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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor of BMC Medical Education,

We have now formatted our manuscript 1976048772156837 - Factors affecting the choice of and predicting dissatisfaction with the medical profession observing all the comments we got from the reviewers.

First of all, we would like to give very kind compliments for the reviewers. Their excellent comments have helped us to significantly improve our manuscript.

Based on the comments from the reviewers, the manuscript has gone through a major re-writing process.

First of all, we have changed the title of the manuscript based on the suggestion made by the reviewer 2.

In Background, we have focused the manuscript to better support the aim of the study and also provided better background for the analysis to come.

In Methods, we have added asked information about significance of the results, as well as information about Finnish legislation concerning this kind of studies. We have also added references to the Finnish legislation.

In Results, we have added information about previous study years in to the tables, as asked. We have also made a completely new logistic regression analysis based on the comments from the reviewers. The text of the manuscript has been rewritten based on these changes.

In Discussion, we have rewritten the manuscript based on the changes made in the Methods and Results. We have also focused the manuscript based on the comments given by the reviewers.
In Conclusions, we have reduced the section as recommended in the comments given by the reviewers. In here, we have given the main conclusions of the study for the readers of BMC Medical Education.

The manuscript has gone through a language revision by a professional. We have also prepared the manuscript to conform to the journal style.

Detailed comments for the reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. The first comment includes quite a few concerns in the background section. Because of this, we have done several changes in to this section by both removing and rewriting the text. Some new references have also been added.

2. We have included some background of the questions concerning gender in this section to better justify our following analysis.

3. The representativeness of each survey has been described in details in each study report. Therefore, even if these reports are in Finnish, we didn't consider it necessary to include this information in to the Table 1. Instead, we clarified the text and the references in this matter.

4. As based on this comment and also the comments concerning the results section, we run the logistic regression model also for the 1998 study. The results have been included in to the Table 4.

5. The results of the statistical test have been mostly included. Where they have been not, we have justified our decisions in this cover letter.

6. Done as suggested

7. Table 2 has been completed as suggested. We also decided to remove the sentence from page 14 line 1 to prevent possible confusion in this matter.

8. Information about statistical significance has been added in to the text.

9. Done as suggested

10. First of all, we have included the results of the 1998 study in to the Table 4 as suggested. Concerning the request to add the model statistics, coefficient and standard error for each parameter, we have discussed this matter with our statistician. In our understanding, these parameters can be mostly deduced from the data already presented in the table. Adding this information would also widen the table significantly and make it much harder to read. However, we have included Nagelkerke R-squared value for both 1998 and 2008 models in to the table to show the goodness of fit as suggested. We have also discussed these values in the discussion.

11. Done as suggested
12. Done as suggested

13. We have started the discussion with the most important findings.

14. The discussion has been revised as suggested. After changes in the methods section the first example mentioned in this comment has become irrelevant.

15. This statement has now been justified with references.

16. These items have been removed from the analysis and therefore also from the discussion.

17. Done as suggested. We have also clarified this section in the discussion.

18. Done as suggested.

19. After serious consideration, we have decided to propose that we report the numbers of respondents as in original tables, not as suggested. We have been trying to keep the tables as easy to read as possible. We believe that even if adding this information for each variable/line would make the tables more accurate, it would also make them more difficult to follow. Moreover, the differences between the numbers of respondents for each variable/line are quite small. Hence, they don't have a significant impact for the interpretation of the results.

20. Done as suggested

21. We have clarified the definition in the text.

22. Corrected as suggested

23. Corrected as suggested

Reviewer 2

1. We have gone through the literature concerning this issue and added some new references in to the manuscript.

2. We have added some discussion about this matter in to the manuscript.

3. There weren't any other work to which the first questionnaire was based on. The questionnaire hasn't been validated. We have added some discussion about this matter in to the manuscript.

4. This has been added in to the discussion.

5. From our perspective this comment about the main findings of the study helped to rewrite especially the discussion.

6. We have added some discussion about responder bias as suggested. We didn't include discussion about survivor bias, since in our data there may also be
respondents who have left medicine.

7. We have added some discussion about this in to the manuscript.

8. Thank you for the excellent suggestion for the title. We have changed the title as suggested.

9. We believe that it is unnecessary to repeat the results presented in the tables and figures in the manuscript. We have added some information about significance of the changes in to the tables and figures.

10. The revised manuscript has gone through a language revision by a professional.

11. In original manuscript we included also some results from the 1998 survey, even if it wasn't presented in the tables. Because of the suggestions from reviewer 1 we have now included this data in to the tables. This should also clarify this line noted here.

12. Major changes have been made to the table because of the suggestions from reviewer 1.

13. Done as suggested.