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**Reviewer’s report:**

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.

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

**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.

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

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.

Last paragraph in results

Typo -“ not being stick in rural areas” should be “stuck”
Limitations.
Spell out 62.5% in words at the start of a sentence.

Tables and figures
Table under Fig 3.
No need to comment “sig” or non-sig”. Don’t use >0.05- quote the actual statistic.
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
Table 1 – P=0.00 is not actually correct. Should be quoted as p>0.01.
Table 3 – four blank cells. Should not be blank. Maybe N/A?

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.
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