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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:

1) Information on the two study populations (blood donors and hypertension patients) is now much more complete, but participation rates are still not given. If such rates are unknown, the authors should state this in the methods.

2) Two different devices were used (NAIS DIAGNOSTEC blood pressure watch and mercury sphygmomanometer) to measure blood pressure in the study of blood donors. In order to justify pooling the data for blood pressure in all subjects, the authors should provide evidence (in their own data or that of others) that the two methods provide comparable blood pressure readings.

3) In describing measurement of biomarkers (p. 9), the term "measurement uncertainty" should be defined? What method was used to determine uncertainty?

4) In the discussion (p. 16), the authors state that "...studies may be biased due to limited sample sizes, phenotypic misclassification, and multiple testing problems." While phenotypic misclassification could certainly lead to bias, limited sample sizes would lead to reduced power but not a bias in the strength of association, and multiple testing would tend to inflate type 1 error rates. The statement should clarify the nature of these limitations.

Discretionary revisions:

5) The authors should consider changing the sentence in the discussion from, "Another limitation may be the lack of sensitivity of the eGFR calculated based on serum creatinine instead of the actual GFR values obtained from classical creatinine clearance test using 24-hour urine samples" to "Another limitation may be the lack of sensitivity of the eGFR calculated based on serum creatinine instead of the actual GFR values obtained from measurements using an exogenous filtration marker."

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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