Handling editor's Comment

I have reviewed the revised article and have only 2 small grammar edits done in track changes.

The quantitative and one qualitative result showed that these participants agreed that their clinical relationships, communication, and their abilities to better address the needs of their patients had improved from participating in DEI education and/or training.

Despite these findings, some of the study's findings did not support the positive impact or the need for DEI education and/or training. One participant experienced no change in knowledge or sensitivity after DEI education or training. Another respondent reported a preference for hiring based on skill and not diversity per se. This emphasis on equality or preference for skill over

Methods - because of the small size and what appears to be limited qualitative analysis, would reframe from mixed methods to a primarily quantitative survey with limited qualitative components.

Results:
Figure 3 correct grammar "**Number of Participants' Responded"**
In Demographics:
It states:
"Majority worked outpatient (n=4) or skilled nursing (n=4)"
But total final sample = 5.
This likely reflects earlier respondents (n=9), not final analyzed sample (n=5). This needs clarification to avoid confusion.

Conclusion - there is a contradiction
"While most study participants did not receive DEI training, those who did believe…"
However, your inclusion criteria required participants to have participated in DEI education/training.

Please correct that and the article is good to go.