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Reviewer's report:

The report is improved and the authors have nicely responded to each of the reviewers' concerns.

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.

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 this format of the discussion. Like the format, but tit needs a better explanation/launch.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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