Reviewer’s report

Title: Gout is associated with a higher risk of Chronic Renal Disease in Older Adults: A Retrospective Cohort study of U.S. Medicare population

Version: 1 Date: 06 Sep 2018

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER: Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? No

Reviewer comments: The authors have responded satisfactorily to most of my comments. However, two issues remain:

Validity of using ICD9 to define kidney disease: Thank you to the authors for providing clarification providing this point. Inclusion of CKD stage 2 risks over-ascertainment of clinically significant CKD compared to the existing literature - this limitation should be specifically acknowledged in the discussion section.

Description of baseline characteristics: In the original manuscript, table 1 compared characteristics of those achieving the study outcome (CKD) and those who did not whereas the corresponding text compared those with and without the exposure (gout). My recommendation was that the table and text should both compare those exposed to gout and unexposed. The authors have done the opposite so that the revised text and table now both compare participants according to outcome (CKD) and added an appendix comparing according to gout status. It is more informative to compare at baseline according to exposure (gout status) as this is the best way to assess the comparability of the groups and potential for confounding in a cohort study. I strongly advise revising both the text and table 1 to compare according to exposure (gout status) and removing any comparison of characteristics according to outcome."
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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