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**Reviewer's report:**

This non-randomized interventional study examines the impact of informing patients of the presence of CKD on referral status and outcome. The study is well done and the results are important. The limitations are adequately discussed.

**Major Comments**

- Abstract: Patients are separated in those with eGFR<45 at a single measurement point and those with eGFR consistently <45. Please specify how far the measurements were apart, rather than use the word "consistently".

- Abstract: absolute numbers and percentages are mixed, which is confusing to understand the patient flows. Please use only absolute numbers or use absolute numbers with percentages between brackets.

- Abstract conclusion: since the study is not randomized and small scale, no firm conclusions with respect to outcome can be made. "resulting in better outcome" should be replaced by "which may result in better outcome"

- there is a discrepancy between the abstract and methods on the timing of evaluation of the secondary end-point: 3 months and 1 year versus 3 months or more. It should be clearly specified that referral status was recorded after 3 months and outcome after 1 year.

-18 patients had an eGFR<45 at the time of inclusion but 45-60 at a measurement >3 months earlier. I don't see the fundamental difference with the group with eGFR consistently <45, since the previous measurement of kidney function could date from f.i. one year earlier with no measurement points in between. Both groups should therefore be grouped as one for the
purpose of the study. Separating them into 2 groups does not add an important insight, only creates confusion and makes the flow of patients difficult to follow.

Minor Comments
-methods: specify what time frame is meant by a "recent" blood analysis showing eGFR >60
-please specify in the methods that the inclusion period covers 100 days. In the results "study period of 100 days" should be replaced by "inclusion period"
-p-values: should be rounded at the same number of digits
-spelling error: methods line 15 "programme"
-there is a question mark in Table 1
-the number of references in the introduction alone is 25. This should be reduced to less than half, referring only to landmark or very recent papers.

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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