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Reviewer's report:

Medve et al assessed prospectively the rate of AKI by AKIN definition in seven Hungarian ICUs. The manuscript reads well and the results, although confirmatory, are interesting.

Points about the manuscript:

Positives

The strength of the current report it is its prospective nature and the use of AKIN classification. Most of the manuscripts widely cited about AKI in the ICU are retrospective analysis and few used AKIN definition.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. How were selected the ICUs? How many ICUs exist in Hungarian? How the authors can be sure that the numbers of ICUs and patients analyzed are really representative for the country?
2. How was selected the time frame of two months? Might this time limit introduce a bias for seasonality of diseases?
3. There are missing patients? We can only speak about incidence if all patients admitted to the ICUS during the study were included in the analysis. Please, clarify.
4. It is not clear if the patients developed AKI in the ICU or if some of them were already admitted in the ICU with AKI. If that was the case, how was defined the baseline serum creatinine? Please, clarify both questions.
5. How many patients were categorized as AKI using the creatinine versus the urine output criteria? When a patient was defined as AKI by one but not by the other parameter, how the authors proceeded?
6. Which method was used for creatinine analysis? They were done in a core laboratory or each hospital performed its own? If that is the case, did the authors test for inter-variability among the laboratories?
7. The way the results were written is a little confuse. I suggest describing the entire sample first followed by the AKI patients, comparing them with the whole population.
8. The authors must include the potential limitations for the study results in the manuscript.

Minor essential revisions:
1. Minor observation: in the figure there are two misspellings: hypovolemie and drud-related.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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