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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study on the prevalence of CKD in a Kenyan diabetes clinic population.

This is useful information, considering the setting and available medical facilities.

I have a few comments that are intended to help improve the manuscript:

- the paper probably needs a rewrite - it is very chatty in style and needs to be written in a more scientific fashion. There is some quirky English as well. The document is very wordy and could be made much more concise.

- there is a lot of superfluous information, eg. details on the actual conduct of the clinic are unnecessary; some of the details of the assays used are also unnecessary, if these are standard assays....but there are many more

- there needs to be a legend provided for each table

- in Table 1, what is the Odds Ratio in reference to? OR for CKD? OR for albuminuria? This is not identified (but could be in a Table legend).

- why have you used the C-G eGFR equation? The "industry standard" is now the CKD-Epi formula, which is likely to reveal a lower rate of CKD. Do you know if there are validation studies for any of the eGFR formulae for the Kenyan setting? (I presume muscle mass is high relative to say, European studies).

- the discussion drifts between discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the data presented and otherwise acting as an educational treatise - I don't think we need the educational part here (eg. the comment about use of NSAIDs; some of the data about metformin). Overall, the discussion could be trimmed considerably.

Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?
Please state in the 'Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

NA

**Are you able to assess the statistics?**

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?

- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?

Please can you confirm which of the following statements apply to your statistical assessment of the manuscript (Please include details of what the authors need to address in the 'Comments to Author’ box):

There are statistical tests that I am unable to assess and recommend seeking additional advice (please specify which tests these are in the 'Comments to Editor’ box)

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in the 'Comments to Author’ box below.

No

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Should the manuscript be highlighted for promotional activity?**
Articles that are deemed of interest to a broad audience can be promoted in a variety of ways. This could be through email updates, postings on the BioMed Central homepage, social media, blogs and/or press releases. Please indicate in the text box below whether you think this
manuscript should be considered for promotional activity, indicating your reasons why (e.g. what is the most newsworthy aspect of the research).

No
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