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Reviewer's report:

In this trial, Sharma et al propose to undertake a parallel group randomized controlled trial of immediate intensive v.s. delayed, periodontal treatment in patients with chronic kidney disease and periodontitis. The purpose of this trial is to inform effect sizes for the design of a much larger trial about periodontal treatment in patients with chronic kidney disease. An impressive set of measurements will be obtained in each participant; the rationale for each measurement is clearly documented in the manuscript. The authors have put quite the effort in designing an ethical trial around an intervention that can be quite uncomfortable and they have to be congratulated for trying to assess the observational evidence about periodontal treatment in a randomized setting.

The only minor concerns I have about this manuscript are: a) size of the introduction; this runs for about 5 pages and should be reduced in size somewhat b) the authors should more clearly explain to the audience that four measurements of eGFR may not be sufficient to detect an effect of the intervention of the rate of decline in renal function. This could have been feasible if they only recruited rapid progressors (conventionally set at delta-egfr at 5 ml/min/1.73m2 per 1 year), but from the inclusion criteria (criterion 4), it would seem to me that they may end up with patients who do not decline as fast. This should be qualified and quantified in the text.

c) I find the inclusion of a section about "success criteria" somewhat superfluous
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