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Reviewer’s report:

General remarks:

This paper is a statistically correct exercise on the comparison of $K_t/V$ with URR in the ICU setting. Nothing more and nothing less. Therefore I would suggest making the abstract more informative.

For the abstract:

1. The KDIGO-AKI guideline suggests a weekly $K_t/V$ of 3.9. In a thrice weekly schedule, this means a $K_t/V$ of 1.3 by a single dialysis session. Could the authors mention the URR that can guarantee this aim in a thrice weekly as well as in a 6/7 day schedule.

In the methodology section:

2. Renal replacement therapy in ICU is usually performed via a temporary catheters. Do the authors have information on insertion sites, especially the quantity of femoral catheters. We wonder how recirculation can hamper correct post-dialysis urea measurements with this access site. In the original paper, supplements included, no information on vascular access was included.

In the conclusion section:

A warning may be added. Maintaining an adequate fluid balance is an important problem in AKI-settings. Focussing on URR and delivering shorter dialysis treatments might counteract the planned fluid removal.

On the other hand, delivering long and efficient dialysis treatments can remove antibiotics and as such, influence the recovery from sepsis.

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:
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