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Reviewer’s report:

Review of the article titled “Thailand special recruitment track of medical students: assessment of the three batches of new graduates”

Please note that all of my comments are categorized as “Discretionary Revisions” (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore).

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Yes it is. These findings could contribute to the arena of evaluation of interventions addressing inequitable distribution of health workforce. The author assessed the three batches of new medical graduates having been recruited by the special track in Thailand, between 2010 and 2012, in term of their demographic data, attitude toward rural practice, intention to fulfill their obligation, and their medical competency. Then these attributes had been bench marked against the normal track recruitment.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Yes they are, but it will be better if the author could describe how they got those 5 questions representing attitude toward rural practice as well as those essential medical competencies.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Yes, they are. Yet I noticed something for further investigation. The economic status of the graduates’ families, since the penalty for bleaching the medical education contract is MONEY. In addition, according to the theory of attitude (Fishbein and Ajzen. 1975), there is relationship between attitude and intention. But the authors did not analyze them, though they already had the data. Furthermore, I had learnt from a medical statistician in LSTM during my PhD about the over-estimation of Odds ratio. In this case, Incidence Rate Ratio (irr) might be better to describe the result.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes, it is.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

Yes, they are. Yet I have additional comment. Since choosing job is subject to labour market situation, the discussion of the results would be more intellectual if the medical labour market at that time would have been taken into account.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes, it is.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

I observed that there were some parts need attention, in order to make the content clearer for readers. (see comments in the attached file)

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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