Reviewer's report

Title: Medical migration in Europe: an overview of the current situation.

Version: 1 Date: 2 July 2007

Reviewer: Amy Hagopian

Reviewer's report:

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

This is an interesting report on a facet of medical migration that has not been explored much--migration TO Europe from outside the region, but also migration BETWEEN European countries. It is difficult for me to assess the quality of the data, as they appear to come from a variety of sources, many with which I am not familiar.

The survey of professional organisations needs a little further description; the passive voice description on page 5 leaves one wondering who did the survey and what the questions were. The response rate should also be noted. That paragraph needs re-writing and further clarification.

There is a tendency to consider physicians "FROM" a country of origin without adequately defining what that term means. Trained there? Born there? A citizen of there? I realize there is probably a mix of answers to that question, but in each instance the authors should state which use of the term they mean here.

I've made several notations on the text in a pdf document that I will send to the editors separately (I don't think they can be uploaded to this web page). For example, Table 1 would benefit from some population figures or at least some percentages. Tables 2 and 3 need more documentation as to data sources. Figure 1 needs a good caption. I've also made grammatical and spelling corrections.

It would help to have a stronger set of conclusions, as the reader is left wondering "so what?" You say your findings are "cause for consideration," but do you have any more specific recommendations? For example, if I were an Irish health system planner, would I have an opinion about the high numbers of folks migrating out? If I were a French planner, would I think having 4% of my physician stock from other countries would be a good thing? If I were Norwegian, would 15% be good?

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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