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Reviewer's report:

Overall this is well written paper. It clearly empirically tests and refines a theoretical conceptual framework, and adds to the understanding of health support workers work environments.

The objectives are described in somewhat broad terms: "to further our understanding of the work psychology of HSWs and to generate novel insights about the concepts of work environments, work attitudes and work outcomes". It does not give the reader a clear understanding of the research question the paper addresses. Based on the currently stated objective, I would not expect that the study is about refining survey instruments to empirically test the relationships among various work psychology constructs to explain HSW performance. I suggest the authors revise the objective in the abstract and the paper.

While the response rate is understandably low, the authors do not comment on whether the sample is representative (and if so, how this was assessed). In the limitations, the authors note that they took steps to ensure that the sample was representative of LTC and HCC sectors, however, it is not clear how this was done.

Table 2 outlines the characteristics of the total sample. It would be helpful to include the numbers of LTC and HCC respondents. Were there any differences in the characteristics of these two groups? That is, was it appropriate to group them together? Do analyses of only LTC or HCC respondents show similar findings?

The paper includes three figures which are all very difficult to read (figure 2 and 3 particularly so). To decipher the figure, the reader has to reference the text and the figure at the same time which really diminished the overall readability.

The authors present an updated framework with path coefficients. While the comment on the significance and directionality, they don't comment on the magnitude of the coefficients. The authors have highlighted specific ways that system managers can implement these findings, which is particularly helpful. The authors specifically included intention to stay in the model, but do not comment on it in the discussion.

The reference list appears to include papers that are not cited in the paper itself.
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