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Reviewer's report:

This is an important area of study for a country with large agricultural communities. This will contribute to the global literature on CKD of uncertain etiology. The paper is well written. However clarifications are required on some areas.

1. Methods

Page 4 line 20-21

Clarification is required how the stratification of the sample was done.

Page 5 Line 7

Describe the sample collection for urine

Results

Page 6 line 27

Sampling method needs to be described in the methods (Pl see above)

Page 7 line

6-7 - To be moved to discussion.

line 9 - Needs supporting evidence that the factory workers are exposed to heavy metals.

Line 11 - How did the authors assessed participants for diabetes?

Line 12 - What is the definition used for hypertension in the study sample?
Line 14 - The authors have defined 3 categories of proteinuria earlier. What proportion of the proteinuric patients were mild, moderate and severe?

Line 15 - Pre-post tests (interval tests) are better terminology rather than control tests

Page 8

Line 13 Pl see above

Legend Figure 1

Describes the methodology. This should be in the methods and should be replaced with a shorter concise title.

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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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