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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We are sending you a new version of our manuscript. We have completely taken in accordance with the comments you've sent.

For each part of the manuscript and for each change made, we took your comments, and explained the answers.

Editor Comments:

1) In the ethics approval and consent to participate section of this study, please provide a reason why “Verbal informed consent to participate was obtained from all subjects involved” as opposed to written consent to participate.

This is not a face-to-face patient survey. Our study is based on the extraction of a database from the REIN register. The patients were not seen face to face. However, all patients were informed by their nephrologist of their inclusion in the REIN register and thus of the possibility of participating in studies through the data collected. Hence, verbal informed consent to participate was obtained from all subjects involved. In this study, written consent was not required as this research was non-interventional. Informations from included patients have been anonymized and depersonalized directly in the database and before extraction for analysis. This has been explained and added in the ethics approval and consent to participate section.

2) Please clarify if the CNIL is an ethics committee and whether this granted ethics approval for this study.

We completely agree with your remarks. We forgot to mention the second ethics committee. This is the CCTIRS which approved the methodology for the collection of data from the REIN register and the studies relating to the REIN data, without additional collection.

The CNIL is an ethics committee that assists professionals in their compliance and helps individuals to control their personal data and exercise their rights. It analyses the impact of technological innovations and emerging uses on privacy and freedoms. Finally, it works closely with its European and international counterparts to develop harmonized regulation.
The REIN registry therefore has a CNIL agreement and a CCTIRS agreement.

We specified this in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section.

3) Please clarify if the CNIL approved the method of obtaining consent from participants for this study. We completely agree with your remarks. As previously mentioned, we forgot to mention the second ethics committee. This is the CCTIRS which approved the methodology for the collection of data from the REIN register and the studies relating to the REIN data, without additional collection.

The CNIL is an ethics committee that assists professionals in their compliance and helps individuals to control their personal data and exercise their rights. It analyses the impact of technological innovations and emerging uses on privacy and freedoms. Finally, it works closely with its European and international counterparts to develop harmonized regulation. The REIN registry therefore has a CNIL agreement and a CCTIRS agreement.

We specified this in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section.

4) Please provide more detail regarding the contributions of AK in this study in line with ICMJE guidelines for authorship.

AK is a native English speaker who helped us to write the English version of the article. He was also involved in interpreting the data, writing the manuscript and gave final approval of the version to be published. We have made this clearer in the Authors' contribution section.

5) In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. If they had no role, please state this.

This REIN registry was supported by grants from the French Biomedicine Agency. Funding is only available to pay clinical research assistants for data collection from patient records and data entry. The French Biomedicine Agency had no role in study design, conduct, analysis, interpretation, and manuscript writing. We have better described in the section "Funding".

6) Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

We have well provided the titles and legends of the figures under a separate heading of "Legends of Figures" just after the references.
7) Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

We removed the titles that were present in the files.

8) We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


   This overlap is found in the following section.

   - Background

   You're absolutely right. We have reworked the paragraph which was taken from an article published by the last co-authors of our team, Professor Stéphanie Gentile. Indeed, it is an article published by our team and which contains the same ideas that we wanted expressed. According to your comment, the paragraphe has been modified.

   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nephro.2016.07.453

   This overlap is found in the following sections:

   - Methods – Analysed data.

   You're right. You're right. We used these sentences because they are from articles written by members of the REIN registry and because they are clinical reference data. We reworked them by synthesizing the method.

   - Discussion – first paragraph, page 15.

   Similarly, we used these sentences because they are taken from articles written by the members of the REIN register and they are identical ideas to ours. These two articles have been well included in the references.

   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.03.016

   This overlap is found in the following section:
- Methods – Data Analysis

For our analyses, we used the Poisson model from an article that validated this statistical method. We forgot to quote this article and added it to the references.

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

Anne-Claire Durand

For all co-authors