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Reviewer's report:

Introduction

1. Lines 95-97 were not clear due to grammar-related mistakes and should be re-written.

2. Line 99: "Jour" is a French word. It should be changed to "day" as g/kg/day.

3. Paragraph 4, lines 108-115, is somewhat confusing. The paragraph should be re-written more clearly.

4. After reading the introduction some questions raised in mind that should be clarified:

   4.1. Why previous SFFQ that have been developed in French context do not meet the criteria of the consortium objective.

   4.2. Did you develop a new SFFQ in this study or did you evaluate validity and reproducibility the SFFQ? As I understood based on the introduction, a SFFQ was created by a consortium of 6 cohort and this study was the first pilot to investigate validity and reproducibility of the questionnaire. Is it true?

Methods:

1. How did you select 301 participants out of 3033 adults participated in CKD-REIN study?

2. How did you estimate sample sizes for this study?

3. The total numbers of food items of the SFFQ should be specified.
4. Lines 141-142: Was the SFFQ composed of 40 food group items or food items?

5. Lines 149-153: Was the second part of the questionnaire composed of food items?

6. It is suggested that the food grouping used in this study presented in a table.

Results:

1. To better understand the validity of the SFFQ, it is suggest to add a column for tables of validity to show the percent of mean difference from 24-h dietary recalls.

2. Lines 219-221: The question is why foods that rarely consumed considered as food items of the SFFQ while validity will reduced by the food groups rarely used. How were food items of the SFFQ selected? It was stated in lines 135-137 that the food list of the SFFQ was defined based on national food questionnaire. Therefore, we expected that the commonly consumed food items in this population had been chosen.

Discussion

1. Lines 318-319 are not clear and should be re-written.

2. According to the results, validity and reproducibility for food groups are better than nutrients. Please discuss this point.

3. Please discuss about the food groups and nutrients that cannot be estimated in CKD patients using the SFFQ, validly.

4. Please discuss about the generalizability of the findings to CKD patients of other populations.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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