

Response Letter

Dear editor:

We are very grateful to your decision and advice on our manuscript titled "Risk factors for mortality within 6 months in patients with diabetes undergoing urgent-start peritoneal dialysis: a multicenter retrospective cohort study". We are also grateful to the reviewers for all their comments and advice. And we made the corresponding modification according to each suggestion. The language in this revised manuscript has been polished by a professional language editing agency again. For your convenience, we have highlighted the changes in yellow. We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal.

Once again, thank you very much for your consideration.

We are looking forward to your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Wenpeng Cui

Reviewer #1: The article looks good. It is technically sounding great with proper statistics and is informative as well. However, the paper has a lot of grammatical and punctuation mistakes. The sentence formation and paragraph formation are not up to the mark. I recommend rigorous revision of the entire script for language improvement. Overall, the paper can be accepted after the suggested minor revisions are done.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion very much. We have reviewed and corrected grammar and punctuation errors in the article, and we also have rigorously adjusted the sentence formation and paragraph formation in the revised manuscript. And the language has been polished by a professional language editing agency again. And the language certificate this time has been submitted as "73071-Non-Native-Speakers-of-English-Editing-Certificate-revision".

Reviewer #2: The article "Risk factors for death within six months in patients with diabetes undergoing urgent-start peritoneal dialysis: a multicenter retrospective cohort study" was submitted for review. The article is devoted to an extremely relevant topic, namely, end-stage renal failure (ESRD), which is a global health problem. Studies of patients on peritoneal dialysis have shown that patients with diabetes mellitus (DM) have a worse prognosis than patients without diabetes, in addition to lower survival rates due to the high prevalence of cardiovascular disease. This study examines both the occurrence and risk factors for death within the first six months after initiation of USPD in diabetic patients. The introduction section contains all the necessary information about the relevance of the problem under study, the purpose of the study. The Materials and Methods section well describes the characteristics of patient selection and study design, types of dialysis, data collection and definitions, and statistical methods for data analysis. The Results section is presented well and comprehensively. The Discussion

section is well presented. The list of references contains 33 sources. The article is well illustrated with 2 tables and 4 figures. It is concluded that the risk of death in the first six months in diabetic patients was highest after the initiation of the USPD. We hypothesize that controlling serum phosphorus levels and improving cardiac function will reduce the risk of death during the first six months in these patients. Conclusion. The article can be recommended for publication without changes.

Reply: Thank you for your comments very much. The language has been polished again in this revised manuscript this time. And the language certificate this time has been submitted as “73071-Non-Native-Speakers-of-English-Editing-Certificate-revision”.

Science editor: This is an interesting study with appropriate statistics and a wealth of information, and the manuscript is well written.

Reply: Thank you for your comments very much. We have reviewed and corrected grammar and punctuation errors in the article, and we also have rigorously adjusted the sentence formation and paragraph formation in the revised manuscript. And the language has been polished by a professional language editing agency again. And the language certificate this time has been submitted as “73071-Non-Native-Speakers-of-English-Editing-Certificate-revision”.

Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Diabetes, 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 decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please 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.

Reply: Thank you for your comments very much. We have provided decomposable Figures in a single PowerPoint file and submitted it as “73071-Image-File-revision.pptx” on the system. And we have provided standard three-line tables in a single Word file, and submitted it as “73071-Table-File-revision.docx” on the system this time.