

Point-to-point response to reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I know that those that sustained contrast induced nephropathy were few numbers, but when assessing such few numbers any subject carries a high percentage of chance thus changing the whole statistical analysis. If possible adding more subjects who developed procedural related contrast induced nephropathy could help, as you only reviewed cases till January 2011. This study was a side branch of other studies focused on outcomes of hepatic artery embolization for primary and secondary liver tumors. The study group of this work is limited to the patients enrolled into other liver tumor embolization studies and cannot be changed. Small sample size is mentioned in the manuscript as one of limitations of this study. I would also like to see the tables comparing both groups. Both groups are specifically compared in table 2. Also renal artery calcification could be due to many etiologies, not only atherosclerosis and thus from the small sample of patients who developed CIN we cannot conclude that renal artery calcification is a cause unless we exclude other causes of calcification or increase the sample size. As mentioned in the manuscript, prior studies have shown the association between renal artery calcification and renal function:

- Vashishtha D, McClelland RL, Ix JH, Rifkin DE, Jenny N, Allison M. Relation between calcified atherosclerosis in the renal arteries and kidney function (from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis). The American journal of cardiology. 2017 Oct 15; 120(8):1434-9. PMID: 28826901 DOI: [10.1016/j.amjcard.2017.07.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2017.07.020)
- Roseman DA, Hwang SJ, Manders ES, O'Donnell CJ, Upadhyay A, Hoffmann U, Fox CS. Renal artery calcium, cardiovascular risk factors, and indexes of renal function. The American journal of cardiology. 2014 Jan 1;113(1):156-61. PMID: 24210678 DOI: [10.1016/j.amjcard.2013.09.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2013.09.036)

Our findings confirmed what other investigators have already published. Small sample size as noted is a limitation of this study. It is mentioned in the limitations section of the manuscript.

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the contrast-induced nephropathy. The topic is within the scope of the WJN. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is well written, very good grammar, and well structured. Also, renal artery calcification could be due to many etiologies, not only atherosclerosis and thus from the small sample of patients who developed CIN we cannot conclude that renal artery calcification is a cause unless we exclude other causes of calcification or increase the sample size. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered Reviewer's questions are answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 4 figures. A total of 30 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. The authors need to update the references. References are updated. There is 1 self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The manuscript is from the United States. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by the NIH/NCI Cancer Center. The topic has not previously been published in the WJN. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. This manuscript is the resubmission of manuscript No. 55821. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the title was more than 12 words. The title should be no more than 12 words; The current title with 16 words is most appropriate for the purpose of this study. Other titles have been tested and authors have a consensus on appropriateness of the current title. (2) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions; Author contributions is added to title page. (3) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30 CA008748 is an institutional grant. All investigators are obligated to mention this institutional grant in their academic works. The grant does not apply to any individual investigator. (4) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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; Original figures are provided in PowerPoint format. (5) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; References are revised throughout. (6) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text; This is done. and (7) the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the

citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces. This is done throughout. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) 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, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.