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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
- The paper needs to define better dual work, not clear if refers to public and private practice or to practice at different level of care (lines 76-77);
- If public and private practice, it needs to provide a deeper critical review of the existing literature;
- Should consider changing the focus of the paper to explore job satisfaction and not on dual employment;
- Additionally, job satisfaction seems to be very high while in the introduction section the paper suggests it may be low;
- Policy recommendations could be extended significantly given the amount of data presented/analyzed.

Minor comments:
- Are the any data to illustrate some of the arguments about job satisfaction (high workload, low income, etc.) either from the literature or secondary data?
- Would be good to discuss whether the sample for the study is a representative of the entire population (maybe compare some descriptive statistics for the two groups if available secondary datasets);
- Workload is poorly defined: should be number of patients seeing (or tasks preformed), longer working hours do not necessarily means higher productivity.
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