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Reviewer's report:

Is the staple diet eaten in Medawachchiya, Sri Lanka, a predisposing factor in the development of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology? – An experience from urinary #2-microglobulin measurement

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The authors say that The current study intended to compare the variation in urinary #2-microglobulin excretion of CKDu patients and normal subjects inhabited in a high CKDu endemic area and to compare the dietary patterns of CKDu patients and normal subjects from the same endemic area.

The research question that they are trying to address through this comparison is not clearly defined. What do the investigators mean by `an experience from urinary #2-microglobulin measurement`?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Without a clear research question it is not possible to comment on whether or not the methods are appropriate.

Methods are described. However if the intention was to investigate the role of heavy metals in the causation of CKDu a 24 hour heavy metals should have been analysed. No analysis of heavy metals in the food has been done.

3. Are the data sound?

The CKDu group has subjects with moderate and severe kidney disease. Their diet intake will be influenced by a) loss of appetite b) need to reduce consumption of proteins as per medical advise. Further, if heavy metals are playing a role, longterm intake will determine the accumulation of metals in the body which cannot be assessed by a 24 hour dietary recall. Both these would interfere with the data and the conclusions that have been made.

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?

The discussion and conclusions are not adequately supported by the data. The CKDu group has subjects with moderate and severe kidney disease. Their diet intake will be influenced by Loss of appetite as well as the need to reduce consumption of proteins as per medical advise. These factors would interfere with the data and the conclusions that have been made.

The role played by heavy metals is discussed but heavy metals have not been analysed in the food. A 24 dietary recall of food types and quantities consumed will not give the answer to the question whether heavy metals are causative factors in the causation of CKDu; if indeed this is the question that is been asked by the investigators.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Some of the limitations are stated.

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?

No

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes with some editing.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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