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**Reviewer 1**

The changes made by the authors have improved the article which I believe is ready now for publication. I have no suggestions for further changes.

**Reviewer 2.**

This paper is highly important, and should serve as a prompt to improve the organization of medical care in Nepal. However to do this it requires more precision than it has at the moment.

Can the authors please make the following alterations to improve it – none is major, but the accumulation of these small errors do reduce its current effectiveness. All of these are minor essential revisions.

Abstract Methods – remove statement about using SPSS and chi square. This goes into the methods section of the paper per se.

Done -removed

Results – add the total responses and % with the total number of potential questionnaires as the denominator as the first sentence in this section

Done – added total of 1137 of a potential 1820 responses or 62.5%

Methods

First paragraph – I don’t think you need to name the colleges. I would put – Three colleges were in Kathmandu, and three were outside, then in the last sentence, “one college approached declined to participate.

Done -removed

Paragraph 2. Change “This was entirely voluntary to participate” to “Participation was entirely voluntary, .....

Done

The final sentence about analysis needs expansion. You have already said how you analysed qualitative data. This paragraph should describe the quantitative analysis. For example: Demographic data were presented as means and standard deviations for continuous data, and means and quartiles for categorical data. Correlations were compared using the Chi squared test, or Fisher’s exact test (my note – used where there are less than 5 in a cell in the 2x2 table), or Student t test for continuous data. Significance was set at >0.05.

Done
Last paragraph in results -Typo -“ not being stick in rural areas” should be “stuck”

Done

Limitations. Spell out 62.5% in words at the start of a sentence.

Done

Tables and figures

Table under Fig 3.

No need to comment “sig” or non-sig”.

Removed

Don’t use >0.05- quote the actual statistic.

Done in all tables and figures

Figure 5 and Table under it don’t really add to the argument about low GP choice- I would delete.

If you keep it in, p-0.22 labelled as significant. It isn’t. Should it be 0.022? Remove Significant and non-significant, and quote actual p values, not >0.05

We felt it was good to see how choice had changed during the undergraduate course so as to have some marker of the influence of the course itself in choices. Therefore we would like to keep so made changes as suggested above.

We have corrected the error in the p value and provided actual values.

Table 1 – P=0.00 is not actually correct. Should be quoted as p>0.01.

We have put p < 0.001 (we think that is what is meant above rather than > 0.01)

Table 3 – four blank cells. Should not be blank. Maybe N/A?

We have put N/A

Reviewer 3

I have no further amendments to suggest and consider that this article is now suitable for publication.