Author’s response to reviews

Title: The effects of workplace respect and violence on nurses' job satisfaction in Ghana: a cross-sectional survey

Authors:

Isaac Mensah Boafo (imboafo@gmail.com)

Version: 2 Date: 22 Nov 2017

Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: The author has clearly addressed all comments adequately.

Reviewer #2: Overall: All new texts needs to be proof-read. There are typos and repetitive and wordy language.

RESPONSE: The entire manuscript has been proofread and errors corrected

- Introduction:
  o Missing citations p 3 line 52; p 4 line 49
  RESPONSE: Citations have been inserted.
  o This is a cross-sectional study but RQ1 implies causality. Please review the paper to remove any causal language.
  RESPONSE: Language has been revised. Question now reads ‘What is the relationship between workplace respect and violence and nurses’ job satisfaction?’
  o The research questions are presented in a different order than the order of results in the results section.
  RESPONSE: Questions have been re-ordered to reflect the order of presentation of the results
- **Methods:**
  
  - More information about participant recruitment is still needed. How exactly were participants recruited? Were surveys administered online or on paper? Were there incentives for participation?

  **RESPONSE:** Suggested information has been included. See lines 8 and 13 of Sampling - Participants

- **Results**
  
  - A correlation table for all variables would be more useful than the new table presenting only correlations between violence and satisfaction. This would allow the reader to examine things like correlations between the different kinds of violence.

  **RESPONSE:** A new correlation table has been included. See Table 4

  - In the new section on p10, consider moving interpretation to the discussion. Further, the information about cultural practices should be cited (e.g., p 16 line 20-23 and 23-28) as it currently sounds anecdotal

  **RESPONSE:** Interpretation has been removed. Citation has been provided for the cultural practice stated. See reference #77.

- **Discussion**
  
  - The discussion still mentions facets of job satisfaction that have been removed from the methods and results sections

  **RESPONSE:** Rectified

  - Page 15, line 32, remove the word "remarkably" -- this is not as surprising a finding as the word implies.

  **RESPONSE:** Removed
Where did the data about the number of nurses working at the same time come from? This is not mentioned in the methods section or presented in any of the tables.

RESPONSE: Rectified

How can we be sure that the number of nurses working at the same time represents staffing adequacy? It is possible that a small number of nurses working means lower acuity patients with fewer care needs, rather than a high workload.

RESPONSE: The discussion of this issue has been removed as adequate data was not presented on that in the current paper. The multiple regression analysis has also been re-done without this variable, and the results amended accordingly.