

Dear Editor

On behalf of my co-authors, I would like to thank the editorial staff and reviewers for their thoughtful comments regarding our work. We appreciate the opportunity to address reviewers' comments, and the suggested changes have enhanced our manuscript.

Please find our responses to the queries below, and our revised text is included in the online submission documents.

Please find below our point to point answers to the Reviewers:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: COVID-19 pandemic is worldwide problem. The authors presented their experience with this disease in the patients with chronic kidney disease. Since this disease is new one every experience is very important.

Authors' response: We thank Reviewer 1 for the suggestion of minor language polishing. We addressed that in the new version

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is unique single study of the experience in a relatively large number of patients with hemodialysis. It is well done and well written and can be accepted as is. Ys

Authors' response: We thank Reviewer 2 for the appreciation of our article. We kept the same content in the revised version

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: A very fantastic paper. Although as you stated there some discrepancies in literature you had some results resembling some single centres as one published from Turkey. In that paper as in yours, there was a number diagnosed by routine screening with CT primarily mortality resembles your results. very big databases as you

mentioned are heterogenous. we know some centres with very high mortality. but most of time as many papers early admission and follow up was a key.

Authors' response: We thank Reviewer 3 for the appreciation of our article. We kept the same content in the revised version

We also addressed the EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

This manuscript is A retrospective cohort study was conducted to investigate the clinical course and outcome of MHD hospitalized due to covid-19. This manuscript has certain value. Please supplement the author information according to the format requirements of the World Journal of Neurology.

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Authors' response: We are thankful for the appreciation of our study. We addressed every requirement asked.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Nephrology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Authors' response: We are thankful for the acceptance of our study. We addressed all the requirements for the figures and tables in the revised version