Reviewer’s report

Title: Renal Ultrasound Provides Low Utility in Evaluating Cardiac Surgery associated Acute Kidney Injury

Version: 0 Date: 31 May 2017

Reviewer: Tomas Salerno

Reviewer’s report:

This retrospective review of 90 patients undergoing heart surgery who postoperatively developed abnormal renal function had ultrasound of the kidney to help in management. The authors only found 4 patients who benefited from this ultrasound study, concluding that this modality should be scrutinized rather than "viewed as universal measure".

Comments:

1) the article is well written and from a reputable group;

2) There are 8 authors for a small retrospective study, and not sure what their contributions were to this manuscript;

3) There are some serious limitations to this study as mentioned by the authors due to the retrospective nature of the study;

4) Similar studies have been done in the past, coming to same conclusion, and the authors themselves mentioned those articles in references 20-22;

5) Not sure what the authors mean by stating that this "modality should be scrutinized rather than viewed as universal". Not sure cardiac centers see this modality as universal in cases of abnormal renal function post surgery.

6) This reviewer is not convinced that this retrospective studies adds to the literature or to changes in clinical practice.
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