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Reviewer’s report:

Major Revisions:
I believe the content of the manuscript is appropriate. Unfortunately, based on the work up presented, a conclusion regarding why these clots are forming is not possible, other than the fact that this finding is attributable to something patient-specific, and not dialysis-specific. However, the writing style is not up to par, and I cannot support publication of this manuscript in its present form.

Specific comments:

Line 57, 177: If this patient’s Kt/V is at goal, it would be wrong to say uremia is a culprit here. Also the homocysteine levels are only moderately elevated and I wonder if it has to do with the fact that this patient is on dialysis..
- – It is wrong to invoke uremia as a cause here, if this patient is well dialyzed.
- Line 83 – Needs revision, nephrotic syndrome cannot be steroid – resistant at presentation
- The authors shift gears from starting the story with age to writing dates in second paragraph of case presentation. This needs to be revised... Is there really a reason to mention dates?
- There are several instances where choice of words could be better. I have provided a few examples below, but please note these do not include all the problematic areas of the manuscript:
  • Line 50: ‘adherent on’ is incorrect, should be ‘adherent to’
  • ‘An adolescent male with end-stage renal failure due to focal segmental glomerulosclerosis was known to have recurrent access thrombosis.’ This sentence needs revision.
  • ‘Due to lifestyle preference, the patient was initiated in January 2013 on home hemodialysis’ How about ‘Patient switched to home HD xyz months after initiation of renal replacement therapy’
  • Similarly ‘His next dialysis two days later was changed to conventional hemodialysis using F60S dialyzer in Gambro® AK 95TM (blood flow rate 315 ml/min and dialysate flow rate 700 ml/min)’ is not an easy sentence to read. It
could perhaps be written as ‘After this episode, dialysis modality was switched back to conventional in-center HD using…’

• Another example ‘Unfortunately, NxStage® home hemodialysis was performed for only two months due to peripheral nerve injuries related to the AVG, leading to poor hand dexterity.’ It would make more sense if it is written as ‘home HD could not be continued after two months due to poor dexterity resulting from peripheral nerve injury at time of AVG creation’

• Line 158: Young adolescent?
• Line 167: ‘developed the white thrombi’ should be ‘developed white thrombi.

I think the manuscript still needs extensive revisions from a language standpoint. I encourage the authors to have peers look at their manuscript, to define how it could be improved. Professional language editing services may be needed.
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