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Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for providing us the feedback of our Revised Manuscript entitled « Monitoring of hemodialysis quality-of-care indicators: Why is it important? ». We are pleased to submit the second revision of our case article, which takes into account the constructive remarks of the Reviewers. Special care has been taken in modifying this manuscript according to your concerns and we sincerely do hope that this additional revised version will satisfactorily address requirements for publication in your journal.

Sincerely,

Steven Grangé

~~~~~~REVIEWER COMMENTS~~~~~~

Reviewer #2:

“I don’t have the specific changes made in this revision these need to be provided as opposed to a general discussion by the authors”

We apologize to the Reviewer for having forgotten to underline the changes made in the first revision of our manuscript. The most significant additional changes are now highlighted in the second part of the revised manuscript file.

“the conclusion needs to be rewritten”

The conclusion has been completely rewritten, according to the Reviewer’s suggestion, to better stress on general concluding remarks about the use of quality-of-care indicators and clinical implications resulting from this work.

“something along the lines of the current quality indicators need further study to decide on which ones make a clinical difference and whether they are worth the financial cost of using them in chronic dialysis, like hemo dialfiltration vs conventional hemodialysis or PD also the difficulties of evaluating the effects of multiple quality indicators simultaneously on outcomes needs to be mentioned with a suggestion on how to approach this in future studies”

We have reorganised the discussion of the manuscript, now separating the evidence-based indicators from the non-evidence based indicators. The cost/benefit ratio of the use of specific indicators, and the systematic combination of multiple indicators are discussed in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #3:

No additional change was suggested.