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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer 1’s report:
Discretionary revisions:
Figure 1: Doctor categories are not labelled. A number of outliers are not realistic (max number of hours per week is 24*7=168). I would suggest excluding these observations from Figure 1, which would also make the figure more readable.
FIGURE 1 HAS NOW BEEN REVISED, LABELS HAVE BEEN INSERTED, AND OUTLIERS HAVE BEEN EXCLUDED.

Quality of written English:
Acceptable

Reviewer 2’s report:
1. Major Compulsory Revisions.
NONE

2. Minor Essential Revisions
Section 3.2, third paragraph:
There seems to be a mistake when referring to the number of hours per week when it is said 49 "hours per month".
"The median amount of hours worked per week by private only physicians in our survey sample was 49 hours per month, 56 hours for public only ones, and 62 hours for dual practitioners..."
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED (PAG.5, PAR.3).

Quality of written English:
Acceptable

Reviewer 3’s report:
The study findings are interesting and is improved. However, the paper still needs to be revised further.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. The paper needs an objective that presents the study hypothesis.
THE PAPER’S OBJECTIVE AND HYPOTHESIS HAVE NOW BEEN CLARIFIED AND SPELLED OUT (BACKGROUND SECTION, LAST PARAGRAPH).

2. The results section should be re-written so that it is clear what the study findings are and the technical issues are stressed less. It would be helpful if each paragraph has a topic sentence that summarizes the main point of the paragraph
THE RESULTS SECTION HAS BEEN REVISED; EXPLANATORY SENTENCES HAVE BEEN ADDED FOR EACH FINDING AT THE BEGINNING OF PARAGRAPHS; SOME TECHNICAL ISSUES FROM OUR ANALYSIS HAVE BEEN ELIMINATED (PAG.4-5).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The paper needs to be edited by an English language editor. The language is often awkward and difficult to understand.
THE PAPER HAS BEEN NOW EDITED BY A NATIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE RESEARCHER.

Specific comments:
Abstract, Methods, 2nd sentence: ‘us’ should be ‘as’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Abstract, Findings, last sentence: ‘such’ should be replaced with a word such as ‘this’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Background, 1st sentence: Replace ‘attracts’ with ‘is attracting’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Background, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence: replace ‘strain of’ with ‘set of papers in’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Results, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence: replace ‘declared working’ with ‘declared that they worked; replace ‘working only’ with ‘worked only’; and replace ‘engaging’ with ‘engaged’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Physicians' motivations to work in the private sector, last paragraph, last sentence: replace ‘did not result’ with ‘were not’
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.
Personal trajectories, 3rd paragraph: replace 'operating' with 'operated'
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Personal trajectories, last paragraph: replace 'public because' with 'public sector because'
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Discussion, 2nd paragraph: paragraph is confusing and limitations should be made clearer
THE DISCUSSION OF THE LIMITATIONS HAS BEEN REVISED AND CLARIFIED (DISCUSSION, 2ND PAR.).

Discussion, 5th paragraph: replace 'reason' with 'reasons'

Discussion, last paragraph: replace 'public sector work is' with 'public sector work still'
THIS HAS NOW BEEN CORRECTED.

Quality of written English:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
THE MANUSCRIPT HAS NOW BEEN EXTENSIVELY EDITED FOR LANGUAGE.