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Reviewer's report:

1. English Editing & Formatting is suggested

2.

3. Abstract: Results; 2nd line…" Thirty nine per cent, 39.0 % (95%CI 34.3-44.2) had CKD/KDIGO stages 3, 4 and 5 while 32.7% (95%CI, 27.8-37.4) had Albuminuria" can be rephrase like……."There are 39 % (95%CI 34.3-44.2) had CKD/KDIGO stages 3, 4 and 5 while 32.7% (95%CI, 27.8-37.4) had Albuminuria………………………………………………………………………

4. Abstract Conclusion is very weak and not reflecting the study findings……………………………………………………………………………

5. Study Design; "This was a cross-sectional analysis of adult patients with type 2 diabetes without overt complications or co-morbidities who attended the out-patient diabetic clinic"…. What does author mean by this statement, further clarity is required…..? Should I considered Inclusion/Exclusion criteria……………………?

6. Author need to provide reference for the Sample size calculation formula…….Further, statement need to rephrase as study design statement & sample size determination statement is not matching……………………………………………………………………………………

7. Result 3rd paragraph……. "Two hundred and thirty three, 60.5% of the study subjects had poor glycaemic control and 191 (49.6%) had hypertension where more than 75.0% of them were poorly controlled"….. Study Design statement and here this sentence causing confusion…………….. Need to clarify..?

8. Number of references need to relook and or follow journal formatting style……

9. Table 1; need to standardised, either continuous data or categorical variables and respective statistical analysis.. why it is based on gender…..? It is suggested to provide overall/general picture of the study population…………………………..
10. Why author shuffling Reference value for the Odd ratio in the table 1….? Sense of Biasness……………………………………………………………………………….

11. Table 3; Age OR is not given or author forget, which need to provide………?

12. Table 4, How age &gt;50years are significant here with OR 1.12, causing confusion with respect to table 3……It is suggested to add values in Table 3 would be more clear picture.?……………………………………………………………………………….

13. Table 4; Further clarity is required like;

   i. Duration of diabetes(&gt;5 years)………

   Duration of diabetes, years……………..

   ii. Systolic Blood Pressure, SBP≥140mmHg…..

   Hypertension present…………………………

14. Conclusion is missing either by author or by reviewer…. Need to highlight….

15. Applied Statistical tests need to mention in footnote in respective table/place….

Please confirm that you have included your review in the ‘Comments to Author’ box?
As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors’ hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.

Please note that we may not be able to use your review if no comments are provided.

Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included as text in the 'Comments to Author' box.

Yes

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.

Yes

**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):

I have been able to assess all of the statistics in this manuscript (please refer to checklist above)

**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).
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