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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSES TO REVIEWER’S COMMENTS

We would like to thank the reviewers for the comments in trying to improve our manuscript.

Responses to comments are below:

Editorial Committee Comments:

EDITOR: Please can you address the two editorial points listed below.

1. Ethical Approval
Please can you include the full name of the ethical committee in your manuscript.

2. Declarations Section

Please can you ensure that your revised manuscript includes a Declarations section. This should appear after the Conclusions. Further information about this section has been included at the foot of this email for your attention.

Declarations
- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions
- Acknowledgements

AUTHORS:
1. The full name of the ethical committee is included in the manuscript in the Methods section on page 9, line 159

2. A Declaration section was inserted in the manuscript after Conclusions and List of Abbreviations on page 20, line 401

3. North Shore University Hospital was renamed Northwell Health. The institutional affiliation name was changed for 3 authors on page 2, line 43 and page 3, line 49 and 55

Reviewers Comments:
Reviewer #1:

REVIEWER: Excellent work
AUTHORS: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We are glad to see that there are no comments that need to be addressed.

Reviewer #2:

REVIEWER: The Discussion Section is quite long, perhaps can decrease the length a little bit.

AUTHORS: The Discussion Section was carefully reviewed by the authors. The authors were only able to agree upon removing content from one paragraph that contains 4 references (page 16, line 323). We also shortened content in many paragraphs by using passive voice as recommended by reviewer #3 in the annotated manuscript. The authors believe that all other information in the Discussion Section is essential content information for the manuscript.

Reviewer # 3:

REVIEWER: This study is simple, however, it may shed light on the importance of dose adjustment in CKD and the need of more training and education among prescribers. It needs some minor corrections which appear as notes in the attached file.

AUTHORS: Thank you for reiterating the importance of the topic of our manuscript.

We revised content to address these comments.

Please see changes in the abstract, page 5, line 87.

Please see changes in the body of the manuscript:

Page 7, line 117

Page 8, line 147

Page 9, line 159 and line 172

Page 14, line 277

Page 15, line 295

Page 16, line 313 and line 323

Page 17, line 338.

Font size was corrected in all parts of the manuscript.