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Reviewer's report:

General

This version read much better. It is clear and easy to follow.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. I would still recommend running a factor analysis as the time involved is minimal. This is not essential but it may help to uncover global issues (e.g., patient population attractive/not attractive, etc.)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Paragraph 1, Background: The sentence that begins "The demand for pediatric pulmonologists ..." needs a reference.
2. Paragraph 1, Methods, the authors still needs to add a phrase saying how the questionnaires were distributed (It was in the response, but it is not mentioned in the paper.)
3. The fact the Human Subjects was not obtained should be explicitly stated and, then, followed with the reasons for why this is not a concern.
4. Paragraph 1, results should be divided into 3 paragraphs. New paragraphs should begin at "Of the 43 respondents ..." and "Eight residents (19%) ..."
5. Table 4: please make clear that these are numbers in the columns. Percents would be particularly helpful for the -PF group b/c the text discuss actually career choices using percents.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions