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Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript: Limited Knowledge Of Chronic Kidney Disease Among Primary Care Patients – A Cross-Sectional Survey by Leng et al.

WHAT WAS THIS STUDY ABOUT?
This study seeks to evaluate the knowledge level of CKD of the primary care patients in Singapore. While much has been documented on the successes of screening programs in increasing awareness of CKD both locally and internationally, there is limited research into the actual knowledge level of CKD among the general population.

STRENGTHS OF THE STUDY
A cross-sectional survey of a convenience sample (n= 1520) of patients from 3 primary care centers. Those with existing CKD or on dialysis were excluded. A simple, brief questionnaire self-administered was to assess CKD knowledge

WEAKNESSES OF THE STUDY
Biased sample - Clinic patient cohort;
Differences by knowledge by education: not clear that the survey ascertained CKD knowledge or limited literacy. Lesser education and associated lesser literacy could be indicative of limited reading comprehension and not necessarily low content of knowledge/health literacy.

DETAILED COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHORS
1. MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
ABSTRACT:
Overall, well written.
Page 3. Line 12 convenient should be convenience.
Conclusion is presumptive. Data shows CKD knowledge by the self-administered survey is low and the conclusion should be limited to the data.

CORE MANUSCRIPT
DISCUSSION
P16. Line 18, Limitations
It is not clear that the responses to questions reflect language literacy versus health literacy. If the questions are developed by experts/professionals it seems others of similar background would empirically be more likely to answer correctly. Thus, the results could reflect a bias in question design

CONCLUSION
The study suggests knowledge of kidney disease is reduced in lower socioeconomic groups, not that it can be further improved. The survey does not test if older respondents with lower education levels and of lower income would more likely benefit from more tailored education interventions. It found they had lower scoring on the survey and might be a cohort to direct education toward, but one can’t say they are more likely to benefit.

TABLES
Table 2
For grouping with residents and foreigners it is not clear the analysis for foreigners is valid with a sample size of only 8 (statistician should review for consideration of deleting foreigners). Also there is not enough detail on “foreigners” to make an interpretation valuable.

Table 3.
First grouping with residents and foreigners. It is not clear the analysis for foreigners is valid with a sample size of only 8. See table 2 above for details.

2. MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

CORE MANUSCRIPT

PATIENTS AND METHODS
Page 6. Line 20. convenient should be convenience.
Page 7. Lines 4-7. Questionnaire development:
“The self-administered questionnaire included 7 questions to assess the knowledge of CKD and additional questions on demographics. The questions were developed using a combination of patient references for CKD as well as expert opinion.” The authors should add another sentence or two with more detailed description of the questions were developed and any pre-testing.

RESULTS
p.12 lines 5-9 should be in methods and not in results.
p.12 line 11 “Multivariate logistic regression reported being older”
should be ....A multivariate logistic regression analysis revealed that..... or something along that line.

TABLES
Table 2
Fourth column, not all groups of respondents total 1435. There should be a notation to that effect in the legend. (Minor Essential Revision)

For grouping of religions is Buddhism different than others at p <0.001? (Minor Essential Revision)
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