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Author's response to reviews:

MAJOR REVISIONS

1. The authors should check for any centre effect by adding centre as an extra level to their multivariable models, and report the methods/findings of the multilevel analyses in the manuscript, either as the main analyses (in Table 3/4), or as supplementary sensitivity analyses.

This information has been updated in the main multivariable analysis table. As demonstrated, between centres variability is exceedingly low. Table 3 has been updated. Relevant text has been added to the methods and the results section.

2. The authors should either revise their current modelling approach, or acknowledge in the Discussion (as a study limitation) that they did not check whether the variables in their model satisfied the criteria for confounding, and that this may have resulted in some associations being potentially mediated by other factors in the model.

Detailed confounder adjusted analysis has been presented with significant variables in the main manuscript (Table 2). Relevant text has been incorporated into the methods and the results section.

3. Related to my point 4: the authors' reply is satisfactory, but they should report in the Methods section of the manuscript that they executed a sensitivity analysis. The results of the sensitivity analysis should be reported in the text of Results section and/or as a footnote to Table 4.

This has been incorporated into the Methods section of the paper. The results have been reported as a footnote to Table 4.

4. The authors' reply to my point 6 is satisfactory, but should be made available to
BMC Nephrology readers as (supplementary) information in the manuscript.

Supplementary information on missing data analysis has been provided.

MINOR REVISIONS
1. The second part of the sentence on line 25-26 in the abstract (pg. 2) doesn't read well ("...and 30 prospectively observed subset of ESRD patients."). Please rephrase.

   This has been rephrased.

2. Please make sure the term used to refer to study group is used consistently in Tables 3 and 4 (now ‘Group’ in Table 3 upper panel, ‘Cohort’ Table 3 lower panel, and ‘Study group’ in Table 4).

   Term used consistently is ‘group’.