a way to identify and separate “key influences” of trust by seeking antecedents to trust versus antecedents to motivation and direct and indirect paths. Let me illustrate. Resources for work are well known factors for extrinsic motivation. Poor resources lead to “mistrust” by HWs of the organization and “mistrust” of HWs by the patient (and community) that leads to poor motivation of the HWs. The first is a direct relationship and the next an indirect one. This is
the stuff (elicited by qualitative reviews) that lead to useful hypotheses for testing mediation and moderation effects.

2. In the discussion section one expects the findings of a study to be placed in context of what is already known. Much of this knowledge is in the OB literature. This is not well done. Here are some examples for consideration.

(a) One of the well described constructs of trust of organizations by workers is “perceived organisational support -POS“ [Eisenberger]. Therefore some aspects of trust of supervisors and management is indirectly trust of the organization.

(b) In a few places “autonomy” as an antecedent for motivation was mentioned. Autonomy is a known factor for intrinsic motivation [Hackman & Oldham]. Trust and autonomy have circular relationships as shown in some of the papers reviewed.

(c) In both sections” trust with supervisors and managers “ and “trust with the organization” the cause of breakdown is clearly a well-researched construct in OB literature “ procedural justice”

3. Minor issue : the reference list in the revision stops at 68. Bu the manuscript still refers to articles 71 and 72? (sloppy work!).
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