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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

This is a very timely and controversial topic and a very good one for debate. The references are well selected. There are several excellent points made, and the authors clearly understand the issue. However, the article is too unfocused and does not have a particular point of view other than allocation based solely on biopsy is probably insufficient.

Although the reader can eventually figure out that the issue being debated is the selection of kidneys for dual versus single transplant, it should be more obvious in the reading and should also be explicitly stated.

Most of the text is a restating of major findings of the literature without relating these findings to the argument. There should be more detail about the articles being referenced. A good example is the discussion of the NITp system. How does the biopsy optimize utilization? The authors should be very specific about how their references impact the issue - literature about discard impacts opportunity to use discarded kidneys as dual transplants; literature about outcomes speaks more to whether a kidney should be used as single vs dual.

There should more context and background about where there are specific allocation rules or systems for dual kidneys. The Remuzzi score is referenced, but is that employed widely across Europe? It is not used in the US. In fact, US allocation policy regarding possible allocation for dual kidneys is very controversial, and this ought to be discussed. It is important to educate the reader on the magnitude of the problem. The authors should clarify whether the issue is simply allocation, or also, more broadly, optimal utilization at the discretion of the community outside of allocation rules.

Minor essential revisions

p3, line 56 the authors call this a "study". I would call it more of a review.

References 20 and 21 are the same.

Discretionary revisions

The authors might consider how and whether the use of KDRI in the US affects this issue, since there are several references to ECD, which is a term which will become obsolete soon.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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