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Author’s response to reviews:

Assistant Editor
BMC Nephrology

July 23, 2020

Re: Manuscript BNEP-D-19-00833

Dear Assistant Editor,
Thank you for your review of our entitled “Plasma fibrinogen and mortality in patients undergoing peritoneal dialysis: a prospective cohort study”. We appreciate your comments and suggestions and those of the other reviewers.

Indicated below in red font are responses to all your comments. We believe the revised manuscript and supplement address your concerns and are hopeful that you will find the article of sufficient interest to the readership of the BMC Nephrology. Please let me know if you have any questions or if we can be of any further assistance.
-- Assistant editor comments:
1. Consent

-- In the section 'Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate', please state whether the informed consent obtained was written or verbal. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

Reply: We thank the editor for these comments. In the section 'Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate', we’ve stated that the informed consent obtained was written.

2. Authors' Contributions

-- Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

Currently, the contributions of authors XY, JL and HM do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authors are expected to fulfil the criteria below (adapted from McNutt et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Feb 2018, 201715374; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1715374115; licensed under CC BY 4.0):

Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the conception OR design of the work; OR the acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation of data; OR the creation of new software used in the work; OR have drafted the work or substantively revised it

AND to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study);

AND to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.
Acquisition of funding, collection of data or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

If these guidelines are not met, we would request the following change of authorship form be filled out and sent to our editorial office - https://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship

Reply: We thank the editor for these comments. Unfortunately we did not clarify this issue in the 'Authors’ contributions’ section. In fact, Prof. Xiao Yang and Prof. Haiping Mao made critical revision of the article. In addition to collecting data, Dr. Jianbo Li also made contribution to the statistical analysis. We’ve provided further clarifications on their contributions in the 'Authors’ contributions’ section.

3. Cite

-- Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Reply: We ensured that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text.

4. Clean Manuscript

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. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Reply: We thank the editor for these comments. We’ve uploaded our manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

We operate a transparent peer review process for this journal where reviewer reports are published with the article but the reviewers are not named (unless they opt in to include their name).
Reviewer 1: The manuscript improved substantially. The responses to the reviewer comments were accurate. I have no further comments.

Reviewer 2: PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

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: Well done. The revisions were thorough and strengthen the current work

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Authors response to reviewers and revisions were satisfactory

Reply: We sincerely appreciate all reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions to this article.