

Reply to the Reviewer/Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer,

Good day

Thank you for your thoughtful and constructive feedback on our article titled "Renal Calcification in Children with Renal Tubular Acidosis." We appreciate your positive assessment of our work's scope, structure, and readability, and we are committed to addressing the specific suggestions you have provided to improve the manuscript. All the changes were marked in red for easy tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes, and we tried to improve the language as much as possible. Thank you again for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

Reviewer 1:

a) It should be explained in detail how the bibliographic review has been carried out: search and retrieval criteria, sources used, period of time, ...

Our reply: We indeed followed your guidance by providing a more detailed explanation of how the bibliographic review was conducted, including the search and retrieval criteria, sources utilized, and the specific period of time covered. We already mentioned this information in the method section. This information enhances transparency regarding our literature review process. These changes are highlighted in red color.

b) The discussion section should better synthesize what are the current main lines of work as well as propose future lines of work.

Our reply: We agree that the discussion section can benefit from a better synthesis of the current main lines of work in the field and more explicit proposals for future research directions. We revised this section to provide a more comprehensive overview of existing research and to highlight the potential avenues for further investigation. These changes are highlighted in red color.

c) In the conclusions section, the explanation of the main scientific contributions of the article should be improved.

We appreciate your feedback on the conclusions section. We worked on improving the explanation of the leading scientific contributions of the article, ensuring that

they are clearly articulated and their significance is effectively conveyed. These changes are highlighted in red colour.

After completing these revisions, we believe our article has been even more valuable to the scientific community, providing a deeper understanding of the relationship between renal tubular acidosis and renal calcification in children. We genuinely value your feedback, which will help us enhance the quality and impact of our work.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to resubmitting the revised manuscript for your review.

Sincerely,

Professor Mohammed Al-Biltagi

Corresponding Author