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Dear Editor of BMC Nephrology

Thankyou for inviting me to review the article “Laparoscopic versus open catheter placement in peritoneal dialysis patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis” by Xie et al.

This is an article of interest and of reasonable quality. I am concerned though, that there is a lack of balance in the arguments for and against laparoscopy. When the introduction is read, I can guess the conclusion immediately.

One of the key issues with laparoscopy is less pain and less scarring yet this is not mentioned in the article.

All the points below can be corrected and would advise publication after revision however if the initial argument in the introduction and discussion is not more balanced on revision I would advise against publication.

Minor comments

Introduction:
The first sentence should be reworded to say “for patients with end-stage renal disease”
The use of PD has not been defined in the manuscript. When using peritoneal dialysis first you should have PD in brackets.
Delete the “the” in “the catheter”
The sentence starting “Review aims to assess…” is poorly worded.
“Several authors….” needs a reference
The last sentence in the introduction says laparoscopic versus surgical when the
Methods

Why were studies restricted to the English language?
There are multiple grammatical and spelling errors

Studies can be analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. To exclude studies based upon lack of quantitative data goes against PRISMA guidelines.

Data extraction
Multiple grammatical and spelling errors

Who were the independent extractors?
The use of the Newcastle Ottawa score is good

Figure 1 needs replacing with the PRISMA diagram

There needs to be a more balanced argument for and against the use of the laparoscope in particular what the suggested advantages are and what authors say to counter those advantages and propose disadvantages in order that the reader can decide for himself.

There are no statistics for the operation time or hospital stays in the main manuscript

In the discussion the authors should make a softer statement about the conclusions made by Crabtree et al.

The conclusion is far too strong for the number of studies included.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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