Reviewer’s report

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

Version: 1 Date: 24 Oct 2017

Reviewer: Stephanie Hastings

Reviewer's report:

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

- Introduction:
  - Missing citations p 3 line 52; p 4 line 49
  - This is a cross-sectional study but RQ1 implies causality. Please review the paper to remove any causal language.
  - The research questions are presented in a different order than the order of results in the results section.

- 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?

- 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.
  - 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
Discussion

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

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

- 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.

- 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.
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