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Reviewer's report:

The authors address an important question in early faculty attrition. Overall, they have done a nice job describing the scope of the problem and their findings. The Title and abstract are well-written.

The introduction is well written and requires only minimal revision (see below). The methods are also well written and the categories are clear. You may consider including all of your survey questions in an appendix. The use of tables displays the data nicely. I wonder if it would be worthwhile to include a table of factors NOT associated with early attrition (especially if there were any surprises.) In the discussion, I appreciate the numerous references to support your conclusions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

The data on % of respondents who had resigned does not match in the Results section (36% completion) and the discussion section (55%, when discussing limitations). Please double check your data and respond with the accurate numbers.

Discretionary Revisions:

The first sentence of your abstract reads much better than the first sentence of the manuscript. I would consider having your manuscript begin with the same sentence as the abstract.

In the Methods, for the question, “What primary professional or personal consideration impacted your decision to leave the University of Colorado School of Medicine?”, was this a multiple select or free text option?

The 3rd sentence in the Methods/Data Analysis section is cumbersome. I would consider revising and making 2 shorter sentences.

The first paragraph of page 12 (starting with “Although previous studies have focused..”) seems out of place and disruptive to the natural flow of the discussion.

Minor Essential Revisions

1st line of Methods: Insert the letter “a” prior to public

1st line of page 15 should be “losses” instead of “loses”

Table 1: Spacing of Rank (Assistant Professor, etc) does not line up with other columns, making it difficult to read.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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