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25th November 2019

Dear Editor-in-Chief

According to reviewer’s comments we have modified the paper as follow as:

1. For the Background, authors explain a better description of the current dental health services in Thailand, highlighting the concerns regarding the maldistribution of the dental professionals on Paragraph 1 (Page 4 Line 53-60)

2. For Sample selection, authors explain more on the proportion of admitted students of rural track compared to normal track, how to recruits these student and difference on dental curriculum between these two tracks on Paragraph 3 (Page 5 Line 82-91)

3. For the Data collection, authors add heading “Research Instruments” which describe detail of questionnaire including asking hometown of CUDS in each track and attached questionnaire in supplemental file.

4. For the Result, authors analyzed and added the result that the retention rate of dentists in rural track and normal track within the first 3-year work in public services and after 3-year public work were no statistically difference on Page 8 Line 156-160 and in Table 3

5. For Discussion, authors added a more comprehensive discussion on

- comparation the findings for the dental graduates with the existing literature from Thailand on the retention of other health professional graduates on Paragraph 2 Line 221-223.
- the policy implications of the findings on Paragraph 6 and in conclusion.
- how the results of the survey among CU graduates can be generalized to other universities and
colleges in Thailand on Paragraph 7 Line 272-277.
6. For General, the text was revised the English language and the references No. 4, 5, 9 are edited. All content in this manuscript has been read and approved by the authors. All authors are responsible for the content of manuscript.

Thank you very much for consideration, and looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,
Palinee