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Dear Editor,

We thank you most sincerely for your consideration of this paper for publication in your esteemed journal. We are very grateful to the reviewers for a great job done. Kindly find our itemised responses to the issues raised.

With kind regards.

Reviewer I. Ian Wilson

1. The sections have been reordered in accordance with the journal’s format.

2. Words are now spelt consistently throughout the article.

3. The portions referred to on Pages 3 and 4 have been revised and an appropriate reference has been added to support an assertion there.

4. Referencing has been redone according to the journal’s format and as suggested by reviewer.

5. The father is almost solely responsible for providing financially for the family in Africa hence his occupation matters a lot. On the other hand the mother’s educational level determines how well the children are educated. These attributes have been validated in a previous publication on social classification in West Africa. [References: 1. Olusanya O. An original system of social classification for use in Nigeria and other developing countries - Presented at the 24th Annual Conference of the West African College of Surgeons, 1984.


6. The following sentence has been added to the article to explain mentor emulation: Mentoring, a process of giving advice, imparting knowledge or teaching psychomotor skills over a period of time to a junior apprentice by a senior colleague is very important in medical practice, with the former wishing to be like the latter.

7. Errors of grammar have been corrected where they have been identified.

Reviewer II. Jennifer Reath

1. Major corrections have been effected.

2. The sentences have been broken up to create shorter sentences in many places.

3. The Methods section has been rewritten to include the details mentioned.

4. The References have been re-checked for accuracy.
5. Spelling errors and unclear sentences have been corrected.

6. The statements referring to ‘time wasting’ have been revised completely.

7. The Discussion section has been revised to remove contradictions.

8. The ordering of the specialty preferences by males has been corrected.

Reviewer III. Jean-Karl Soler

1. The Methodology section has been properly situated and it has been included in the Abstract.

2. For a descriptive study of this nature, the proportions provide the information needed. Adding confidence intervals will make the tables more cluttered without providing additional illumination of the points being made.

3. Proper numbering has been done.

4. Referencing has been correctly done.

5. The tables show a lot of tests of statistical significance.

6. Discussions are linked with existing literature.