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Reviewer's report:

This is a cross sectional study of people with hypertension and is looking at the relationship between AGE/SAGE ration and the presence of albuminuria. It is a clearly written paper. I have some comments: 1. Throughout the paper you say "level of AGE" and other biochemical measures - this should be concentration. 2. The introduction is lacking and the discussion overly long. I suggest moving the background on the relevance of albuminuria and some previous work on AGE, SAGE and the reason for the ratio being of interest to the introduction (but being more concise than currently). 3. Intro page 5 ln 56 "Level of sRAGE may be up-regulated by AGE via the expression of sRAGE" does not make sense to me. 4. Discussion P6 ln 54 "Our data suggested that the ration of AGE to sAGE, as an independent determinant...." is pushing the finding of the data too far. This small cross sectional study cannot do what you are claiming so I would remove such claims. 5. The discussion section is lacking (especially once you more a lot to the intro). I needs far more critical analysis on what the study adds and the strength and weaknesses. Need more detail on the future work needed to try and validate AGE/sRAGE as a biomarker.
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