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Reviewer's report:

The authors investigated the impact of different GFR equations developed in Caucasian and other Asian populations on GFR, and the prevalence of CKD in a Thai cohort using the new KDIGO guidelines. The sample size is impressive, but the statistical analyses and data presentation are confusing. If a reference GFR method could be employed in at least a subset of patients, the results would be more informative.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Introduction should be shortened.
2) The division of the groups as CKD1-5 or CKD3-5 is extremely confusing. The authors should present data in a less confusing way.
3) Were GFR values with the different formulas statistically compared to one another (with ANOVA, for example)? (Table 2 data). On the other hand, there is no meaning to compare data from men and women (not even visually), since they are not matched by age, BMI or diseases (men are sicker).
4) Were CKD prevalences statistically compared? (qui-square, Table 3 data)
5) Eliminate figures number 2, 5, 6 and 7 (or 5 a, b and c, wrong number in figures)
6) References 14 and 23 are incomplete (online first?)
7) A native English speaker should review the paper.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   No
3. Are the data sound?
   Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, partially

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   No

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

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

**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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