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Reviewer's report:

The presented study of Temilola et al. is interesting and the research topic is actual. Nowadays salivary diagnostic is gaining a popularity.

The manuscript is clearly written and authors discussed several potential limitations of their study, however several major issues should be addressed before further evaluation.

The table with clinical characteristics of patients would be of interest (other comorbidities, age or BMI).

There are no information how the blood samples were processed after collection. Regarding the saliva processing, centrifugation should be reported in g not RPM (or type of rotor and centrifuge should be stated). Were the samples centrifuged at room temperature or at 4°C?

The number of patients in the study is relatively large and worth of publication. However, creatinine was already measured several times in CKD patients and by several authors (e.g. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28724318, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28372505). It would be interesting to point out what was the add-on value of the present study to the former ones. Indeed, more markers as is urea, uric acid, or NGAL as new markers of kidney failure would be appropriate to analyze as a part of the results and would greatly increase the significance of the paper. Similarly, in the discussion part, more information about the other markers should be added, discussed with the rationale why the authors focused only on creatinine.

Indeed, the sensitivity and specificity of a combined palette of salivary markers should be calculated and discussed.

Overall, the manuscript needs a major revision, but has a potential to become a sound paper in the field of nephrology.

In conclusion, since saliva is an important body fluid that could be obtained non-invasively, in large volumes and repeatedly. Saliva also has a large diagnostic potential,
also in case of systemic diseases, I would recommend this article to be accepted, after major revision.
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