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Reviewer’s report:

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

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes

3. Are the data sound? There were 1,305 patients with missing eGFR values for which CKD could not be assessed. Authors compared demographics and clinical characteristics of these patients with those included in the analysis and addressed issue of potential bias. Other data limitations satisfactorily addressed. Given consideration of limitations, data are sound.

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? Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes, limitations are clearly stated and adequately addressed.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? Suggest revising title as “Association of Race and Income with Risk of Mortality in Patients with Moderate Chronic Kidney Disease”

9. Is the writing acceptable? Writing is generally quite good, however, before it can be published it must be thoroughly reviewed for material errors (e.g., p6 line 6: “2761” should be “2789”?), typos (e.g., p5 lines 18-19: “…ESDR( eGFR <15...per 1.73m2) at baseline...”), punctuation errors (e.g., use of commas, semi-colons), awkward and run-on sentences (e.g., p7, 5-8: “Additional factors included smoking status (former, current and never) and body mass index (BMI), measured in kg/m2, was categorized as underweight (<18.5), normal weight (18.5 to 24.9), overweight (25 to 30) and obese (>30).”, terminology (e.g., use of “death” when “mortality” would seem more appropriate)and use of the definite article “the” (sometimes omitted, sometimes used inappropriately). Phraseology could be tidied up in several places...fewer words, more precise language, minimize use of long introductory dependent clauses, simple declarative sentences best. Overall, the exposition is very good, and the writing clear and
understandable. Needs some polishing.

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. Item 9 above: Review and revise for errors, punctuation, etc.
2. p6 line 6: Should 2,761 be 2,789?
3. p7 line 4: Should “Education (high school diploma, high school diploma,...” be “Education (no high school diploma, high school diploma,...”?
4. p7 line 5: Does “insurance” refer to medical insurance? Please specify type of insurance.
5. p8 lines 5-6: Revise as simply “Interaction between race and income was investigated.”
6. p9 line 21: Report p-value for interaction of race and income “…significant (p = 0.xxx).”
7. p10 line 3: Put the 95% CI after the HR estimate, “1.45 (95% CI 1.27 – 1.66)”
8. p10 line 16: Give results on interaction of Race and Income for outcome ESRD or death. Report the interaction p-value.

Discretionary Revisions: None

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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