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Reviewer’s report:

Experimental animal model of CKD looking at changes in erythrocyte quality and effect of an ESA on erythrocyte quality.

In the abstract anaemia is not a symptom of CKD rather a complication of CKD.

Written English in the abstract and introduction is ponderous and repetitive and would benefit from being rewritten.

CKD model while a progressive mesangialproliferative glomerulonephritis model, seems a reasonable model. Methods seem reasonable and well thought through.

Experimental agent seems to have significant effects on markers of erythrocyte quality and survival. Ideally there would have been a fourth arm where the animal model was treated with a recombinant erythropoietin.

In your conclusions you state that improvement in erythrocyte quality would be expected to have an advantageous therapeutic effect. What is the perceived advantage an is this additive to correction of anaemia?

It would be useful to have a paragraph with regards the limitations of your study

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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