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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This is a review of the Literature concerning the role of a biopsy-driven only or a hybrid model comprehending bioptic and clinical features in the selection of grafts from expanded criteria kidney donors.

The present debate presents a novel argument, addressing its attention on a hot topic in American and European experiences.

The present study is well referenced, reporting the most recent papers in the field.

The papers is acceptably well written for publication: however, I suggest to correct English style, with the intent to improve the fluidity of the text itself.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In Abstract (line 17), please explain the meaning of ECD the first time this acronym is reported.
2. In Abstract (line 17), please explain the meaning of DKT the first time this acronym is reported.
3. In introduction (line 42), is better to use the term “deceased” instead of “cadaveric”.
4. In line 97, please amend the term “densored” in “censored”
5. In line 128, I suppose it is correct to write “any event”.
6. In line 191, there is a problem with references: I don’t know if the reference here reported must be removed or there is a problem in the complete numeration of the references in the text. Please amend this.
7. In line 195, a similar situation has been observed respect to the previous comment. Please amend also this.

Discretionary Revisions

No discretionary revisions are reported.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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