Author’s response to reviews

Title: Use of estimated glomerular filtration rate to predict incident chronic kidney disease in patients at risk of cardiovascular disease: a retrospective study

Authors:

Saif AlShamsi (salshamsi@uaeu.ac.ae)
Abderrahim Oulhaj (aoulhaj@uaeu.ac.ae)
Dybesh Regmi (dregmi@uaeu.ac.ae)
Romona Govender (govenderr@uaeu.ac.ae)

Version: 1 Date: 24 Jul 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Cover Letter
July 24, 2019

Re: Resubmission of manuscript, Use of estimated glomerular filtration rate to predict incident chronic kidney disease in patients at risk of cardiovascular disease: a retrospective study, BNEP-D-19-00084

Jing Zhang
Assistant Editor
BMC Nephrology

Dear Dr. Zhang,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript, "Use of estimated glomerular filtration rate to predict incident chronic kidney disease in patients at risk of cardiovascular disease: a retrospective study."
We would also like to express our thanks to the reviewers and editors for the careful review and helpful comments for correction. It is our belief that the manuscript is substantially improved after making the suggested edits.

Following this letter are the reviewers and editor comments with our responses, including how and where the text was modified. The revision has been developed in consultation with all coauthors, and each author has given approval to the final form of this revision.

We look forward to hearing from you in due time regarding our submission and to respond to any further questions and comments you may have.

Yours sincerely,

Saif Al-Shamsi,
Internal Medicine Department,
College of Medicine & Health Sciences,
United Arab Emirates University,
Al-Ain, United Arab Emirates.
Email: salshamsi@uaeu.ac.ae

REVIEWER #1 Cécile Couchoud, M.D., Ph.D.:

Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript. The following are our point-by-point responses.

Thanks to the author for having taken into account our comments.

I have only 2 minor comments.

1. Figure 3 may be more relevant by using a Y axis from 0 to 1 (and not 0.88 to 1). It would attenuate the variability that may not be significant.
Author’s response: Thank you for your comment. Figure 3’s Y-axis has been adjusted from 0 to 1 and the new figure file has been uploaded.

2. The interpretation of Figure 4 is may be over optimistic "the calibration plots comparing actual risk and predicted risk in both models showed that the actual CKD risk in the cohort was similar to the predicted risk". It rather suggests underestimation in lower risk group and overestimation in higher risk group.

Author’s response: Thank you for pointing this out. The following sections have been edited/corrected:

Abstract section, Results subsection, lines 48-49, page 2, the sentence “The calibration plot showed that the actual CKD risk is similar to the predicted risk.” has been removed.

Results section, lines 202-204, pages 9-10, the sentence “The calibration plots comparing actual risk and predicted risk suggested underestimation in the lower risk group and overestimation in the higher risk group in both models (Fig. 4).” has replaced the previous sentence.

REVIEWER #2:

Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript. The following are our point-by-point responses.

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately
STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Very well done. The investigators substantially revised the manuscript and the revised work is much stronger. The addition of a competing risks framework, calibration and discrimination measures and more transparent methods are well done.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
None identified.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comments.

EDITOR COMMENTS

Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript. The following are our point-by-point responses.

Editor Comments:

1. Please address the Reviewer#1’s comments as below.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment. Reviewer #1, Dr. Cécile Couchoud’s two comments have been addressed above.
2. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0199920

This overlap mainly exists in the Methods (page 6).

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment. Methods section, lines 115-120, page 6, has been re-phrased.

3. On uploading your revisions, please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Please remove the current response to reviewers from the file inventory.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment. A revised manuscript clean copy has been uploaded and the previous response to reviewers has been removed from the file inventory.