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Reviewer's report:

The authors have responded partially to the previous comments. They could make their work better if the following points are addressed.

Major compulsory revision

1. The spelling issue seemed to persist. In the abstract, abbreviations “CKD”, “ESRD”, “OR”, and “CI” were not spelled in full at first mention. Also, redundant sentences also needed polishing. Ex. page 6, line 7, “Previous studies also…”, but in line 10, again “Previous studies had shown…”. Similarly, in page 5, line 11, “systematic evidence that has confirmed that a screening…”. In page 6, line 11, “that the effects of some factors…that means that some risk factors…”. Page 6, line 13, “it might be change our clinical…”, and more in discussion section.

2. The introduction section should display manuscript flow like the following: CKD as a public health threat # DM, HTN, and other traditional factors as historical focuses # inconsistency in results or heterogeneity exists # focusing on HTN/DM and interactive factors # main study aim. I would suggest the authors re-write the introduction, make it brief while informative, and combine the description of DM/HTN/other factors together. Also, the wording “cost-effectiveness…” at the end of introduction might be better placed elsewhere or removed, as this study did not address medical cost issue.

3. Following the 2nd comment, I suggest the authors re-write the discussion section in a softer tone and try to avoid descriptions regarding the choice of targets for CKD prevention. This study essentially investigated the heterogeneity of CKD associations between different factors (based on the study results), but not prevention or intervention strategies (the latter issue need medical economical analyses, not just risk estimation among subgroups).

Minor essential revision

4. In Table 3, please consider to remove the description “…(X is ref.)” following every variable. Other better wordings for this statistical issue are available.

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:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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