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Reviewer's report:

TITLE

Nurses' job satisfaction in Ghana: the neglected roles of respect and workplace violence

I don't think the use of 'neglected roles' is the best descriptor. One reason is that roles here may be confused with 'jobs' as opposed to their intended meaning: 'effects'. Additionally, there is no evidence that these effects are 'neglected'. They simply haven't been researched before. Isn't 'respect' here also related to workplace respect? Your study doesn't explore the issue of respect in the personal lives of the nurses so in this case it's 'workplace respect and violence'. The HRH journal submission guidelines also recommend author to include the study design in the title as well.

So I propose the author consider a review of the title. One title suggestion could be,

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

ABSTRACT

Background: I suggest that in the Background section of the abstract, the author briefly describe the rationale for the study (one sentence). At first glance, the first question that came to mind when reading the Background was, 'so why do this study?' The first sentence also clearly states that there is indeed evidence linking workplace violence and respect to negative outcomes, making it even more important to justify the study. Also, it is not clear what this existing evidence is about? Is it on health professionals? Is it more about the general workforce? It would be useful to add a couple of word saying 'negative outcomes on [professional group], research on the job satisfaction levels etc.' It is important for the Abstract to be informative enough to be a standalone piece that provides sufficient insight into the larger study/context.
Methods: the description of the methods is too succinct in the abstract. I believe adding another sentence or two on period of data collection and method of data analysis is warranted.

Results: 'multiple regression analysis' should read 'multiple regression analyses'

Conclusion: 'ensuring a high level of respect' sounds like a great idea, but I'm not sure how practical it is as a concluding recommendation from your findings. Do your results measure the effects of 'high level of respect' -or medium levels for that matter- on job satisfaction? I believe your study is concerned with reporting the effects of perceived low levels of respect. So wouldn't 'developing policies to address low tolerance for workplace disrespect' be a more appropriate conclusion/recommendation?

Key words: I believe the word 'violence' should be added to the list of key words, in my opinion.

INTRODUCTION

Paragraph 1 line 4: 'worse' -> 'worst'

Paragraph 1 line 5: what is meant by turnover? Migration out of the country? Exiting the workforce?

Paragraph 2 line 2: 'significant proportion': the author ought to be more specific using number etc.

Paragraph 2 line 3: what is meant by 'leadership' in this context?

Paragraph 4 line 2: 'impact on it' -> 'impact them'

Paragraph 5 line 6: again not sure what 'turnover rates' describes

Paragraph 8 line 5: substitute reference number [45] with author name

Paragraph 10: isn't another (4th) study question on the issue of violence?

I suggest the author slightly expand the context and rationale of the study by referring to the (1) Objectives of WHO's Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health and (2) the Recommendations of the UN Commission on Health Employment and Economic. Both refer to
strategies to understand and improve the work conditions of health workers. This studies' objectives are aligned with these strategy and the author ought to make clear reference to this alignment.

METHODS

Paragraph 3 line 1: 'Nine out of ten regions hospitals. The regional hospitals...' why was it important to select regional hospitals? What implication does this inclusion have, if any?

Paragraph 5 line 7: The author refer here to the case study questionnaire used to derive the violence items. But the questionnaire is only introduced in paragraph 7. I suggest the author move paragraph 7 beginning with 'The study utilized the Health Sector...' up so it immediately follows paragraph 5.

RESULTS

Paragraph 2 line 4: the paper here refers to nurses and midwives simultaneously. It is unclear what this means? Are midwives also considered nurses in Ghana? Are they an interchangeable name for the same role? I suggest the author provide a short description of nursing roles in Ghana in the INTRODUCTION. This will provide some much needed context that would explain the 'midwife/nurse' query.

Paragraph 6 line 9: 'Usually, these findings mean that male nurses were given greater level of respect than their female counterparts at the hospital'. I invite caution when making such statements, because it is important to emphasize that all results are 'self-reported' and as such all conclusions must highlight 'perceived respect' rather than 'given respect'. I suggest the author rephrase this sentence and ensure the 'perceived' notion is emphasized throughout the paper.

Paragraph 7 lines 6-8: see comment about

DISCUSSION

Paragraph 1 line 8: international studies on nursing? Where?

Paragraph 2 line 7: would be good to list those countries where nurses are also dissatisfied with pay

Paragraph 3 line 4: would be great to briefly expand on the other studies regularly referred to throughout the paper, like the author have done with
What are the strengths and weaknesses of this study? What are the implications of this study for the nursing workforce in Ghana? How does this study contribute to the global evidence on health workforces (linking in with the WHO Global Strategy and UN Recommendations which are priority strategy for the global workforce)? And what future studies might need to be carried out to further understand and impact this area? These are all questions that should be addressed in the Discussion section but currently aren't. I encourage the author to expand the discussion to address those questions.
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