Reviewer's report

Title: Time and site of injury affect the predictive value of urinary biomarkers for acute kidney injury in critically ill, non-septic patients

Version: 1 Date: 20 August 2013

Reviewer: Jose Vieira, Jr.

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
I would suggest that the authors should leave “site of the injury” out of the goal and the core of the study. I don’t really agree that they have addressed this question.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes

3. Are the data sound?
Yes. I think the N is fair and the study helps to understand the role of biomarkers in the AKI of the critically ill patients.

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?
Again, I would suggest to leave out the theme “site of injury”.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, pretty much

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
I would show the data AUC of ROC for other timepoints, not only in those considered significant (KIM is shown only at T0, and even son with a 0,73 AUC, which is not so exciting). I would not emphasize the GST data. It really does not add much to the study. Both GST have same pattern eventhough they have
different sites of production.

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct). No comments
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The study of de Geus and colleagues is a subanalysis from a previous study on biomarkers. It covers a later AKI (non-septic), and although the N is low for the event AKI, biomarkers help them to find biological and relevant effects, such as NGAL superiority over KIM-1 and a pattern of increase in biomarkers. It add to literature in the field.
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