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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.

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

We have now addressed all the comments given by the referees. Detailed comments of these changes are given below.

Referee 1

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. We have added a couple of references, to both Background and Discussion, to better support the argument that more satisfied clinicians give higher quality of care, and satisfaction with the career would lead to longer career.

2. Done as suggested.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Done as suggested

2. We have added Hosmer-Lemeshow test.

3. Done as suggested.
4. Done as suggested.

5. To our knowledge, these cited recommendations given by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada and the WONCA Europe, even though given by medical educationalists, are largely accepted as the "golden standard" of what a physician needs to know and be able to do to be successful. However, based on this comment, we have revised the sentence mentioned.

6. Done as suggested

7. The sentence mentioned has been removed.

8. Done as suggested.

9. Done as suggested.

10. Done as suggested.

Referee 2

Discretionary Revisions

1. We have changed some sentences so that we report this issue as asked. However, in some other contexts we believe that our interpretation is eligible. To justify this, we have added some evaluation about this interpretation into the limitations section in Discussion.

2. As a simple answer, none of the authors have a position on the purposes of medical school selection. However, we have done some revisions into the manuscript based on this comment.

3. We have made some revisions into Discussion to address issues mentioned in this comment.