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Author’s response to reviews:

To the Editors of BMC Nephrology

Mrs. Danielle Talbot and

Mrs. Hayley Henderson

Date: January 22nd 2019

Regarding: Revision of the manuscript BNEP-D-18-00608R1

Dear Mrs. Danielle Talbot and Dear Mrs. Hayley Henderson,

Dear Editorial Board Members,

We thank you very much for your time, dedication and constructive comments regarding our manuscript entitled “Clinical course & Management of Childhood Nephrotic Syndrome in
Germany: A large epidemiological ESPED study” by Ingo Franke & Malik Aydin and colleagues to BMC Nephrology.

We are very excited to resubmit our revised manuscript and are very grateful for the final editorial technical comments. We have included the appropriate changes in the revised manuscript, which are highlighted. We agree with the comments. Moreover, we have provided a more structured presentation of our data.

These (and other) implementations have certainly made the manuscript much stronger and interesting for the readers of the journal. In summary, we believe that we have adequately revised the manuscript and addressed the remaining issues raised by the technical check. Enclosed, please, find a point-by-point response to the various comments of the reviewers and the revised version of the manuscript.

If any unresolved issues remain, please do not hesitate to let us know. We thank you very much for your time and considerations again.

On behalf of all authors,

With best wishes,

Dr. Malik Aydin

Dr. Ingo Franke (R.I.P.)

Point-by-point response to reviewer’s remarks

21-Jan-2019
Dear Dr. Aydin,

Your manuscript "Clinical course & Management of Childhood Nephrotic Syndrome in Germany: A large epidemiological ESPED study" (BNEP-D-18-00608R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Nephrology, once you have carried out some essential editorial revisions (listed below).

Their reports, together with any other comments, are below. Please also take a moment to check our website at https://www.editorialmanager.com/bnep/ for any additional comments that were saved as attachments. Please note that as BMC Nephrology has a policy of open peer review, you will be able to see the names of the reviewers.

If you are able to fully address these points, we would encourage you to submit a revised manuscript to BMC Nephrology. Once you have made the necessary corrections, please submit a revised manuscript online at:

https://www.editorialmanager.com/bnep/

If you have forgotten your password, please use the 'Send Login Details' link on the login page at https://www.editorialmanager.com/bnep/. For security reasons, your password will be reset.

We request that a point-by-point response letter accompanies your revised manuscript. This letter must provide a detailed response to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing what amendments have been made to the manuscript text and where these can be found (e.g. Methods section, line 12, page 5). If you disagree with any comments raised, please provide a detailed rebuttal to help explain and justify your decision.

Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found at the Submission Guidelines on the journal homepage.

A decision will be made once we have received your revised manuscript, which we expect by 20 Feb 2019.
Please note that you will not be able to add, remove, or change the order of authors once the editor has accepted your manuscript for publication. Any proposed changes to the authorship must be requested during peer-review and adhere to our criteria for authorship as outlined in BioMed Central's policies. To request a change in authorship, please download the 'Request for change in authorship form' which can be found here - http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#authorship. Please note that incomplete forms will be rejected. Your request will be taken into consideration by the editor, and you will be advised whether any changes will be permitted. Please be aware that we may investigate, or ask your institute to investigate, any unauthorized attempts to change authorship or discrepancies in authorship between the submitted and revised versions of your manuscript.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Danielle Talbot
on behalf of
Hayley Henderson
BMC Nephrology

AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank you very much for the friendly, kind and constructive feedback. We have addressed all mentioned remarks to the best of our beliefs into the manuscript. We have outlined all changes in detail below.

Technical Comments:

1. Upon resubmission, please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Please ensure the document is in the final form for publication; please upload only files that are to be published. If you wish to respond to these revision requests, please insert the information in to the designated input box only.
AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial team for this comment. We removed all tracked changes and highlights, and the document is now submitted in its final form for publication. The files are now finished/ready for publication.

2. In the Ethics approval and consent to participate section, please clarify that consent was given by the parents/guardians of the children.

AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial board for this advice. We added this missing information in the ethics approval and consent to participate section.

3. In Funding, please state whether or not the funding body played any roles in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial team for this comment. We added a statement. The funding did not play any role in the design of the study and collection, analysis and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

4. Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. Please remove the titles/legends present within the figure files.

AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial board for this advice. We removed the titles presented within the figure files.

5. Please ensure that the author list in the submission system matches that within the manuscript.
AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial team for this comment. The author list presented in the manuscript is the initial submitted author list/range in its final form. Based on that fact, that my name is on second position in manuscript, but performing the corresponding authorship role by my person, the system presents my name on first place. We could not delete or change this.

6. If the questionnaire used during the study was created specifically for this study please include a blank English copy of the manuscript in the Additional files. Also, please add a section "Additional files" (after the References/Figure legends) where you list the following information for each additional/supplementary file in the file inventory:

File name (e.g. Additional file 1), Title of data, Description of data

If the questionnaire used is an existing one, then please include a link to the questionnaire in the Methods.

AUTHOR REPLY:

We thank the editorial board for this comment. We translated the questionnaire used during the study specifically for this study in English and it is given as supplementary material.