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Subject: Revised manuscript BNEP-D-16-00631, entitled “Internet and social networks users profiles in Renal Transplant Recipient in France” written by Yosra Mouelhi; Marine Alessandrini; Vanessa Pauly; Bertrand Dussol; Stephanie Gentile.
Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewers for their comments in regards to our manuscript BNEP-D-16-00631, which we submitted to BMC Nephrology.

Please find enclosed the revised version of our manuscript. We have completely taken in accordance with the pertinent comments you've sent.

We rewrote some parts in order to improve the understanding. For each part of the manuscript and for each change made, we took your comments, and explained the answers.

Reviewers

“The conclusions and discussion are somewhat speculative and a wider coverage of internet and social media-based information, monitoring and intervention is appropriate. This should discuss the efficacy, cost and practical implementation of such interventions”

According to this comment, we refined the section "discussion" focusing on the results of our study, as well as the efficacy, cost and practical implementation of Internet and social networks intervention, and we tried to ease the reading. We have also reconsidered the section "conclusion”.

“The assertion that hypertension per se causes social isolation in this patient group is not justified by any of the data”.

You’ve absolutely right. This was corrected in the section “Discussion”. We removed social isolation and we explained that patients with hypertension connected less to social networks, and this suggest higher awareness for them.
“A predictive model for lack of internet or social network is not useful since this can easily be assessed by direct question”.

You’ve absolutely right. We think we have confused the use of the term “predictive model “. There is no particular interest to predict the lack of internet or social network. In our study, we would like to determine characteristics associated with the use of internet and social network using the Polytomous regression model. We have concluded that factors associated with the use of internet without social networks were ‘male gender, having no children, employed status, high monthly incomes in the household (>4400 €), having felt a need for an informative support and a high score of the Charlson comorbidity Index’. Moreover, social networks users in our study were ‘younger, without children, with high monthly incomes in the household (>4400 €) and having felt a need for an esteem support. Furthermore, patients without hypertension used the most the social networks’.

To be clearer, we have decided to remove the term of predictive from the manuscript since we are interested in associated characteristics.

“Availability of data and material”

This was indicated in the section “Declaration, Availability of data and material”.

We hope that this revised version meets the expectations of the reviewers, and we remain at your disposal for any further suggestions.

For all co-authors,

Yosra Mouelhi