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Response to the comments of the reviewer 2180842609414713,

Dear reviewer Prof Thomas Ricketts,

We are sincerely grateful for your time devoted to professional review our manuscript. We have agreed to all your suggestions and appreciate your comments. Please, find below our responses and the re-revised text.

Sincerely,

Milena Santric Milicevic, for all authors of the MS 3963514817345639

Reviewer's report:
The paper is much improved but still needs to be edited for meaning and English usage. There are many instances where the meaning is not clear, for example:

Page 4 “HRH planning can include projections about cross-cutting problems...”
Planning can consider this issues, but projections rarely focus on them—the sentence implies you “project” these issues. Reword to say these issues can be considered as part of projections.

- That sentence (4th sentence in Background section page 1) has been rewritten into: Along with that, HRH planning can include projections, that identify cross-cutting problems regarding HRH production, employment and management, such as the relative attractiveness of employment or practice in the health professions, the role of the private sector and migration of health professionals and the population.

Page 4 end of paragraph with ref (15): Include sentence saying that his paper describes a “trend analysis, using existing data to anticipate supply and demand issue in Serbia.”

Page 7: “Rations” for ratios...
- We have followed the suggestions for text on pages 4 and 7

Page 8: Clarify: “Its purpose is to meet the requirement ... “ Do you refer to the purpose of the study or the article? This is a bit confusing; reword for clarity
  - The purpose of the study

Page 16, the discussion of GDP loss is confusing, two numbers conflict
- That has been corrected into: While changes in population have small impact on healthcare workforce, the economy had relatively greater effects (for instance, the decrease of GDP by 18% influenced downsize of the hospital bed number by 3%).

Page 19: Models are simplifications of reality and provide a glimpse into the future based on the limitations of the models. With unanticipated changes...
The paper needs careful editing by a professional and the uncertainty in some statements cleaned up.
- The text has been carefully edited by the professional.
Response to the comments of the reviewer 2721400399530465,

Dear reviewer Prof. Basu Ghosh,

Thank you very much for your time devoted for professional review, and the opinion that manuscript is now satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Milena Santric Milicevic, for all authors of the MS 39635148173456