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Author's response to reviews:

Reviewer (R): The manuscript contains many grammatical and spelling errors. Please have the manuscript read carefully by a native English speaker to correct these.

Author (A): Revised.

R: Please incorporate references to the recent articles cited by the reviewers.

A: Included.

R: You use many abbreviations without defining them: ESRD, GBM, GFR, NKF, BMI, HTN, ACE, ARB please be sure to spell out all abbreviations where they are first used.

A: Corrected.

R: The paper starts off with a list of other diseases that are attributed to smoking. This is all very well known and adds nothing to your paper, so I would recommend that you edit this down to discuss the role of smoking in kidney disease. From the comments from the reviewers it appears that there may be more recent information that could be incorporated into the introduction about kidney disease and smoking.

A: Revised.

R: The methods could be improved by providing more information on how the diagnosis was made. Who made the diagnosis? Was this study retrospective or prospective in terms of the diagnosis? Were subjects diagnosed by their own doctor and then later identified by chart review for inclusion in the study, or were
they entered into the study as soon as they were diagnosed? Please provide more detail on how the controls were identified, were they from hospital patients, clinic patients or people in the community? How were they identified? Who contacted them?
A: Revised.

The p values are carried out to 3 places when one is sufficient when they are not significant. The last 2 sentences of the discussion talk about results that were not presented in the results section concerning gender differences. You should present the relevant data in the results section or not discuss them.
A: Corrected and revised.

Editorial Requests:

We recommend that you copyedit the paper to improve the style of written English. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional copyediting service. We would be grateful if you could address the comments in a revised manuscript and provide a cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns. Please also highlight (with ‘tracked changes’/coloured/underlines/highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript to make it easier for the Editors to give you a prompt decision on your manuscript.
A: MS. Word track changes option was used.

This is an interesting paper dealing with an issue only scantily investigated so far in patients with chronic kidney disease. Very recently Yamamoto R and all published a study on Am J Kidney Dis. 2010 Aug;56(2):313-24, involving patients with IgA nephropathy and their conclusions were in keeping with the present paper. The Method Section should implemented, clearly stating the nature of the study (ie cross sectional, length of follow-up and so on). The discussion could be shortened. There are many errors in spelling all over the manuscript.
A: Corrected and revised, Changes are highlighted and tracked using MS. Word track changes option.