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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written and clear report on medical student and resident perceptions of nephrology. Many of the preferences and themes identified are consistent with previously published data on IM trained fellows who have chosen and not chosen nephrology. Therefore, I think this paper is valid and I have no concerns about it. This is the first large scale survey to ask about interest and lack of interest in students/residents in a contemporary time frame. I think this will make a fine contribution to the literature surrounding recruitment and interest in nephrology.

This work is highly relevant to nephrology educators, program directors, and practicing nephrologists.

A few things that need to be amended:

- "As with all Survey Based Research" on line 33/34 on pg 14 should be a new paragraph

- Re Figure 6. the titles of each sub-figure "Would Consider Nephrology Contribution to Sentiment" I understand this is how the text finding program reports results, but please re-write or re-arrange the wording for each sub-figure. It was not clear at first what it was describing. You could say something like "Frequency of words in text and contribution to the sentiment 'Would Consider Nephrology'"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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