

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The relationship between autonomy, optimism, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior among nurses fighting COVID-19 in Wuhan: A Serial Multiple Mediation
AUTHORS	zhang, hui; Zhao, Yi; Zou, Ping; Liu, Yang; Lin, Shuanghong; Ye, Zhihong; Tang, Leiwen; Shao, Jing; Chen, Dandan

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Foroozan Atashzadeh-Shoorideh Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Jun-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>bmjopen-2020-039711 Dear authors Thank you for submitting the manuscript entitled “The relationship between autonomy, optimism, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behavior among nurses fighting COVID-19 in Wuhan: A Serial Multiple Mediation” to this journal. There are some challenges regarding the manuscript as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. First, what is the relationship between some authors with this research? What is relationship between COVID-19 and the variables of this study? On the other hand, the results of this study may be similar to normal conditions. In addition, the relationship of autonomy, optimism, work engagement and organizational citizenship is a fact and it does not need to study.2. In the introduction, some of sentences and paragraphs are separate and do not relationship with together. I suggest to revise the contents and to provide a better presentation of the available literature in other Asian countries. Also, the current challenge and gap is missed.3. What is theoretical/ conceptual model of this study? You use some theory/models but none of them is related to nursing.4. There are some variables in this study, which they are not related each other. What was the reason for examining these variables without any supportive model? Please clarify it.5. How did you measure autonomy with only three items? Or measure optimism with only four items? Are these scales valid and reliable? Are they international instruments? Reporting of the scales is missed? Is there any cut off point for these instruments?6. The Cronbach's α for work engagement is low. It must be upper than .70.
-------------------------	---

	<p>6. In discussion section, I suggest you use the studies have been done in Asian countries, which the contexts of them much like China. However, you have mentioned the studies in only China!</p> <p>Moreover, there are several typos mistakes, grammar mistakes and ambiguous terms. Please revisit the whole manuscript and correct the grammatical errors.</p> <p>The study was conducted at one hospital located in China, which is not generalizing to other setting. In other words, this manuscript does not add anything to the current knowledge.</p> <p>Hope the above comments help you to develop the manuscript. Good luck!</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name

ForoozanAtashzadeh-ShooridehInstitution and Country

Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

1. First, what is the relationship between some authors with this research? What is relationship between COVID-19 and the variables of this study? On the other hand, the results of this study may be similar to normal conditions. In addition, the relationship of autonomy, optimism, work engagement and organizational citizenship is a fact and it does not need to study.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. Some of authors work in Wuhan, and some work in other places. However, we collaborated for the success of this project. Our contribution is as follows: HZ, YZ, and ZHY designed the study. YZ, SHL, and YL participated in the data collection. HZ and DDC analyzed the data. HZ and YZ drafted the manuscript and interpreted the data. HZ, LWT, JS, ZHY, YL and PZ revised the manuscript.

With many nurses from across China coming to work with local medical staff in Wuhan, they needed to cooperate effectively with each other in order to deliver high quality medical care to patients with COVID-19. However, some challenges and difficulties, such as diverse backgrounds, different work standards, and different levels of original hospital, may pose a threat to cooperative behavior. To improve this, our study focused on some important factors might affect nurses' organizational citizenship behavior during the COVID-19 epidemic at the Wuhan Jinyintan Hospital. In such case, because the relationships between autonomy, optimism, work engagement and organizational citizenship remain unknown, we decided to elucidate its connections with the Job Demands-Resource theory to propose a serial multiple mediation which has not been previously investigated.

2. In the introduction, some of sentences and paragraphs are separate and do not relationship with together. I suggest to revise the contents and to provide a better presentation of the available literature in other Asian countries. Also, the current challenge and gap is missed.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. We have revised some places which need to be connected smoothly. Please see Line 20-21, Line 58- 61, Line 70-73, Line 83-88, Line 92-94. We have added Asian literature. Please see Line 23-24, Line 31-32. The current challenge and gap have added. Please see Line 11-13, Line 33-41.

3. What is theoretical/ conceptual model of this study? You use some theory/models but none of them is related to nursing.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model is the most popular model in occupational health psychiatry context. It has been used to investigate the relationships between job characteristics and employee well-being for decades in different fields.

Bakker AB, Demerouti E. Job demands–resources theory: taking stock and looking forward. **Journal of occupational health psychology** 2017;22(3):273.

Particularly, some nursing researchers have used this model among nurses, and there is a literature review about using JD-R model in nursing studies. Please see references as follows:

Broetje, Sylvia, Gregor J. Jenny, and Georg F. Bauer. "The Key Job Demands and Resources of Nursing Staff: An Integrative Review of Reviews." **Frontiers in Psychology** 11 (2020).

Adriaenssens, J., Gucht, V. de, & Maes, S. (2015). Causes and consequences of occupational stress in emergency nurses, a longitudinal study. **Journal of Nursing Management**, 23, 346–358.

Maurits, Erica EM, et al. "Autonomous home-care nursing staff are more engaged in their work and less likely to consider leaving the healthcare sector: A questionnaire survey." **International Journal of Nursing Studies** 52.12 (2015): 1816-1823.

Dong, Xu, et al. "The effects of job characteristics, organizational justice and work engagement on nursing care quality in China: A mediated effects analysis." **Journal of Nursing Management** 28.3 (2020): 559-566.

4. There are some variables in this study, which they are not related each other. What was the reason for examining these variables without any supportive model? Please clarify it.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. We choose those variables based on the constructs of JD-R from the critical reviews. Additionally, we find many empirical studies of JD-R model to help us propose the relationships between variables in theory and hypotheses section. Please see P6-8.

Bakker AB, Demerouti E. Job demands–resources theory: taking stock and looking forward. **Journal of occupational health psychology** 2017;22(3):273.

Bakker AB, Demerouti E. Multiple levels in job demands-resources theory: Implications for employee well-being and performance. Handbook of well-being 2018

Schaufeli WB, Taris TW. A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. Bridging occupational, organizational and public health: Springer 2014:43-68

5. How did you measure autonomy with only three items? Or measure optimism with only four items? Are these scales valid and reliable? Are they international instruments? Reporting of the scales is missed? Is there any cut off point for these instruments?

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. The instruments used in our study are international and valid. The autonomy subscale of the Job Diagnostic Survey was used to measure autonomy. It comprises three items, and this scale is used in a Cross-national study (Liu et al., 2007).

The scale of optimism is valid and reliable, and Arnold B. Bakker who is one of the famous researchers to develop JD-R theory had also used this scale in his study (Arnold B et al., 2013).

Reporting the scales is in the section of measures, please see P9-10. There is no cut off point of these instruments. Higher scores reflect a higher level of optimism and autonomy.

Liu C, Spector PE, Shi L. Cross-national job stress: a quantitative and qualitative study. Journal of Organizational Behavior 2007;28(2):209-39.

Bakker AB, Sanz-Vergel AI. Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. Journal of Vocational Behavior 2013;83(3):397-409.

6. The Cronbach's α for work engagement is low. It must be upper than 0.70.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. After we check our manuscript and our data, we find that Cronbach's α of our investigated variables are all above 0.7. The values of AVE for variables are also satisfactory (≥ 0.5). Please see table 1.

7. In discussion section, I suggest you use the studies have been done in Asian countries, which the contexts of them much like China. However, you have mentioned the studies in only China!

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. We have added studies done in Asian countries. Please see Line 205-206, Line 262-264.

Moreover, there are several typos mistakes, grammar mistakes and ambiguous terms. Please revisit the whole manuscript and correct the grammatical errors.

Reply : Thank you for your important suggestion. We have revised the whole manuscript for typos, grammar mistakes and ambiguous terms. Please see highlight words.