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Title: Quality assessment of clinical practice guidelines for chronic kidney disease: a systematic review

This study evaluates the quality of clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) regarding the CKD and its determinants. Authors focused their evaluation on CPGs regarding the early detection and management of CKD.

Introduction: the question is well defined by the authors.

Methods: It's unclear line 24-26 page 5: "or languages that were feasible to translate": which language? French for example?

The AGREE II instrument was used and well described. But, how authors considered non applicable item? Some AGREE II items may not be applicable to the particular CPGs under review. AGREE II does not include a "Not Applicable" response item in its scale. So there are different strategies to manage these items and the decision should be made in advance and described.

Results: 13 CPGs from Europe, Latin America, Oceania, Asia and USA have been reviewed. The agreement between reviewers was good, it's an important point. This section is very clear.

Discussion: the main results was the lack in the stakeholder involvement, rigor of development and editorial independence domains.
One question: line 19, p17: is the sentence right: "The CPG from the USA (?) is not recommended (?) …"? In table 2, the CPG from USA is Recommended.

References: Ref26 line 36 p28: "guideline implementation tolos ==> tools" 
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