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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript BMC-2013 by Bagshaw et al. “Acute kidney injury among critically ill patients with pandemic H1N1 influenza A in Canada: cohort study.” is confirmatory by nature. Authors argue that “There have been few larger scale prospective multi-center cohorts [19,23,26], none of which described the Canadian pandemic. This is the reason why they worked on a multi-centre Canadian cohort”. But, this is a secondary analysis of the reference 27. And comparing to previous publications (see references 13 to 28), the reason why this study is original is not clear.

45 values of serum creatinine are missing. How was it possible in a prospective study in ICU? The prospective design of the study is quite unclear.

First paragraph of discussion: why “Canada wide” when the study setting is limited to a sample of ICU? Did all Canadian ICU units be enrolled in the study? If not, please do not use the substantive: incidence, for AKI case, because of lack of wholeness.

Authors’ conclusion is that the exact balance between needs and resources is difficult to establish. This is not new and the study did not bring solutions. In a prospective study, it would have been more valuable to identify fatal cases that might have benefit from RRT.
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