being above the central point of the adoptedeach response scale. For example, a the mean score of 2.71 at on the physical demand scale meant indicated that all the five investigated aspects describing a of high physical demands tended to be reported by most of participants. As far as Regarding musculoskeletal problems are concerned, in general they were highly prevalent among participants, with the highest prevalence being for the lower back problems.

Furthermore, the results, presented in Table 1, showed that, among theall confounding variables (i.e., age, gender, organisational organizational role, type of contract, and physical demands), all of them were related to at least one of the outcome variables considered (i.e., MSDs of lower back, upper back, neck, and shoulders). Thus, these confounding variables have beenwere included in the mediation analysis.

In order tWith respect to the mediation analyses test our hypothesis, which postulates that strain mediates between bullying and MSDs, four mediation analyses have been performed. As mentioned before, the Preacher and Hayes [35] analytical approach allowed us to test the direct and indirect effects of the variables considered. Thus, we provided estimates of all the path coefficients (Table 2), as well as indirect effects (Table 3), along with bias-corrected, bootstrapped the 95% bias corrected, bootstrapped confidence intervals for the four different musculoskeletal disorders (i.e., lower back, upper back, neck, and shoulders). Specifically, in Table 2 presents both results concerning the direct effects of the antecedent and confounding variables on the mediator (job-related strain) and results concerning the direct effects of the antecedents, confounding variables, and the mediator on the outcomes (MSDs of lower back, upper back, neck, and shoulders) are presented. Results concerning the indirect effects between the independent variable (bullying) and the outcome variables (MSDs of lower back, upper back, neck, and shoulders) are presented in Table 3.

Commented [A19]: I would recommend that you be specific about the results that were found, using numerical and statistical values.

Commented [A20]: I would recommend that you add more detail about how you determined that each of these variables were confounding variables, as it is not clearly explained here, or in the Statistical Analysis section above.

Commented [A21]: This has been established in the Methods section and should not be detailed in the results section.