

Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: Mental Health, Well-Being, and Quality of Patient Care among Radiologic Technologists

Version: 1

Comments:

1. Clarify whether the mental health items were used as full validated scales or as “items aligned with” those scales, because this affects construct validity and interpretability.
2. Specify scoring more explicitly, including whether subscale scores were summed or averaged and how cut points (if any) relate to “mild” or “moderate” labels.
3. Add one concise statement on missing data and outlier handling beyond “checked,” including whether any cases were excluded from regression.
4. State how the 10 interviewees were selected in practice and whether recruitment continued until thematic sufficiency, not only “maximise variation.”
5. Provide a brief integration step showing how the qualitative themes explain the strongest quantitative associations, not just presenting both phases sequentially.
6. Consider reporting confidence intervals for key correlations and regression coefficients to strengthen inference given the modest sample size.
7. Tighten one or two discussion claims to keep them clearly “perceived quality of care” rather than objective care outcomes.

Overall recommendation: Accept with minor revisions.

Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: Mental Health, Well-Being, and Quality of Patient Care among Radiologic Technologists

Version: 1

Comments:

The paper is strong, but I would like clearer measurement provenance. The instrument description implies established scales yet also suggests adaptation, so readers need a sharper statement of what was adopted verbatim, what was modified, and what evidence supports equivalence. The analysis would also benefit from one short paragraph on model assumptions and uncertainty, especially since the regression is central and the sample is small; confidence intervals and a brief multicollinearity note would be enough.

The mixed-methods logic is sound, yet the integration could be more explicit. A compact “joint display” style paragraph (even without a table) that maps depression and stress findings to specific interview excerpts would make the explanatory sequential claim more convincing. Finally, the paper should stay disciplined about language: the outcome is perceived quality of care, so implications should be framed as quality-risk signals and workforce support priorities rather than statements about confirmed clinical outcomes.

Overall recommendation: Accept with minor revisions.

Reviewer 1 Report

Manuscript title: Mental Health, Well-Being, and Quality of Patient Care among Radiologic Technologists

Version: 2

Comments:

Substantial compliance with the revisions has been achieved, warranting publication.

Reviewer 2 Report

Manuscript title: Mental Health, Well-Being, and Quality of Patient Care among Radiologic Technologists

Version: 2

Comments:

It is recommended that this paper be published, given that the revisions are complete.