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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   The question posed by the authors need much more clarity. On one hand it seems that they intend to come up with new conceptual framework, while in actual fact it seems that there is a predetermined framework. One would assume that they are originating this framework but it is not clear how they arrive at this as they are not linked to the key question of FGDs or in-depth interviews.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Methods have to describe precisely the who the participants were for the Key informants, what the questions were. Table one only shows their affiliations. What specific variables were discussed in FGDs and KIF. IT is not clear, examples on page 5 are not good enough. Much more details needed.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   The data is interesting but not compelling. Not much of new data is being advanced. Clear clarity on the variables is required. As rightly indicated the quantitative data cannot be generalized, but validate with extensive literature review.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   It does but limited in scope.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The conclusions and discussions are not adequately supported by the data. Some of it is authors own knowledge.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   The title and study objectives are not linked. The goal of the study is “to identify themes within the Philippines policy mechanism.........”. The title deals with response and managing effects of health worker outmigration. This is misleading.

7. Is the writing acceptable
   Yes the writing is acceptable.
Conclusion
1. Major revisions include revisiting the title of the article, clarifying the methodology and origination of the framework, expansion on the literature review
2. Minor essential Revisions; reworking of discussion and conclusion

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no declaration of competing interests.