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April 29, 2009

RE: MS: 2146381036239231, REVISED VERSION

To the Editor:

Thank you for the comprehensive review of my manuscript entitled, “DIAGNOSTIC YIELD OF RENAL BIOPSIES: A RETROSPECTIVE SINGLE CENTER REVIEW.” I appreciate the comments and suggestions of the two reviewers and have revised manuscript accordingly. In particular;

- At the end of the first paragraph of the Discussion, I added a sentence justifying the breakdown of useful kidney biopsy procedures into four distinct subcategories.

- I modified the third paragraph of the Results section to provide information on all 11 patients who required a repeat kidney biopsy.

- I modified the fourth paragraph of the results section to provide information on the 21 patient with inconclusive biopsies.

- I added a sentence to the third paragraph of the Discussion section to explain why not all biopsies reports were reviewed by one of the four primary authors and the independent reviewer.

- I have added text describing the subcategories to enable easier interpretation of Figure 2 by readers.

I hope this revised version is now considered suitable for publication in BMC Nephrology. Thank you for your kind attention in this matter.

Sincerely yours

Howard Trachtman MD

Chief, Division of Nephrology