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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Editor Comments:

Thank you for considering a revision and addressing the reviewers comments. This revision should include some enhancement of the discussion. Both reviewers and myself feel that readers need to be better persuaded as to what can be learnt from your study. Please explain more how your study adds to knowledge and insight on the known problem of low primary care research output - it may be that you provide some evidence of contextual solutions or of further barriers to be overcome. Attention to your expression in English will also be required in the revision.

BMC Family Practice operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

**Reviewer reports:**

Ron Brooker (Reviewer 1): Review of manuscript FAMP-D-18-00317 by Dr Ron Brooker (October, 2018)
Abstract uses appropriately headed sections and contains relevant information in a succinct manner. English expression though has errors of syntax and word usage (viz. "difficulties heralding physicians").

(This has been corrected)

The Background also contains inaccurate or unusual word usage (viz. "serving point"; "burden to the (a?) nation"; "the individuals"[line12]; "gives insight"; and others)

(This is all corrected now)

Lines 10-21 contain three sentences that each cite the same reference which has only limited relevance to the descriptions these sentences contain. The third sentence is not supported by the article cited and its referencing should not be included.

(A new reference (4) has been added)

Lines 24 to 28 cite references which should be included in the same brackets as they are at line 46.

(Done)

The Method also contains some unusual English expression. Sample selection using "Slovin's formula" is appropriate but its source is not referenced.

(A reference for the formula has been added)
The use of the Omani "validated (by whom?) questionnaire" with minor changes challenges the originality of the study, especially when the Method section is essentially a copy of the Omani Methodology by Jahan[9]. Unfortunately, neither source provided a copy of the questionnaire. The study's sample selection and analysis procedures were appropriate for use with survey data.

While the interpretations of the Results based on the Tables' offerings of Likert scale Means and Standard Deviations are rather simplistic, they do provide some information about the questionnaire's items which has been missing. The unattached asterisks at the bottom of Tables 4 and 5 were also very much appreciated.

(A copy of the questionnaire is provided as a supplemental file).

The Discussion restates much of the Background with appropriately placed supporting references. Apart from further unusual English usages, there were some logically developed interpretations that were appropriately directed towards policy makers in Bahrain.

In sum, the paper has replicated a limited set of findings that have been previously provided. It needs a full revision of its English usage, the inclusion of the instruments used, and a positive validation of all its References.

(Instrument is included as a supplementary file)

(The manuscript was sent for editing and proof reading)

(The reason for this Reference formatting is that we chose BMC family practice from the drop down menu in endnote. However, we have changed this now and all references are validated accordingly)

Provided below is a checked and validated list of References if required.
References:


Tarek Turk (Reviewer 2): This is a well-structured study. The paper is written well, and the methodology seems sound. I have concerns about what can this study add to the current literature other than the Bahraini setting. It is well established and very frequently reported that physicians have positive attitudes towards research without actual scientific output.

(This has been explored further in the discussion)

Another concern is the recommendations of the study that might not align with Bahrain's economic status and might not be realistic. As important as these recommendations are, building research infrastructure and allocating fund from the ministry of health might be harder to obtain. I recommend starting with more academic goals such as supporting training programs and providing more educational and practical training opportunities for students. Also, raising awareness on the importance of research academically, professionally and scientifically among such populations. Approaching universities and academic institutions might also be more beneficial in terms of promoting research attitudes and practice. Educational support, workshops and awareness campaigns can target both medical students and physicians.

(Recommendations have been amended accordingly)

Regarding the population, are all these doctors affiliated with the MoH? They do not have any academic orientation or endeavors? It would be helpful to compare practitioners with pure
clinical work, especially those working for the MoH, and practitioners with academic degrees affiliated with a university or recommend such comparison in future research studies.

(All participants are affiliated with MoH. A handful of them have part time affiliation with universities. A comparison between physicians with pure clinical work and those with affiliated with universities is fundamental but unfortunately was not done in this study so it has been added as a future research studies).

It would be useful to proofread the paper in terms of language, especially methods and results section "e.g., method section: data were not data was…".

(The manuscript was sent for editing and proof reading)

I recommend adding the survey to the paper, not only the reference of the Omani study. Also, please describe how was the survey validated in the Omani study.

(This statement has been added to the text to explain how validation was done in the Omani study).

"Face and content validity of the questionnaire was obtained through a review process with experts in the field".