

Review of: "Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Work Stress, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention of Chinese Medicine Practitioners in Hong Kong"

Eleftherios Giovanis¹

¹ Adnan Menderes University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for that. This is an interesting paper. I suggest some comments that may improve the quality of the paper.

1. I am not sure about the sample size calculation. Using the formula, you suggest a minimum number of participants at 82. Then, you argue for a sampling error of 5%; you need 87. How do you get this number? For instance, if we need 90 or 99%, how do we define the sample size?
2. Then you mention the pilot test, which is good. You mention, "After the pilot test, at least 87 valid questionnaires were to be collected". According to Table 3, I guess the number of participants is 141. You may emphasize that.
3. It would be interesting if you conduct in future a survey that covers COVID-19 and the post-COVID-19 period, so you may also show how job satisfaction varies and may influence turnover intention.
4. I understand that your aim is to show correlation and not infer causality. However, this does not imply your study is novel and contributes to the literature. In particular, you mention in the abstract that "multiple regression analysis showed that the variables ranked in the following order of decreasing importance: organizational commitment > job satisfaction > work stress". However, I am not sure about this since you have endogeneity, such as unobserved heterogeneity, omitted variable bias, selection bias and reverse causality. In other words, this order may change.
5. Following the previous comment, you may have multicollinearity that affects your estimated coefficients. For example, the correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is 0.77 is quite high and may influence the estimated regression coefficients. A correlation of more than 0.75 is taken as a rule of thumb, but in some cases even correlation of 0.3-0.4 can be a problem. In Table 3, you find that the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intention is slightly higher than between organization commitment and turnover intention.
6. The last row of Table 3 is not required because are the same correlations presented in the last column.
7. If I am not wrong, in Table 6a, you find that job satisfaction has a higher impact on turnover intention. The same applies in Table 6b. How is this consistent with your findings in the abstract, "multiple regression analysis showed that the variables ranked in the following order of decreasing importance: organizational commitment > job satisfaction > work stress," as I mentioned in the previous comment? Should it be: job satisfaction > organizational commitment > work stress? Unless I missed something.
8. My main concern is whether you control for other characteristics in your regressions. As I see in Table 2, you have

collected information on gender, age, education, qualifications and others. You should repeat your regression analysis controlling for those characteristics. Your results now are not robust. Otherwise, if you have already included those in your regressions, it would be interesting to present them and briefly discuss them. As you mention very correctly, one of the limitations is that your analysis relies on cross-sectional data, and future research should consider panel or longitudinal data. Thus, controlling for those characteristics, you may account up to some degree for confounding bias. Also, in the case you have not included those in the regressions, as I mentioned above, your results are not robust, and the coefficients of the variables of main interest, e.g. job satisfaction, may change or even become insignificant.