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Reviewer’s report:

The objective of this study was to develop and validate a new risk score of CKD in Thailand, which could also be applied to other populations in Asia. To do so, the authors used the results of a national cross-sectional survey that was conducted to estimate the prevalence of CKD in Thailand.

The methods are well described and the tables helpful in interpreting the results.

Some limitations in the methodology and interpretation of results, as follows:

1) Major compulsory revisions

1.1 Do the 3,459 subjects included in the analysis represent the total number of subjects sampled for the original prevalence study (Page 9)? This should be better specified.

1.2 The percentages describing the characteristics of the overall population in the first paragraph on page 9 do not match those listed in table 1 of the original manuscript (Nephrol Dial Transplant (2010) 25: 1567-1575). Whether the sampling weight was used to calculate these percentages is unclear.

1.3 The frequency of high cholesterol at 53% seems extremely high and does not match any of the results of table 1.

1.4 Most of the percentages listed in table 1 are incorrect if they represent the description of the sample. For example for patients with CKD: age<40, 102/626=16.3% and not 1.6%; for female, 356/626=56.9% and not 57.8%; for DM 183/626=29.2% and not 28.5%. Among the subjects without CKD: for BMI<25, 1880/2833=66.4% and not 65.1%. The percentages for all the characteristics should be reviewed for accuracy. Is the purpose of this table to show the characteristics of the overall Thai population? If so, the sampling weight should be applied and clearly indicated and standard errors instead of standard deviations should be shown.

1.5 The authors indicate that only the variables for which the difference between CKD and non-CKD had a p value<0.15 were included in a model. Gender, smoking, LDL and NSAIDS had a p value >0.15 so were excluded. Shouldn’t Exercise which has a p value of 0.164 (>0.15) be also excluded from the model?

2) Minor Essential Revisions

2.1 What is the Yuden’s index (Discussion page 13). A reference should be provided.
2.2. The result of the calculation of the post test odd provided page 14 is incorrect:

\[(0.175/1-0.175) \times 2.5=0.53\]

2.3. It would be helpful if the pages were numbered

2.4. The abbreviation LR+ should be defined in the abstract

2.5. The last sentence of the abstract’s conclusion is unclear

2.6. The font should be uniform over the whole manuscript.

**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:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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