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Reviewer’s report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. reading the title, several thoughts raced through my mind. Are the authors talking about human resources migration or patient migration?
   Of course they are talking about human resources flows but this was not clear without reading through the whole manuscript

2. the methods section is not clear enough to assess where particular data were obtained. For example, if pubmed was searched, would this source provide data that was not available from the regulatory or registering bodies?

3. the authors also that their study aimed to assess implications of the migration. There is not enough data collected that one would to assess implication. But if the authors were able to present the shortages in the source country and compare this with out emigration, one would sense what impact this may have on service delivery.

4. I found both tables 1 and 3 confusing to understand the message. Of course the authors refer to these as figures but this is a minor issue I guess which can be corrected. Is there a way to make table 1 more informative without loading it up?

5. the pubmed sources, like reference 21 are themselves based on the AMA masterfile which the authors access. With the wide source of information from primary regulatory sites, I doubt a pubmed search would add more to searching the numbers of doctors. We are also not told how far back the search went. An important guideline is the MOOSE guideline that one could use for systematic search.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Grammatical errors in diverse places in the text. Formatting changes

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

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: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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