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Reviewer's report:

This paper requires one major compulsory revision as I believe there is an error in the interpretation of table 4.

The statement in the conclusion "the chance of accessing continuing medical training are all helpful to improve the recruitment of doctors in rural and remote areas" is not supported by the results.

The 6th statement in the questionnaire "the training can help attract more young doctors to work in rural areas has 30% disagreeing and another 31% having a neutral response. This lack of impact training has provided is further supported by the high proportion of respondents who disagreed with the statements 3 and 4 - this is a surprising and disappointing finding but essential to comment on in both the discussion and the conclusion and needs to be discussed further and should be included in the results section of the abstract.

With regard to minor revisions: on page 4 para two I think this para could be just referenced in the next para rather than written out in full. Because Beijing is represented initially as a city - I believe the sentence in methods that clarifies that the municipality included 13 townships and villages should be moved into the background in para 3 and does not need to name three of the 13 by name.

There is a sentence in page 5 para 2 "the report released by the Chinese ministry showed the number of rural doctors has increased 6.5 percent..." which seems to contradict the rest of the evidence maybe just the word "although" would help here.

I had some queries from the results that I think would have been interesting to explore in the discussion for example even the 7.23% who were qualified had a part-time job - with their increased income and benefits why is this. Also even though it explains on page 3 that in order to be called a qualified doctor the person must be a graduate from the faculty of medicine only 1.5% responded that they had a university degree! this does not make sense at all.

Table 4 as discussed above seems to be wrongly reported on with regard to the medium score on the Likert scale as surely the median score for questions 1 and 2 should be 1 or 2 - that is agree or strongly agree and the items 3 and 4, Likert score 4, the sentence on page 8 para 2 sentence 2 should state that although other studies show that self esteem of doctors may improve recruitment this study does not support this. - a minor details is in sentence 4 it should say our study...
not my study.

The wording in para 2 page 10 "ensuring evolved into the social pension" needs rewording.

with regard to the point concerning the impact of the classification of "rural doctors" being classified as farmers - surely needs to be stressed as a strategy to improve the situation of these rural doctors and make them eligible for more benefits.

I do think this paper has improved and is of significant interest but the analysis and subsequent discussion and conclusions still need work.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field
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