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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions

This is a retrospective chart review of a single center experience on renal biopsy. The authors look at this procedure with a well defined question: how many procedures yield in a useful specimen that help in the diagnosis and guide treatment of their patients. The article is well written in smooth English. The data presentation is good, the tables are correct and provide useful and complementary information to the reader, figures are OK. Methodologically though I have some comments:

The six-point scheme presented is OK, but to strictly respond to the question posted in the article’s title, categories 1 to 4 can be resumed into a single one.

More explanation should be provided on the biopsies that were not useful:

Results, paragraph 3: out of the 11 patients that needed further biopsies information on why this deemed necessary is provided in only 5. What happened with the other 6 patients? Please clarify.

Results, paragraph 4: of the 21 patients with inconclusive biopsies, treatment was based upon clinical findings on three, what happened with the other patients? Were these listed for a second biopsy, lost for follow up? Please comment.

Each case was independently reviewed by one of the four primary authors. An independent observer reviewed 15% of the cases where there was a discrepancy between the primary reviewers. This study could have been more powerful if all the cases were blindly reviewed by more than one author and the independent observer.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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