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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This paper embraces an interesting matter regarding the epidemiology of IgAN. The differences on IgAN clinical presentation and progression to ESRD between gender has been noted since the description of the disease. Although, in the current paper the authors find a more aggressive presentation in males, the gender was not associated with worse outcome and curiously they find a higher incidence of IgAN in females.

The strongest point of the paper is the number of patients and the well documented histological diagnosis.

I understand that the paper has several weak points that should be improve before further considerations:

1. I noted that the population is pretty young (mean age 32 years), did the authors excluded old patients? did they have any specific biopsy policy?

2. The paper need a definition of gross haematuria and microhaematuria, as well as clarify the detection method of haematuria/ discrimination of glomerular vs non glomerular haematuria. Have they excluded patients with prior history of kidney stone, urological malignancies or menstruating females? Because haematuria´s prevalence between gender in the current cohort is quite the opposite than the previously described.

3. The follow up seem to be short for a disease that when is not aggressive use to evolve during more than 20 years, especially in young patients with mild presentation. I will suggest that this point should be discussed over the text.

4. Combined end-point: each one should be specified in results; how many patients reach each of them? Because is not the same ESRD that doble SCr.
5. Although currently there is not guidelines for IgAN therapy, I understand that the author should make an improvement in clarifying the possible bias of the effect of treatment on evolution.

6. Very weak and not properly up dated references, for instance author refer a recent meta-analysis one from 2002 (ref 8) with is not specific for IgAN as referred in the text. I kindly suggest reviewing and improving the discussion with up to dated references.

**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.

No

**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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