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Subject: Resubmission of research article manuscript: **Prevalence of low glomerular filtration rate, proteinuria and associated risk factors in North India using Cockcroft-Gault and Modification of Diet in Renal Disease equation: an observational, cross-sectional study**

Dear Dr. Norton

Thank you for the recent review of our manuscript. We have attached a revised manuscript incorporating the suggestions of the initial reviewers. We appreciate the comments of other reviewers on the first version of our manuscript but we believe that the revised manuscript has adequately addressed majority of their concerns. Here is our response to reviewer comments.

**Reviewer #1**

Discretionary Revisions

1) The manuscript is improved and acceptable for publication. However, the following point can be changed for easy to understand.

Page 5, line 10 from bottom: “Depending on the equation, 35.6 to 48.3% of subjects with proteinuria had low eGFR. However, only 8-19% of subjects with low eGFR had proteinuria. “ is not clear.

Response: Point changed for easy comprehension.

“Among subjects with proteinuria in the study population (n = 118/5,252), 35.6 to 48.3% had reduced eGFR depending on the GFR estimating equation used. Subjects with moderately reduced GFR (eGFR 30-59 ml/min/1.73m^2) formed a majority of subjects with low eGFR. In this subgroup only 6.2-13.6% had evidence of kidney damage in form of proteinuria”.

**Reviewer #2**

Minor Revisions

1) The paper is greatly improved. I believe that in the present form the paper is suitable for publication. The only minor revision I suggest is to uniform X- and Y-scale in the two panels of figure 2. This will make more immediate readability of figure.

Response: X- and Y-scales uniformed in the two panels of figure 2 for easy comprehension.
Sincerely
Narinder P. Singh, MD
Vinay K. Saini, MBBS