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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor-in-Chief Amy Branch-Hollis

Thank you very much for the opportunity to submit a minor revised version of the manuscript” Differences in association of lower bone mineral density with higher coronary calcification in female and male end-stage renal disease patients” by Zhimin Chen et al. Below, we have provided itemized responses to each of editor’s comments, and have made corresponding changes in the revised text.

We thank the editor and reviewers for their constructive comments and hope the revised version is now suitable for publication in BMC Nephrology.
On behalf of the authors,

Zhimin Chen, MD

Kidney Disease Center

1st Affiliated Hospital College of Medicine, Zhejiang University.

310000 Hangzhou, China

Editor Comments:

1. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works. This overlap mainly exists in the Background, Methods and Discussion sections. Please rephrase these sections to minimise overlap. For overlap in the Methods section, please rephrase/summarise your methods and ensure that they are fully cited.

Comment: Yes, we rephrased the overlap part existing in the Background, Methods and Discussion sections.

2. 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.

Comment: Yes, we described the role of the funding in revised version of the manuscript.

3. Please represent authors' names using their initials, NOT their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section.

Comment: Yes, we represented authors' names using their initials in the Authors’ Contributions section in revised version of the manuscript.

4. We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of Abdul Rashid Qureshi, Torkel B Brismar, Jonaz Ripswed, Mathias Haarhaus, Peter Barany and Olof Heimburger as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to being accountable for all aspects of the analysis of data or participating in the design of the study, alone, does not usually justify authorship.
Comment: Yes, we provided more justification for the contributions of Abdul Rashid Qureshi, Torkel B Brismar, Jonaz Ripsweden, Mathias Haarhaus, Peter Barany and Olof Heimburger in revised version of the manuscript.

5. Please remove the competing interests/funding information information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding and Competing Interests sections instead.

Comment: Yes, we removed the competing interests/funding information information from the Acknowledgements and include them in the Funding and Competing Interests sections instead in revised version of the manuscript.

6. We note that you have not included a ‘Consent for publication’ section in the Declarations. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Comment: Yes, we included a ‘Consent for publication’ section in the Declarations in revised version of the manuscript.

7. Please include a section called "Keywords" after the Abstract section in your manuscript. This section should include three to ten keywords representing the main content of the article.

Comment: Yes, we included "Keywords" after the Abstract section in revised version of the manuscript.

8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Comment: Yes, we uploaded our revised version of the manuscript as a single, final, clean version.