Reviewer's report


Version: 1 Date: 27 January 2014

Reviewer: Christina Wyatt

Reviewer's report:

This cross-sectional study addresses the question of whether albuminuria or decreased GFR is a stronger predictor of cardiovascular disease. While this is an important and somewhat controversial issue, several questions about the study design and the relatively small sample size may limit the impact of this publication to the debate.

-Methods: although the methodology has been previously described, it would be helpful to provide some additional detail so that casual readers do not need to refer to the previous publication. For example, it should be clarified whether first-AM urine and fasting serum creatinine are the standard of care and routinely obtained in this population. Were participants only excluded if these data were missing, or if information on other variables were missing at the time of medical record review? Did the study rely entirely on data collected for clinical purposes (which appears to be the case based on the limitations section), or did the investigators follow a study protocol to ensure necessary data were collected? Most importantly, it was not clear until the limitations section that multiple measures were required to categorize participants, if this was indeed the case (this may be a vestige of a prior publication, since the authors do not specifically refer to a single CKD category in this paper)

-Results: a related issue is the importance of providing some information about excluded participants. What proportion of eligible participants (ie first 3 patients of the day) were excluded because of missing data, and for which data? How did they differ from included participants?

Minor comments:

-Abstract, methods: “different variables” should either be explained/expanded if space allows, or omitted from the abstract

-Abstract, results: it would be useful to include the sample size

-Abstract, results: the first and last sentence of the results seem to contradict each other. A summary sentence of this nature may be more appropriate for the conclusion, allowing more space to expand on the quantitative results.

-Results, first paragraph: It is not clear why the baseline characteristics are compared between men and women, since this has not been discussed earlier in the paper? Table 1 could be eliminated and the data summarized in the first column of Table 2.
Results: similar to my comments on the abstract, the summary of results

Figure: the presentation of the ORs is a bit unusual and may be confusing to some readers. It may be easier to follow the same categories used in the Tables? Also, since none of the OR were < 1, the axis could potentially center at 1 rather than zero.

Discussion: the authors state that decreases in GFR above 60 were not associated with increased mortality risk; however, it is not clear that these data were presented?

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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