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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper addresses a very important topic on CKD treatment, which is to determine the impact of superimposed nephrologist care compared to guidelines-directed management by PCPs in CKD patients. However, a significant limitation of the study is that both groups (intervention and standard care), were actually co-managed by nephrologists, either in person or by email or phone call. Therefore, it is not surprising that the results were similar in both groups. Additionally, the number of requested consultations by email or phone call is not mentioned in the paper as is the number of patients without PCP that were followed at the Community Medicine clinic.

It is also not clear if the personnel (PCP and nephrologist) were blinded to patient allocation and outcomes, and how clinical data was collected in the PCP group to avoid potential bias for selective reporting.

It would be interesting to describe the model of CKD care in your program (nurse-led, multidisciplinary, etc).
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Are you able to assess the statistics?

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?
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- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?
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