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Reviewer's report:

The paper by Houben et al is a retrospective study evaluating 72 patients diagnosed with AAV with renal involvement. The authors objective was to evaluate in this population whether a longer prodromic phase would be associate to poorer clinical outcome. Based on clinical history patients were equally divided into two cohorts presenting a prodromal phase of more or less than 22 weeks. Authors evaluated at diagnosis and six months eGFR and proteinuria and at three years evolution to ESRD. Results show that patients with longer prodromal phase more frequently had proteinuria at six months and higher mortality rate and progression to ESRD.

The paper is properly written and apparently the design is straightforward. The conclusions seem to be adequately drown. However there are some major limitations: The retrospective design that is obviously an unmodifiable issue but mostly the total absence of mention to type of treatment regimen used. This issue is not minor if considering patient outcome thus in order to consider the paper for publication authors should consider including a treatment section in the paper.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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