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Reviewer’s report:

This paper by Matsha and Yako provides important information about the prevalence of CKD in South Africa. The paper is clearly written and easy to follow. I think the paper can be greatly improved by some additional information as outlined below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. CKDEPI and MDRD equations: Please be consistent in the use of “corrected and uncorrected”. I think it may be preferable to use “with race-adjustment” and “without race-adjustment” rather than corrected and uncorrected?

2. The biggest strength of the paper is that provides information about CKD prevalence in South Africa from a population-based cohort. I would like to see greater details regarding the prevalence on the cohort itself. Please consider creating a table with prevalence estimates using the attached table.

3. Table 1 should describe the characteristics of the population overall (first column) and by CKD (>60, <60; by CKDEPI formula) with p values for the univariate associations. The description of the population will be of great interest to the readers. Please remove the word “mean/median” from the description of the variables and put it in footnote to the table.

4. The methods describe collection of urine and measurement of urine albumin. Why is it not used for CKD classification or reported in Table 1?

5. In the discussion section, please discuss why there are more women than men in the cohort and how could this selection bias effect your results? For example, is it possible that the men included in the study were perhaps sicker than the general population – this would lead to an overestimation of the CKD prevalence.

6. Conclusions: The study provides evidence for support of CKDEPI equation for eGFR reporting and CKD classification (rather than against the current guidelines).

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please double check references to all tables. Some of them appear to missing.
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