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Dear Dr Morrey,

Thank you for your email, dated 22 August 2012.

Please find below our point by point responses addressing Reviewer #3’s new final concerns.

We look forward to your final editorial decision in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

David Johnson

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #3

1. Pg 09 line 13. Add a parenthesis before “table 2”

   The bracket has been added.

2. Pg 10 line 09, spell DBD

   DBD has now been spelt out in full (donation after brain death).

3. Page 10 line 20 OR 1.304 is wrong. Value should be between 0.91-1.18.

   The typographical error has been corrected (the OR is 1.04).


   The range has been corrected to 1-10 mg/kg. References have already been provided in the preceding 2 sentences (references 16-21).

5. Page 11 line 18. “However…this possibility”. This sentence is not clear. This is about higher dose of statin or modifying influence of immunosuppressive agents?

   The sentence has been clarified, as follows:

   “However, a previous study by our group demonstrating a significant renoprotective effect of simvastatin on cyclosporine-induced injury in primary cultures of human proximal tubule cells argues against abrogation of the renoprotective effect of statins by calcineurin inhibitors in transplantation-related ischaemia-reperfusion injury.”


   The reference was provided in the preceding sentence (reference 26). To avoid any confusion, the reference has been additionally cited at the end of the sentence referred to by the Reviewer.

7. Page 13, line 12. “Mitigating against” or only mitigating. I thing “against” is not needed.
The word “against” has been deleted.

8. Table 1. There is no need to indicate that 100% data is available. Also, as there is no missing data above 5%, the missing data may not be needed to be specified at all. However, if so a line in the bottom of the table would be the better way.

The % data available was added to Table 1 during the second revision of the manuscript in response to a request by this Reviewer. We agree with the Reviewer’s current position that the data do not need to be specified at all (given the minimal amount of missing data) and, accordingly, have removed it from the table.

9. Table 5 “statin use” line. Change 0.389 to 0.39

The value has been changed to 0.39.