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Overall, this is a very well done study.

I have one main remark.

In the discussion the authors stated "Although the eGFR between 60-89 showed that MDRD seems to have similar classification with 51Cr-EDTA results, this was not true when the GFR increased further to > 90"

From table 4, comparing MDRD and CKDEPI shows the MDRD was better by 4.4% for GFR 60-89 and CKDEPI was better by exactly same margin of 4.4% for GFR >90. Hence, for staging purposes MDRD, compared to CKDEPI, was better in GFR 60-89 and CKDEPI was better for GFR > 90, in all other GFR groups the formulas had exactly the same performance.

Some small remarks.

The authors need to define which BSA formula was used to adjust the measured GFR.

There some small typos and some sentences need to be stylistically corrected.
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