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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Page 4, lines 6-7: The authors stated that the pediatricians rapidly concentrated into urban areas, which was based on the results obtained from PCA analysis, multiple regression analysis and categorization of SMA into four groups. I feel that the approach is somewhat circuitous and indirect. Why the authors did not show direct relationship between indexes such as population density and increase in CWP per childhood population.

2. There were no graphs in this paper, and it is hard to understand intuitively the figures on tables. I think some graphs will allow readers to understand the authors’ point of view.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Page 4, lines 7-8: There was no description concerning female pediatricians in the Result section. The conclusion phrase about female pediatrician in Conclusion section is was an unexpected remark for readers.

2. Page 5, lines 12-13: No evidence or references were given in this sentence.

3. Page 7, lines 4-5: What advantages did the new system have?

4. Page 7, line 7-8: Only a little amount of evidence or reference was shown about the description that the shortage of physicians in Japan was resulted from their mal-distribution.

5. Page 8, lines 11-12: I think that a considerable number of pediatricians do not work as clinical fields but works as researchers in universities or research institutes. Did the authors exclude these pediatricians from their analyses?

6. Page 12, lines 7-: What do these underlines mean?

7. Page 13, lines 8-9: It is easy to understand CWP per childhood population means the level of supply of pediatric service. However, I cannot understand why the number of beds per population means the level of supply of pediatric service. Is there any evidence that the number of beds per population correlates with the number of beds used for children?

8. Page 16, lines 3-4: Again, no evidence or references were given.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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