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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
1- There is no justification for why KIM-1 and IL-18 were the ones chosen for analysis among all the AKI biomarkers that are available.

2- Can the authors provide a rationale or a reference for the classification of the burn patients as mild/moderate/severe?

3- I am not sure I understand the rationale for including a “healthy control group”. After all, I thought that the main objective was to anticipate AKI using the biomarkers in patients with burns. In that case, “controls” should have been patients with burns who did not develop AKI.

4- I am not sure what the correlation analyses add.

5- The authors must go into greater depth when describing the numerous limitations of this study.

Minor compulsory revisions
1- I think it would be inappropriate to refer to KIM-1 and IL-18 concentrations as “sensitive” predictors of AKI as is done in the final paragraph.

2- Even if one accepts that KIM-1 and IL-18 are good markers of early AKI in burn patients, the key question to ask is what if anything can be done to mitigate the risk of progressive AKI in the setting of a positive biomarker result.

3- I am not sure when the “baseline” specimen for biomarkers was collected: was it at the time of admission or within 6 hours of admission?
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