

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this study, the clinical efficacy and renal function improvement of the joint group were significantly higher than those in the dialysis group after treatment. The results suggest that paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration can deliver significantly greater efficacy in patients with comorbid DN and CRF, and improve renal function. The results indicate that paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration can control serum phosphorus and calcium levels, lower iPTH level, and improve bone-metabolism-related indexes, without increasing safety risks. Authors also established a risk model to predict the efficacy based on laboratory indexes. And their result indicates that this is an ideal predictive model. Some concerns have been noted including:

#1 Table 2 and 3 are problematic and the current statistics of Total effective rate and Total incidence rate are not incidence rates.

Re: Following your suggestion, we revised the data in the manuscript to percentage form.

#2 Regarding adverse reactions, the text suggests to specifically describe the common adverse reactions in the two groups.

Re: Thank you for your advice. The adverse reactions in our manuscript are nausea and vomiting, loss of appetite, phlebitis, gastrointestinal reaction and skin rash, which are common adverse reactions in the treatment of this disease.

#3 There are a few grammatical errors, such as the discussion section "This indicates that that this is an ideal predictive model." One that needs to be deleted. So proofreading is needed to maintain the best sense of reading.

Re: Thank you for your suggestion. We first deleted this sentence, and then we polished the manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Ma XY et al. This is a retrospective study to investigate the effects of paricalcitol combined with hemodiafiltration on bone-metabolism-related indexes in patients with DN and CRF, and to construct an efficacy prediction model. The result of the study is of interest and may provide a basis for clinical treatment of comorbid DN and CRF. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology. The number of participants in the study is large enough. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all the important component from the study. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the

study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. 8. Illustrations and tables: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables very explicative and complete. However, calculation of Total effective rate of the Dialysis group in Table 2 is wrong and should be 33 after calculation. In addition, I recommend that the number and incidence of each group be presented in the Total effective rate, for example, Dialysis group should be $33/45 = 73.3\%$, and the Joint group should be $45/49 = 91.8\%$. Similarly, the same calculations are required for Total incidence rate in Table 3.

RE: Thank you for your approval of the manuscript. We first revised the results in the manuscript Tab 2 and recalculated the statistic and P-value. Second, we present the form of data-rate in Tab 2 and 3 on request.