**Response to Editorial and Reviewer Comments**

We would like to thank the Editorial team and the reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. Below are the detailed responses to their suggestions and comments.

The following Editorial Comments have been addressed:

1. The manuscript has been carefully edited to limit both spelling and grammatical errors.
2. Panels A and B in Figures 2 and 3 panels have been combined.
3. Error bars in Figures 2 and 3 have been defined as the standard error of the mean (SE).
4. City, State, Zip Code and Country are now all included in the institutional address.
5. Email addresses have been included for all authors:

Sarah M. Peterson; email: smpeterson99@gmail.com

Xuexiang Wang; email: xuexiang\_Wang@rush.edu

Ashley C. Johnson; email: acjohnson2@umc.edu

Ian D. Coate; email: icoate@umc.edu

Michael R. Garrett; email: mrgarrett@umc.edu

Sean P. Didion; email: sdidion@umc.edu

1. Where appropriate abbreviations have been standardized per the Journal.
2. Spaces have been included between numbers and corresponding units.
3. Protocols have all been labeled numerically per Journal requirements.
4. All pronouns have been removed from text.
5. Solutions, materials, and equipment information have been moved to Materials Table in excel format.
6. Information regarding age, gender, and strain of mice has now been included.
7. All surgical instruments have been specified.
8. Lines 218-220 of text have now been included as a note.
9. Critical steps in protocol have been discussed in the Discussion section.
10. Journal titles in Reference section have all been spelled out completely.
11. Table of supplies have now been expanded to include source and company information.

**Reviewer #1**

1. The reviewer noted no major concerns but suggested including some additional discussion of limitations associated with the acid maceration method and correction of grammatical errors.

We thank the review for their suggestion regarding additional limitations, particularly in regarding to acid digestion of glomeruli that may be more sensitive to digestion by acid due to disease. We have included some additional text to this in the Discussion section. In addition, we have worked to correct all grammatical errors.

**Reviewer #2**

1. The reviewer noted that the acid maceration is documented approach to estimate nephron number and to clarify any technical modifications that are different or new to established protocols.

As we acknowledged in our paper the acid maceration method presents is well established and we made small modifications to that by others. The main goal of this manuscript and subsequent demonstration is to present the method for others in a visual manner. The authors were invited by the Editors to present the method as a way to make the method and materials required more accessible to the scientific community.

2. The reviewer suggests correcting the grammatical errors contained within the manuscript.

Per the reviewer’s suggestion we have worked to correct all grammatical errors in the revised manuscript.