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BMC Medical Education

Re: Manuscript ID 4992432293134649 - Is publication important for annual performance assessment?

Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to resubmit the above manuscript. The manuscript has been revised in response to the reviewer’s comments that you provided us. Below, we provide an itemized summary of the changes made. Reviewers’ comments are shown in bold, followed by our responses. Changes to the manuscript are bolded in the document.

Referee #1:
1. Ideally the question needs to be asked to the members of review committees or promotion and appointment committees.

We agree and in the future would like to address the question to members of review committees or promotion/appointment committees. The purpose of this study was to get authors opinions.

Referee #2:
1. The title tends to beg the answer yes or no, and I wonder whether the article would benefit from a title change to suggest more of what is provided in the article content?

Thank you for this suggestion. We’ve now changed the title to “Authors opinions on publication in relation to annual performance assessment”. Another title option is the editors prefer is “Authors opinions on publication and annual performance assessment”.

2. I’m interested in the comment made several times concerning Asian authors, suggest remove one of the comments and add in a possible explanation?

We have added in a potential explanation in the discussion (page 9).

“Some universities only merit first or corresponding authors in annual performance review and promotion. Other universities recognized second or third authors; however being first or corresponding author has the most recognition and financial compensation [17]. In fact some Asian countries, such as China and Japan, give incentives for first and corresponding authors and for publication in high impact factors journals. However, this type of recognition may limit research collaboration. This is consistent with the results from our study in which only Asian authors reported that the number of authors on a manuscript was important to their performance review and promotion whereas in other continents this was not as significant.”
3. ‘Criterion’ is singular, suggest use 'criteria'.
We have made all relevant changes to this suggestion (in abstract and text).

4. Response rate given in abstract 69.9, in Figure is 69.6 and in text non response 30%. Needs checking.
Thank you. We have checked this and the correct response rate is 69.6% which we corrected in the abstract, and corrected the non-response rate to 30.4% in the text.

5. Page 8 'rational' should have an 'e' at the end
We have made this correction.

6. Discretionary Revisions: Some minor wording changes in the abstract would enhance comprehension. Third and fifth sentence need revision.
Thank you. We have carefully revised the abstract (and revised specifically the third and fifth sentence).

We would like to thank you and the two reviewers for all the detailed and helpful comments. We believe that our paper has improved through the BMC Medical Education. We look forward to hearing from you with a decision on our paper.

Yours sincerely,

Hude Quan