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Reviewer's report:

The paper is an important addition to the body of knowledge in this area. This paper needs some major edits if it is to be published. This is an important paper and may contribute to the body of knowledge related to NTP Ratios in acute care. It has some severe limitations that require attention:


2. The Methods section (p5 L53) is quite inadequate for replication of this study. The study is clearly quantitative in nature however statistical analysis is limited to raw numbers, percentages and ratios with a comparison from some other countries in Asia and beyond. Appropriate statistical approaches for validly and reliably comparing the results within the sample and with other countries is not articulated nor implemented and therefore the results are not able to interpreted. This paper should not be published in its current form.

3. Comparison data with other countries (p.7 Line 9 onward) is not valid as there is no known method for data collection from the compared countries. This is problematic relating to the accuracy of the comparison because there may be different categories of staff calculated within the ratio that are not included in the sample or are included in the sample and not in the country being compared. The authors must address this in their discussion,
4. Results (p8 L39) As previously mentioned, the researcher have not used a battery of statistical tests to determine if the null hypothesis is accepted or rejected. In fact the null hypothesis has not been stated in order to make that assessment. There should be some test and discussion on sample reliability (e.g. Cronbach's Alpha), and depending on the whether or not the data distribution is normal requiring parametric tests or bi or multi-modal, requiring non-parametric tests and which ones were used in order to demonstrate validity and reliability of the results.

5. Tables throughout are unclear as to what is being reported on and all need to be revised and commented on in the results section.

6. References are required for the sources of international comparison data.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.