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Reviewer's report:

Overall the paper gives interesting information on Hb and ESA dose response following different iron doses.

This gives the suggestion of using the more effective iron dose to correct anemia, that could be lower than that usually used in everyday clinical practice.

Discussion, pg 12, line 263. Please note that one single bolus of a large dose of iron can cause a significant rise of serum ferritin in the short-term. However, it is unknown whether this has long-term consequences. Conversely, maintenance iron therapy increase less serum ferritin levels, but these are maintained for a much longer period.

I would add among the limitations of the study that in general prevalent HD patients are not naïves to iron therapy. This implies that previous iron therapy had a carry-on effect on the iron doses tested in this observational study. Accordingly, patients who were prescribed no iron had higher ferritin and TSAT levels, higher Hb levels and lower ESA doses at baseline. Moreover, those with Hb levels < 10 g/dl at baseline and received no iron had anyway a significant rise in serum Hb.

Table 1: please give the standard deviation of data

Figure 1 to 4: please give the numbers of the patients in all the sub categories of lab values
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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
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