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Reviewer's report:

Please see comments below.

These are major compulsory revisions:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   A: I have some concerns about the statistical methods used and the conclusions drawn. This is a really nice paper and an important area. However, because it is so important, with potential national impact on policy, the data and methods need to be very accurate. I have some concerns that in the regression, the numbers are low. Also, the confidence intervals of the Odds ratios overlap. a) I think there needs to be a statistical review to ensure that a regression is appropriate for this data set. b) I would appreciate statistical review on whether the conclusions drawn- that there is a correlation between increasing rurality at entry and ultimate practice location. It could be argued that, given that the confidence intervals overlap, that there is no significant difference between these locations- anywhere from urban (upper CI 1.24) to accessible (lower CI 1.24) and accessible (upper CI 4.40) and remote (lower CI 2.26).
3. Are the data sound?
   A: See above
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   A: As far as I can tell
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   A: Yes
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   A: There is a good recognition of the limitations of this study, but there are still some quite strong claims made based on the data set and this needs to be verified statistically.
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   A: Yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   A: Yes

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   A: Yes, within the limits of my previous comments

10. Is the writing acceptable?
    Minor revisions:
    A: Yes. Minor typos eg line 94 'outwith'

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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