

A point-by-point response to reviewers

Reviewer #1: A review without new information. The paper is well written and easy to read, and it includes information from the most important clinical trials. A few points need to be dealt with: 1. No reference is given to the paper Meng MJ, published in World Journal of Clinical Cases. 2. Under the headline: 'Immunosuppressive therapy, second paragraph, line 10, the sentence ends abruptly with 'clinical'. Something is missing.

1. The citation for Meng MJ was added.
2. The sentence referred to by the reviewer was adjusted.

Reviewer #2: The editorial about IgA nephritis is quite simple and consists of superficial information. So the title is pretentious with the phrase "comprehensive". You should better the title. Gender distribution can differ among countries. Some studies stated the male predominance. please rephrase this part. Your comments about the manuscript by Meng MJ et al. should be better placed at the end of the "therapy" part or in a separate part. In the therapy section the sentence "At three-year follow-up, patients in the immunosuppression group had higher rates of clinical. " is missing I think. Does the sentence end with "clinical" phrase? It is not understandable. When you criticising the biopsy quality what is the number of the glomerules in the biopsies of the study? "(the quantity of glomeruli obtained was \geq)

1. The title was changed to Immunoglobulin A Glomerulonephropathy: A Review
2. The statement on gender distribution was updated with a new reference. "Both men and women are equally affected in East Asia, while reports on the North American population indicate a higher prevalence in males"
3. The comments on the article by Meng MJ et al. were placed in a separate paragraph as per the reviewer's recommendation.
4. The sentence referred to by the reviewer was adjusted.
5. The number of glomeruli in the biopsies was added.