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Reviewer's report:
the authors answered to almost all my observations (but not all). I more-less agree with the changes made.

Thanks again for your substantial and critical review of our manuscript.

-Still RIFLE and AKIN criteria simultaneously present and a bit confusing me

We reviewed the manuscript for any unclear RIFLE and AKIN definitions and delete the “RIFLE”, because we did not focused on an ongoing AKI after patient discharge. The existing problem is still, that AKI with a renal replacement therapy is not reflecting in both definitions. So we made the mistake in the revision Version 2, to compare AKIN 3 with renal replacement therapy. In this revision AKIN3 is back to the sentence of “renal replacement therapy”.

-I do not understand the new tab5: are those time points the same than in tabs 2,3 and 4? (I actually asked if creatinine kinetics could resemble or even improve cystatin C performance: could you reproduce tab2,3 or 4 with creatinine?)

No, the collections timepoints for creatinine were not similar with the Cyc C times. We changed the table to more clearer definitions of timepoints.

-english language still needs improvement (some sentences are really difficult to follow)

The manuscript was reviewed by two native editorials (http://www.mt-g.com/)

-I would suggest the authors to remark in the discussion the time that is potentially gained by the use of CysC in your patients just before postulating “what are about patient’s benefits in the development of new biomarkers in AKI patients?”

We deleted the questions in the discussion.
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Kind regards and many thanks for your effort in reviewing the paper,

Arndt-H. Kiessling