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BMC Nephrology
Editorial Review Board

Dear BMC Editors:

Re: MS: 2110942054150428
“The effect of citrate dialysate on intradialytic heparin dose in haemodialysis patients: study design of a randomized controlled trial”

Thank you for allowing us to resubmit our manuscript with editorial changes as requested. We have provided an itemized summary of the modifications made to the paper below, with requested changes provided in **bold**, followed by our responses in *italics*.

1.) Proofs

1. Ethical and Funding Approval Documentation

Before we can proceed with your submission, can you please forward copies of all ethical approval and funding approval for our records. These documents should be sent as email attachments to the following email address, BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com. Please DO NOT upload these documents as additional files in the submission system. If your documents are not in English, please could you provide translated versions of the relevant parts. These should be endorsed and signed by a contactable person at the institution. Please also include the original documents. Can you please confirm in your cover letter that you have forwarded the requested documentation to [BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com](mailto:BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com).

Copies of ethical and funding approval for our study have been forwarded to [BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com](mailto:BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com) as requested. In summary, our study received ethical approval, and was funded by the University of Calgary Division of Nephrology. No funds were received from industry.
2. Funding

A study is considered to be externally funded if the authors have been awarded a grant for the study by a major funding body (e.g. governmental funding/award from a charitable foundation). If a study has not received external funding, then the study protocol will be sent for peer-review with a member of our Editorial Board. If a study has received funding/assistance from a commercial organization, this should be clearly stated in the 'competing interests' section of your manuscript, and the study protocol will be sent for peer-review by a member of our Editorial Board. Can you please confirm whether your study protocol has undergone peer-review by the funding body.

Our study did not receive funding from government, charitable foundations, commercial organizations, or any other external organization.

3. Study status

The protocol must be for a study that is ongoing. An ‘ongoing’ study is defined as one where the investigators are still collecting, or analyzing data. Can you please confirm what stage your study is currently at.

Our study is ‘ongoing.’ Data collection has been completed, and is currently being analysed.

4. Related Articles

Can you please clarify whether any publications containing the results of this study have already been published or submitted to any journal. If so, can you please provide a list of the related articles.

The results of our study have not been submitted to or published by any journal. Preliminary results were presented at the Canadian Society of Nephrology Annual Meeting in 2013, Montreal, Canada (poster and talk presentation).

2.) Emails of all coauthors

-Please include a title page at the front of your manuscript file. It should contain, at minimum, the names, institutions, countries and email addresses of all authors, and the full postal address of the submitting author.

Our title page contains the requested information of all authors, including the postal address of the submitting author.

3.) Acknowledgements

- By way of a section ‘Acknowledgements’, please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include the source(s) of funding for each author, and for the manuscript preparation. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in design, in the
collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the
decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Please also acknowledge anyone who
contributed materials essential for the study. If a language editor has made significant revision
of the manuscript, we recommend that you acknowledge the editor by name, where possible.

The role of a scientific (medical) writer must be included in the acknowledgements section,
including their source(s) of funding. We suggest wording such as 'We thank Jane Doe who
provided medical writing services on behalf of XYZ Pharmaceuticals Ltd.'

Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the
Acknowledgements section.

We have no acknowledgements to make.

4.) Authors’ Contributions

- For manuscripts with more than one author, all BMC Series journals require an Authors' Contributions section to be placed after the Competing Interests section.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual
contributions to a published study. To qualify as an author one should 1) have made substantial
contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of
data; 2) have been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important
intellectual content; and 3) have given final approval of the version to be published. Each
author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for
appropriate portions of the content. Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general
supervision of the research group, alone, does not justify authorship.

We suggest the following format (please use initials to refer to each author's contribution): AB
carried out the molecular genetic studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted
the manuscript. JY carried out the immunoassays. MT participated in the sequence alignment.
ES participated in the design of the study and performed the statistical analysis. FG conceived
of the study, and participated in its design and coordination and helped to draft the
manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an
acknowledgements section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person
who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, or a department chair who provided
only general support.

We have added an Authors’ Contributions section to the end of our manuscript.

5.) Kindly include List of Abbreviations

We have included a List of Abbreviations in our manuscript.
Thank you again for allowing us to resubmit our manuscript with editorial changes. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer M. MacRae MSc, MD FRCPC
Associate Professor Medicine
Cumming School of Medicine
University of Calgary