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Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We would like to thank the editor for giving us a chance to resubmit the paper, and thank the reviewers for their careful reading and giving us comments and constructive suggestions concerning our manuscript. Those comments and suggestions are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. Here we submit a new version of our manuscript with the title “What is the job satisfaction and active participation of medical staff in public hospital reform: A study in Hubei province of China”, which has been modified according to the reviewers’ suggestions. We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made many changes, in-deep editing and revisions including the contents and the language. We marked the main changes made in blue in the revised manuscript. We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely yours

Zhenni Luo, Pengqian Fang

The flowing is a point-to-point response to the three reviewers’ comments:

Reviewer #5 (Reviewer: Kaja Polluste)
1. Comment:

More information about the questionnaire should be provided. Was the used questionnaire originally developed for the study? How was the validity and reliability of the questionnaire tested?

Response:

What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have provided more information about the questionnaire. Adapting the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire based on the actual situation of medical staff members of county hospitals in China, this study formulated questionnaire and its index system through questionnaire investigation, literature survey and Delphi expert consultation. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: Part1 socio-demographic information, Part2 working situation and satisfaction, and Part3 understanding and perception of the reform. Through reliability statistics, the Cronbach's Alpha is 0.913.

2. Comment:

It is not clear why the regression analysis was performed only for the pilot hospitals, but not for the non-pilot hospitals? Are the factors having an influence on job satisfaction in pilot hospitals different compared to the non-pilot hospitals?

Response:

What the Reviewer commented is reasonable. The regression analysis was performed only for the pilot hospitals because of two reasons. First, the main research subject of this study is the pilot county hospitals. Second, considering of word limit of manuscript.

3. Comment:

Possible limits of the study should be discussed.

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have added the content of possible limitations. In this study, there were three possible limitations. First, the cross-section design with job satisfaction. It was difficult to establish causal conclusion and the longitudinal survey might be carried out to confirm the causal conclusion in our future study. Second, the measurements were performed by self-administrated method. Then, it is possible that the respondents might have over-reported or under-reported their level of job satisfaction and satisfaction on work-related factors, understanding and perception of the reform. Third, given that the study was conducted only in counties of Hubei province, the findings of the study may or may not be generalized to medical staff working in other areas in China.

4. Comment:
Table 3 - percentage of persons very satisfied with satisfaction on performance appraisal system is missing.

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We are sorry for this mistake. We have added this percentage in Table3.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

Reviewer #6  (Reviewer: Ana Maria Malik)

1. Comment:
What is missing, from what I could understand, is the explanation about what are pilot hospitals,
how they were chosen and what are their differences or similarities with other hospitals from the country.

Response:

What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have added the explanation about pilot county hospitals. China's Ministry of Health selected 311 county hospitals on a national scale as pilot hospitals and 20 of the 311 are located in Hubei province. These 311 pilot county hospitals must take the lead to carry out the measures and contents of public hospitals reform. While, the rest county hospitals could remain original.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

**Reviewer #7  (Reviewer: Sandra Cole)**

1. Comment:

It is not entirely clear to me where the job pressure is coming from. Under the new reforms, do the staff members have to see vastly more patients/day?

Response:

What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. The job pressure of medical staff members come from the increasing number of patients, higher requirements for technical level and comprehensive quality of medical staff, reform measures of hospital administration system caused by public hospital reform. Because of the health from, basic social health insurance system has been improved, medical cost and expenses has been reasonable controlled. The medical demand of population is released and medical staff members would see more patients/day.
2. Comment:
I am not sure what role 'active participation' plays. Does this mean that the participants do their jobs?

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. 'active participation' means the medical staff participate actively in the hospital reform and implement reform measure proactively.

3. Comment:
It would have been helpful to have a definition of the concept of pilot and non-pilot hospitals.

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have added the explanation about pilot county hospitals. China's Ministry of Health selected 311 county hospitals on a national scale as pilot hospitals and 20 of the 311 are located in Hubei province. These 311 pilot county hospitals must take the lead to carry out the measures and contents of public hospitals reform. While, the rest county hospitals could remain original.

4. Comment:
Having said that, why does the author try to persuade us to see his point (page 12) by mentioning the workers complaints in Ghana and other locations?

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We did literature review to prove that the complaints of medical staff are international problems and they worth of attention.
5. Comment:
The authors indicated that confidentiality was assured however did not indicate how
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have added that the privacy of the
investigated medical staff was strictly protected by filling in the questionnaires anonymously.

6. Comment:
On page 7, I would not say: 3, moderate (not too badly) but would say moderate/acceptable. I would
note the edition of the SPSS that was used. I would spell out hours rather than noting h throughout.
On page 11, I noticed that there are only two categories of job satisfaction: light pressure or slight
pressure then jumps to great pressure. There is a huge difference between light or slight and great.
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have revised these details as the
reviewer mentioned.

7. Comment:
Spelling and grammar/writing: p. 4: comma after and on line 10 and again line 17. On page 11, I
would say in line 8 and throughout: medical staff who were satisfied rather than was. Discussion on
page 12 should be to a higher extent rather than at. Line 14 on page 13: …system, to demonstrate
more concern for their staff, and to increase…. Use sufficient rather than enough on line 18. Page
18, line 6: use ‘utilizing’ rather than by multiple forms… Line 11, say the findings of the study may
or may not be generalized to the medical staff working… Line 17 of page 18, say experienced
rather than ‘got’.
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have revised these details as the reviewer mentioned.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.