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Reviewer's report:
The manuscript is well written and it addresses a subject of current interest. Despite the small sample size (which is openly recognized as a limitation in the Discussion section), I consider the follow-up duration, as well as the numerous clinical and laboratory variables assessed as strengths of the study.
The statistical methods are appropriately used and the conclusions are supported by the obtained results.
There are only some minor suggestions that I have for the revision of your manuscript.

Major compulsory revisions
none

Minor essential revisions
1. Please change "CKD 4/5" from Introduction (page 7, line 116) with "non-dialysis CKD stages 4 and 5".
2. Since the differences between the levels of sKlotho and PTH at 12 months as compared to baseline were not statistically different, it is better not to describe it separately before the phrase in which it is stated "No other significant changes were observed over ...." (page 12, lines 233-235). Please consider to change by clearly including the two parameters among those which did not showed significant variations.
3. As mentioned in the Tables 2 and 3 legends, the non-parametric distributed variables were logarithmic-transformed before inclusion in the models of multiple regression. Therefore, I suggest writing in the Tables "Log FGF23" (etc), as you did in the Figures. It will allow a faster understanding of the methodology for the reader.
Discretionary revisions
None

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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