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Reviewer's report:

In the abstract,

The measured GFR needs to be defined as plasma a "51-Chromium EDTA (51Cr-EDTA) study"

The statement "CKD-EPI was found to be better than MDRD across all GFR groups with regards to bias, precision and accuracy within 30% of measured GFR." is not correct statement because:

1. "Generally, CKD-EPI shown to have lower bias especially in GFR < 90 ml/min/1.73m2". This is not a correct statement. According to the results in Table 2, the overall data shows lower bias for MDRD, hence the term "generally" is misleading.

The overall better bias for MDRD is mainly due to surprisingly, compared to previous studies, better bias for GFR>90 and the authors should elaborate on this finding.

2. "CKD-EPI outperformed MDRD in terms of accuracy within 30% of measured GFR across all strata of CKD stages in our cohort of patients." This is also incorrect as for GFR 60-89 the accuracy within 30% is exactly the same for both formulas in Table 3.

The authors listed a BSA formula but no reference which one was used, upon verification it is the Du Bois and Du Bois formula and it needs to be included in the references.

Still some sentences need to be stylistically corrected. I will list only few examples:

However radiolabelled gold standard measurement of GFR are very costly

Malaysia is among the country that has higher incidence and prevalence of ESKD

On the day of the procedure, blood investigations including serum creatinine withdrawn from the patients at the baseline.

CKD-EPI shown to have lower bias
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.

No

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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