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Major Revisions

Background

1. Authors did not number their manuscript which is a very basic and fundamental mistake to make at this stage of ones academic life. It makes reviews unnecessarily cumbersome.

2. Lines 19-24, page 4: Authors should properly situate this "sweeping" statement since it is also increasingly becoming common knowledge that the world is getting urbanized and more cosmopolitan in nature. Many countries in Africa are getting rural-urban drifts where rural folks are migrating unabated to urban areas.

Authors should emphasize more on the Senegalese situation and how this reflects distribution of health workforce

3. Lines 7 (page 3), 37 (page 4): Authors should consider changing the use of the term "mal-distribution", not sure whether it is proper formal English Language. Perhaps "in-equitable" might be more appropriate

4. Line 26, page 4-5: Subject verb agreement challenge, sentence should read "…Senegalese Health Ministry has made…"

5. Line 38 (page 4-5): Sentence should read "…Human Resources Department …has a working definition…"

6. Lines 9-17 (page 6): Authors should please provide relevant citation for the claim that WTS is a new methodology for DCE in LMICs

Methodology
7. Line 38: The term "D-efficient experimental designing technique" should be briefly explained for novice readers in the area.

8. Authors did not expatiate on the validity and reliability of the proposed research instruments. Supporting literature on the DCE needs to be expanded to justify its use in the current study.

Respondent characteristics

9. Line 16: Authors should take out the word "was" and only maintain "comprised"

10. Line 22: Contradiction with earlier statements in the Methodology section where we are made to understand the non-physician respondents were mainly nurses and midwives but it appears there are other professional cadres (n=11) who also need to be described.

Discussion

11. The entire discussion section needs more work in terms of comparing the findings with relevant local and international empirical studies. It appears the authors merely presented their findings again in the Discussion section of the paper without sufficiently demonstrating their findings deviation or otherwise from the existing literature.

12. The discussion is scanty and should be properly explained in the light of the findings. Relevance of the findings health policy and practice is nearly absent and it is not exactly clear what the Health Ministry in Senegal in other developing countries in SSA should do with these observations.

13. Authors should consider the following suggested literature also looking at staff motivation through innovative approaches at the community level since the central governments (with their limited resources) cannot already find immediate solutions to these human resource challenges within the health sector.
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