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Reviewer’s report:

In this study, investigators provided systematic review of albuminuria, serum creatinine, and estimated glomerular filtration rate as predictors of renal function decline in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and kidney disease. This is a well written through study and will add to the existing medical literature. It is also research in a content area of substantial importance. However, the following issues should be clarified however:

1) Authors have achieved their objective of enlightening the audience to much of the literature and provided individual descriptive details of each study however; I think reader will get lost in all the individual details. Importantly, I would prefer authors to perform critical assessment of the literature and highlight the methodological issues, limitations and provide combined summary statistics of the outcomes.

2) Have the authors convinced the reader that no relevant literature was missed in their literature review? Why only search MEDLINE, EMBASE and Cochrane. Also searching Science Citation Index (reviewing all citations that referenced their articles of interest), and a review of Google Scholar would be preferred.

3) Why the search period restricted to January 2000 through May 2016?

4) I wasn't clear on their justification for only restricting the review to English language publications only.

5) Repetition of Language in Abstract and Methodology section.

6) Authors may want to report which Statistical software was used for the analysis.

7) There is subjectivity in screening citations, the 'industry standard' is for this to be done in duplicate by persons who are knowledgeable about the content, where a full-text article is retrieved for eligibility assessment if any reviewer identifies the article as potentially relevant. Though the authors mentioned that two reviewers did the literature search but it is unclear if they were nephrologist or persons with knowledge about the subject matter. Authors may want to provide clarification?
8) Consider adding the reference number to the study acronyms/Author et al in Table 1; Similarly, for other tables. Please arrange studies based on Year of publication. It is just a personal suggestion.

9) Would like authors to upload pre-specified study protocol with the manuscript?

10) Authors have provided combined quality assessment score; readers will benefit from separate supplemental table on quality of studies included in the systematic review.

11) Please provide PRISMA check list Table.

12) Authors should provide reference for studies in the Result section. For example, in line 169: GFR loss (n = 9; 29.0%) and doubling of serum creatinine (n = 5; 16.1%). Reference for which 9 and 5 studies?

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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