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We are pleased to resubmit our revised manuscript entitled: “Job satisfaction and turnover intention among Iraqi doctors – a descriptive cross-sectional multi-center study” authored by “Saad Ahmed Ali Jadoo, Syed Mohamed Aljunid, Ilker Dastan, Ruqiya Subhi Tawfeeq, Mustafa Ali Mustafa, Kurubaran Ganasegeran and Sami Abdo Radman AlDubai” for consideration of publication in Human Resources for Health.

We revised our manuscript in light of the last reviewers' comments and we made all possible required changes to format our paper. Please find below our responses listed one by one according to the reviewers’ comments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards
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Response to reviewer (1):

Dear respected reviewer, thank you very much for your extensive and particular review which, really, added a lot to this manuscript.

Reviewer’s comment:

Although the authors have conducted some English language editing, I still believe that the manuscript would benefit from a more careful editing before publication.

Response:

Reviewer’s comment has been taken in consideration. Further English language editing has been done.

Reviewer number (2)

Dear respected reviewer, again we highly appreciate your opinion and your comments to improve the quality of this paper.

Reviewer’s comments:

- Gender also plays a major role here since females with families are usually less mobile and are less able to migrate.

Response:

The reviewer’s comment was taken in consideration:

“This finding could be due to cultural issues such as the traditional gender roles, which attribute achievement and adventurousness of males. These opportunities are culturally less available for females with families who are usually less mobile.
and are less able to migrate or quit their job [22,23,65,69]. Previous studies have found similar results: among Chinese physicians and Lebanese nurses men had a higher likelihood of turnover intentions compared to women [65,22].

- The definition of turnover intention used by the authors which in my view measures intention to migrate rather than intention to quit.

**Response:**

Yes, the reviewer’s comment is right. The statement used to define the turnover intention was *"I'm actively seeking alternative employment"*, adopted from Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth [30]”, and in a thought to put more explanation regarding the Iraqi doctors’ turnover intention the word *abroad* was added just before submission. The statement was also extensively discussed with the first reviewer. So, this statement now is; "*I'm actively seeking alternative employment*". We think it is clearly indicated ‘turnover intention’. In this condition the turnover according to the literature could be internal turnover to different safe places in the country, or to another country. We also referred earlier to this point in the limitation of this study earlier: “There are some limitations to this study. First, we analyzed measured intentions to leave rather than actual turnovers, but actual behavioral measures of the Iraqi doctors may be different from intentional measures”. Hopefully, after this explanation you will concern our view as well. We believe that the peer-review process gives a space for both the reviewer and the authors to discuss and exchange information. Thank you very much for your extensive and particular review which, really, added a lot to this manuscript. We appreciate the time you spent on this paper and the effort you put to improve the quality of this paper.