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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revision:

Definition of renal dysfunction is not clear. Acute kidney injury should be defined either as per AKIN criteria or RIFLE. Method section does not clearly state how they went about selecting the patients and the language is very confusing. For example the last line in the method section states "As term failure was defined any irreversible renal filtration" which does not make any sense. There are lot of inconsistencies in the paper throughout as it is also not clear what the authors mean by "Patients with known renal injury were excluded". Renal injury and renal dysfunction are used interchangeably without any clear indication.

Background: It does not state why the authors chose this particular definition of renal dysfunction rather than the widely used and accepted definition of acute kidney injury (AKIN or RIFLE). This section has lot of grammatical errors and the language is also very confusing.

Result section: There is a lot of repetition regarding what is already stated in the tables. It is not clear how peri-operative dehydration and shock were defined. Again the result section seemed like it was all over the place. There are lot of grammatical errors all throughout this manuscript. There are many confusing statements throughout ex: "Furthermore we found a significant main effect of the estimated potential risk factors in renal function after an episode of acute renal failure"

"Heart failure..., we found that not contribute significantly to success of failure to gain the patients their preoperative renal function."

Discussion: Again the language is very confusing and at times does not make sense ..ex "This study demonstrates.....in orthopedic population who admitted in our hospital over a period of one year. Also an assessment of numerous of potential risk factors of postoperative RD was carried out". Again this whole section is not very clearly written and requires a lot of work. The whole manuscript is full of major grammatical errors too.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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