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Level of interest: A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until I see revised version

Major comment:
- Page 12 sentence 2: Leave that sentence out of the paper. This is an irrelevant conclusion.
- Table 1: data expected from the two groups separately: “no UFF” and “UFF”. Please present them, because this is necessary to justify the conclusion that patients with poor baseline ultrafiltration are high or high average transporters and the other group is not.

Minor comments:
- Page 6 first sentence: Is it “frusemide” or “furosemide”?
- Figure 1: How many patients are in the “UFF” group? Namely if I count the patients in the “no UFF” group I count 8 patients, which leaves for the “UFF” 9 patients but then I do not understand that at one timepoint half of the patients drops out. How is that possible by the way?
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