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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear members of the BMC Nephrology Editorial Board,

We thank you for your comments and are happy to complete the final revisions necessary to publish this manuscript, which we believe will advance current knowledge regarding perceptions of nephrology among trainees.

We have made the following changes based on the comments provided to us in the following itemized list:

1. Given that the authors only surveyed residents and students who were training at institutions with nephrology training programs, they need to change the introduction and title to make it clear that these findings do not necessarily reflect all students and trainees, but rather the opinions and attitudes of students and residents who were exposed to nephrology fellows and fellowship. Title could read: Perceptions of nephrology among medical students and internal medicine residents at institutions with nephrology fellows and nephrology fellowship programs.
We agree that the title should better reflect the fact that only students and residents who trained at institutions with nephrology training programs were surveyed. We have accordingly changed the title of our manuscript to, “Perceptions of nephrology among medical students and internal medicine residents: a national survey among institutions with nephrology exposure.”

2. The constructive suggestions at the end are useful but should be set off by an explicit explanation, e.g., on page 9, ln 55, would state the purpose of the figure and make the content of the Table explicit. Otherwise the reader is likely to go directly to the succeeding mix of observations and recommendations on the 6 areas for intervention and miss the rationale for the format of the discussion. Like the format, but it needs a better explanation/launch.

- We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion to more explicitly state the purpose of the figure and make the content of the final table more specific. We have accordingly edited the final sentences of the first paragraph of the Discussion (page 9) to read, “Informed by our results, we summarize strategies to bolster recruitment in Figure 7 and pinpoint ongoing recruitment efforts and areas for future focus in Table 1. Our rationale for these recommendations is described below.”

- Additional minor changes for style and clarity:

3. We have updated Reference #30.

4. We have updated the Figures for clarity

5. We have updated Table 1 with slight variations in text for clarity.
We look forward to contributing to your journal, and we greatly appreciate this opportunity.

Sincerely,

Devika Nair, MD
Division of Nephrology and Hypertension
Vanderbilt University Medical Center