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Reviewer's report:

1) Need a more robust and comprehensive description of the Nephrotest cohort. Since the conclusion is based on the premise that "optimized" care by nephrologists may be beneficial to CV mortality, a better description of the difference between the care that the cohort got and what is standard of care in the hospitals that were included is necessary. Is it not possible to have a control "standard or care" group for a comparative assessment? If not, why?

2) Cause-specific hazards are estimated, not hazards. Perhaps use csHR as the abbreviation. Also, I would not call it a cause-specific cox model, rather a cox model where you are calculating cause-specific hazard ratios - this is a minor point.

3) Table 3 is confusing. Needs to be formatted more clearly.

4) Not entirely clear why change in Pk status is only evaluated between baseline and visit one. This should be explained.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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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