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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Please find enclosed a further amended version of our manuscript, “A dynamic, multi-professional, needs-based simulation model to inform human resources for health planning”. This version includes additional edits in response to Dr. Nove’s further review.

Specifically, we have clarified the description of the manuscript’s contributions in the abstract (lines 27-28), discussion (lines 457-460), and conclusion (removal of the last sentence) to avoid implying that clinical focus was not included as a determinant of supply in either the SoWMy or ten-Hoope-Bender et al. paper.

We trust that Dr. Nove will be assured that it was not our intent to minimize or misrepresent the work of her team; we characterized their paper the way we did because we were not able to locate reference to this parameter – or the estimation of HRH supply in general – within it. We apologize if we have missed this aspect of the paper. We have instead noted (on what are now lines 459-460) that the potential for changing professions’ levels of clinical focus to address HRH gaps has not, to our knowledge, been a specific focus of any peer-reviewed literature; we trust this will be satisfactory.

We look forward to the results of your and the reviewers’ further deliberations.

Sincerely,

Adrian MacKenzie

On behalf of the other authors