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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-depth 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 following is a point-to-point response to the three reviewers’ comments:

**Reviewer #1(Reviewer: Edson Araujo)**

1. Comment:

As noted before, page 5 refers to studies already conducted. From this version we know there are “few”, but would be good to cite them and, more important, to know how this paper add from the
previous ones
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have cited some studies already conducted, and we have added the content of how this paper adds from the previous.

2. Comment:
Page 8, first paragraph: please note the outcome of interest in the logistic regression should be 1 “satisfied” (very satisfied, satisfied, moderate) and 0 “otherwise” (dissatisfied, very dissatisfied);
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have revised as the Reviewer mentioned.

3. Comment:
I didn’t find an explanation on how place of work was controlled in the regression analysis, different regressions, dummy (not in tables 4 and 5);
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have added the factor of working place in Pearson chi-square statistical analysis and explained why the factor of working place was not controlled in the regression analysis.

4. Comment:
In relation to salary levels: is it possible to have the actual figures to compare China with international situation and within country hospitals? If salary levels are basically the same one would assume that dissatisfaction with salary is widely issue for medical staff in Chinese hospitals, is that true? It would be good to have few words on this;
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We can’t get the specific and actual figures to compare China with international situation. But we have made some explanations about the salary level of medical staff in Chinese hospitals.

5. Comment:
Conclusions: the first paragraph needs editing: for instance the text did not identified which group in the analysis is the “non-county hospitals” (see below): “The medical staff members in pilot county hospitals were exposed to work stress at a higher extent but exhibited more satisfaction on current job, performance appraisal system, concern showed by leaders, hospital management, and
compensation packages than those in pilot county hospitals.”

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We are sorry for this mistake. We have revised the first paragraph of conclusion part as the Reviewer mentioned.

6. Comment:
The suggestions for improvements seem quite general: “demand of medical staff” (which ones, anything particularly important was identified?); “arrange human resources” (sounds too general); “reduce…work stress appropriately” (how?) and “improve their income reasonably” (for how much?). I wonder if there is anything on the data, or from the international experience, that can inform policy makers in China on how to achieve these objectives;

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have improved the suggestions as the Reviewer mentioned.

7. Comment:
The above can be said for the suggestions to improve “understanding and perception of the reform”, the proposal sounds too general (not specific interventions).

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have improved the proposal as the Reviewer mentioned.

8. Comment:
Abstract: the “conclusion” part needs to be re-written, particularly the last sentence;

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have re-written the conclusion in abstract as the Reviewer mentioned.

9. Comment:
Page 5, last paragraph: it needs some editing, for instance the sentence starting with “furthermore, this study…” needs to be re-written;

Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have re-written the paragraph as the Reviewer mentioned.

10. Comment:
When authors refer to “working situation” I understand this means working conditions, could be more explicit on what this means and how was measured?
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have made an explanation about what “working situation” means and how was measured.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

**Reviewer #2 (Reviewer: Gerard Schmets)**

1. Comment:
The paper should be shortened
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have tried our best to make the paper shorter.

2. Comment:
The results as presented are confusing. Some paragraphs seem to contradict others. The results should be presented in a very clear way, comparing pilot with non pilot in a simple table. The conclusions and recommendations should be based on this table and presented in the form of bullet points.
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and great helpful. We have made some improvement in the results part and make it clearer. We also have made some improvement in the conclusions part as the Reviewer suggested.

3. Comment:
The confusion may be due to issues of translation in English
Response:
What the Reviewer commented is very good and reasonable. We have improved the translation in English of this paper.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.
Reviewer #3 (Reviewer: Mike Counte)

1. Comment:
No additional revisions are suggested.

Response:
Special thanks to you for your good comments.