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Reviewer's report:

This work is a cross-sectional analysis of lung function in exercise tolerance in pre-dialytic patients with stage III-V kidney disease. The work conducted is sound, but the overall design is limited in a number of ways.

Major Problems
The sample contains 29 CKD patients, but over 300 were screened so it is questionable whether CKD patient data presented are representative of this patient group. Moreover it seems those selected were known to or related to the researchers which suggests selection bias. There were only 9 controls, although sample size seems adequate.

If if the methodological quality of the problems in the paragraph above are considered acceptable, the question must be asked "what new does this data tell us?" The answer is nothing new, we know pre-dialytic patients are de-conditioned and the study adds relatively little. Also the conclusions regarding use of screening and exercise testing appear to be without foundation, why would we waste tax funds in a public healthcare system or, in an un-socialized medicine system, why would the individual (or their insurance company) waste funds to look for something we already know. Although I agree that exercise training at this stage would be beneficial and testing to assist with exercise programming maybe justified.

Minor comments
Clarify what is VO2 (%)? is this predicted % of max? If so state how predicted values were calculated.
Would be helpful to state how long the CKD patients had disease, this would better justify the selection from the 300 screened. As many younger patients (over 65 years have been excluded) do not group thru the decades of chronic deterioration that is typical of CKD patents in class III-V.
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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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