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Reviewer's report:

The paper is devoted to give a somehow new methodological spin on the old subject of human resources planning, using as a reference a pre-programmed basket of services that are part of the Mexican CAUSES. By the way, I was surprised in not finding "human resources planning" in the keyword list. The methodology and internal validity and consistency work well, proving that a planned scheme or basket of services are the best foundation to piggyback a planning human resources technique. At the same time, the fact that the research excluded the rest of the services apart from promotion and preventative, opens a question about external validity of the method. The differences in urban and rural PHC, even expected are well addressed. Perhaps a more region-by-region or state-by-state study can shed more light in assessing specific shortages and direct policies. The conclusions (shortage of MD's and HP's) may be applicable, but what would happen if all the services included in the CAUSES are factored in? Probably shortages are much larger than they seem. This is stated in the article, so no fault is present, but I think that it may be important to highlight or suggest a way to account for the not calculated service needs.

In any case it is a good article, uses different statistical tools than the usual, and serve to the purpose. The text is clearly written and a few typos will be surely corrected in the editing process.
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