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Reviewer's report:

Methods section:
1-More information should be given about the size and characteristics of the study population (universe) as well as determination of the sample size. What was the total number of physicians in the study population? How the sample size was determined?

2-Although authors say that they had selected their sample by “multistage stratified random sampling” method “..using the socioeconomic development level among cities and the grade of state-owned medical institutions as stratification standards at the first two stages”, it is understood from the first paragraph of “Data collection” section that they used cluster sampling method. How were these stratification standards used at the first two stages and was there any other stages of sampling?

3-Why the questionnaires with “more than three missing values among all items; and responses over-centralized or showing undulating curve” were accepted invalid and rejected?

Results section:
1-Text about the sociodemographic characteristics of study group is very difficult to follow and understand. These findings should be presented in table(s).

Discussion:
1-Moderate degree of turnover intention of the physicians cannot be attributed to the new medical reform since its effects were not studied in this study. All discussions should be specific to the study findings.

Minor Essential Revisions
1-The term “grade” should be clarified. Does it mean “referral level” of healthcare institutions or something else?
2-Language of the article should be improved.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? No.
3. Are the data sound? Yes.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.