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Reviewer's report:

this is a very nice paper, on an important issue, well written and already improved after taking into consideration the questions posed by the two reviewers; as section editor, I have been asked by the editorial manager to further analyse this study; I'm glad to find it of very good quality, and overall acceptable for BMC, but I fear that one basic point has not been touched:

- as it is, the paper is only reporting on correlation between The Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index and the progression of aortic calcifications; infact, while two important nutritional markers (differences in BMI and serum albumin) are considered, they are just the two markers of nutritional status selected for one of the many indexes; therefore, the title should be changed into:

The relationship between The Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index and progression of aortic calcification in patients on maintenance hemodialysis

- furthermore, we all know that serum albumin is not the best marker of nutrition in HDF or when HD is performed by highly permeable membranes; these data should be added, and the differences in albumin levels between HD and HDF and according to the permeability of the membranes should be discussed;

- the authors should specify why they chose The Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index, and analyse its limits.

- the complexity of nutritional assessment should also be discussed, as well as the reason why they did not analyse also the changes in The Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index, but only the baseline value as a covariate.

- aortic calcifications are also linked to beta2 microglobulin amyloidosis, please comment.
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