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Author's response to reviews: see over
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 entitled “What is the working situation and satisfaction of medical staff in pilot county hospitals and their understanding and perception of the reform: A study of public hospital reform in Hubei province of China” (MS: 1867767246976415). 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 working situation and satisfaction of medical staff in pilot county hospitals and their understanding and perception of the reform: A study of public hospital reform 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 two reviewers’ comments:

Reviewer #1 (Reviewer: Edson Araujo)

1. Comment:
Writing style: the text does not flow as expected and some terms could be changed to be aligned to the HRH literature (for example, “job satisfaction” instead of “working satisfaction” – there are
other examples throughout the text)
Response:
It is really true as Reviewer raised the question that some terms could be changed to be aligned to the HRH literature. We have made many corrections according to this comment, for examples, use “job satisfaction” instead of “working satisfaction”, “compensation packages” instead of “pay packets”, “gender” instead of “sex”, “educational background” instead of “educational qualifications”, “years in professional working experience” instead of “work seniority”, “position” instead of “post”, “professional title” instead of “title”. We also have made lots of language corrections to improve the text writing.

2. Comment:
Statistical analysis: it has improved significantly from previous version of the paper, though it still not “publishable”. In the regression analysis, why not include socio-demographic characteristics of medical staff? They may affect they job satisfaction. Additionally, job characteristics such as time in the position, experience, specialty, and etc., they all may have influence on job satisfaction.
Response:
It is a good suggestion that we should include sociodemographic characteristics and job characteristics of medical staff in the regression analysis. We re-did the regression analysis and included sociodemographic characteristics (gender, age, educational background), job characteristics (position, professional title, years in professional working experience, the number of hours spent at work everyday, the degree of work stress) and satisfaction on work-related aspects in the regression.

3. Comment:
Finally, some of the findings/conclusions are very much similar to other studies on HRH (importance of management and training opportunities, remuneration, etc.), in this sense it would be good to draw a parallel or at least mention earlier literature on HRH job satisfaction and motivation, it would strengthen the paper and highlights the peculiarities from Chinese hospital health reform that informs the general HRH literature.
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and great helpful. Some of the findings in our study are really much similar to other studies on HRH. In this sense, we mentioned some earlier literature on HRH job satisfaction and motivation and drew a parallel.
Reviewer #2 (Reviewer: Gerard Schmets)

1. Comment:
In the Abstract’s background, I presume that the purpose of the survey is to assess and not “increase” the staff’s work satisfaction and activeness in the reform.

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. The purpose of the survey is to assess the staff’s job satisfaction and activeness in the reform. So we modified “increase” into “assess” in the Abstract’s background.

2. Comment:
The Abstract’s results summary paragraph is key, but unfortunately does not reflect well the discussion chapter of the paper (that has substantially improved)

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We revised the Abstract’s results and improved it for a better reflection of discussion chapter of the paper.

3. Comment:
Clarification: in the subchapter “The Understanding and Perspective of Public Hospital Reform of Medical Staff in Pilot and Non-pilot County Hospitals”, it is said that “In pilot county hospitals, only 6.27% of investigated medical staff thought that the reform could have obvious effects solving the difficulty in accessibility of medical service…” and “Only 7.25% of investigated medical staff thought that the reform could have obvious effects solving the difficulty in affordability of medical service”. Question: are the 6.27 and 7.25% expressed as % of total investigated staff, or % of only those investigated staff who expressed that they know a lot or some about the reform (35.92% of staff). Important to clarify.

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We clarify that the 6.27% and 7.25% expressed as % of the total investigated staff.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.