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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript was a pleasure to review. It is very interesting, nicely written and of good quality. The topic is urgent and well-addressed.

Please number your comments and divide them into:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract

1. Under Results, second sentence, the OR for low job satisfaction is different than what is listed in Table 4: 1.0 vs .967.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Overall: There are some very minor copy edits that are required, for example missing articles or articles when none are needed, some words capitalized that shouldn’t be. None changes the reader’s ability to understand (except as noted below) but should be addressed before publication.

Background

2. First paragraph, 4th to final sentence. “Existing studies confirm a relationship between low job satisfaction low motivation, turnover intention of physicians to leave…” is the relationship between low job satisfaction and both low motivation and intention to leave?

Methods

3. Second paragraph, second sentence, authors use the word “drop outs” to refer to those who do not return the questionnaire. Given this is a cross-sectional study I would suggest calling them “non-responders”

4. Data analysis section (SPSS Inc., Chicago IL, USA). I believe this should be just another numbered citation like the rest.

5. Data analysis section, third to last sentence. Authors describe they use the “Multiple logistic regression analysis (Enter technique)”. For those who are not familiar with the specific SPSS command, please describe what that technique
does (forces all listed variables into the model together) or delete “enter technique”.

Results
6. In the Multivariate Logistic Regression section, there are formatting errors in the PDF file where underlines are supposed to be I believe. I’m not sure if this is something that is taken care of by the authors or by the editors.
7. Please add space between rows of factors/variables/respondent characteristics in Tables 1, 3 and 4. They are difficult to read because there are no spaces to differentiate the rows.
8. Table 4: Please add a note at the bottom of the table defining “I” which is in the 95% CI column.

Discussion
9. Third paragraph, fourth sentence: “For dropping out of medical school and for doctors working abroad in Germany [38], and various job satisfaction subscales have shown a similar pattern in other countries.” I don’t understand this sentence.

Conclusion
10. Fourth sentence. “Although they were consecutive periods but the motives to leave were almost distinct.” It’s not clear to me what “they” refers to. What consecutive periods? (the two decades?) What were the distinct motives? For whom and when?

- Discretionary Revisions

Abstract
1. In the conclusion, the last sentence, rather than “anticipated” I suggest something like “required”

Background
2. Second paragraph, 4th sentence. “…reflected negatively on the health system.” I suggest a different word, such as “affected the health system negatively.”

Results
3. First paragraph, fourth sentence. Delete (51.2%) at end of sentence. Redundant.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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