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:** This is an interesting review paper.

*Our reply:* Thank you very much for your positive and directive comments; we really appreciate them.

However, the manuscript would benefit from the following corrections/amendments:

1) **Abstract:** Methodology: Please give the procedure of literature review, paper selection, exclusion criteria, number of articles, and statistical methods employed.

*Our reply:* We thank the reviewer for the helpful suggestion. We made the requested changes.

2. **Introduction:** The first three paragraphs explain the same theme. Please reduce the text and merge it into one paragraph.

*Our reply:* We made the requested changes. Reference 3 was changed.

3. **Discussion:** Most of the text can be moved to the introduction part.

*Our reply:* We appreciate your feedback. We tried our best to modulate the discussion.

4. **Fig. 2:** Please give the source of the figure.

*Our reply:* The source was added.

5. **Table 1:** Please move Table 1 to the Results section.
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

6. Fig. 3. Please give the source of the figure. Please move it to the Results section.  
Our reply: We made the requested changes. And added the needed sources.

7. Table 2. Please move Table 2 to the Results section.  
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

8. Etiology of Microphalus and micropenis: most of the text is repetitive and has been mentioned above.  
Our reply: We removed the repetition.

9. Table 3: Please move Table 3 to the Results section.  
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

10. Fig. 6. Please give the source of the figure. Please move it to the Results section.  
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

11. ‘Consequences of Microphallus/Micropenis:’ This section should come after ‘Management...’  
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

12. There are a number of repetitive sentences throughout the text that should be omitted.  
Our reply: We made the requested changes.

Reviewer 2:  
1- The nature of the study and the type of review are not clear.  
Our reply: We clearly identify the type of the study as a narrative review.
2- There is no significant difference between the conclusion and the core tip.  
**Our reply:** It is logical that the core tip and the conclusion will reflect the same meaning of the study.

3- The objective of this study and the authors' intention is not clear and not indicated in the study.  
**Our reply:** The objectives were clearly mentioned in the last paragraph of the introduction.

4- Introduction: The definition of microphallus was repeated. The statement:” The term micropenis refers to a normally formed penis that is shorter than average, while the term microphallus is used when there is an associated hypospadias.” Is not referred and it is also incorrect.  
**Our reply:** we do not agree with the reviewer regarding this point. Reference was added.

5- “The absence of palpable testicles and penile urethra may be considered ambiguous, karyotyping should be performed, and counseling for sex developmental disorders should be accomplished [4].” The position of this fact in introduction section is inappropriate.  
**Our reply:** we believe that it is appropriate and severe the normal follow of information needed to be included in the introduction.

6- Methods: There is no any inclusion, exclusion criteria. There are no any statistical studies done There is no mention about how many articles were valid for the study.  
**Our reply:** This is clearly mentioned in the study methods section and in the flow chart.

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