

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77874
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE ON NURSES' COMMITMENT AT PUBLIC HOSPITALS IN SAUDI ARABIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Dear Author(s) Congratulations on your work, it reads well and well written I have some recommendations</p> <p>1. Abstract Background: please emphasize on your aim of the study and mentioned it clearly, not in the method part, Methods: please, add more data about setting, period in one sentence, and more details about t method of questionnaire language, distribution, sampling and data collection approach. Result part The data were analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests to identify the differences in organisational commitment and organisational climate among participants' characteristics. Correlation analysis was used to identify the relationship between organisational commitment and organisational climate. Please move it to methods part We found in the study that nurses are significantly influenced by the continuance commitment component and communication dimension. From this study, it is evident that improving organisational climate leads to an increase in nurses' commitment. Please, results part should contains numbers of each important result, here it sounds as conclusion not result Conclusion: I recommend if you shorten it.</p> <p>2. Introduction I recommend if you shorten it to 4-5 paragraphs, each one has an idea and pave for the next idea without idea repetition</p> <p>3. Methodology Please change it to methods not methodology *This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional method to explore the impact of organisational climate on nurses' commitment in Saudi Arabian public hospitals. Please change to design not method, and I guess you explored the correlation only and not the impact, please correct Subtitles: some end with full stop punctuation but others not, please follow journal instructions Sample size: please add the calculation formula and explain the meant of each of its component in your study.</p> <p>4. Results Age groups: please explain the idea behind your categorization and add to discussion part Table 4.2: all are explained in the text, please omit it Table 4.3: please add ±SD beside the mean (in the table head) Table 4.4: all are explained in the text, please omit it</p> <p>I recommend if you go further in your investigation to use regression, I think your data allow for that. And then your results will be more valuable</p>	<p>Agreed and corrected in the manuscript as recommended.</p> <p>-Abstract was corrected. -The introduction shorted. -We did not discuss the age group in the discussion part because there are no significant differences between ages that affect commitment or organizational climate group. -Thank you for your recommendation about using regression but, we will keep our data analysis as it is. -The methodology part was corrected. -The result part was corrected.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.