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Reviewer's report:

Compulsory revisions

1. 144 patients is a good sample size (power-wise), however in their group comparison HD vs. PD the groups were n= 46 and 48 respectively. Not clear on what criteria these patients were matched? Alternatively, why not use the full 144 patients can control for clinical and demographic confounds in the analysis?

2. No clinical data presented. It would add value to include factors such as residual renal function, dialysis adequacy (Kt/v, co-morbidity, haemoglobin and serum albumin

3. The statistical approaches should be described in the the methods section

4. Discussion should describe study limitations.

Minor essential revisions

1. Low dialysis length (vintage) defined as 1-4 years. Is 4 years really “low” and what were the mean (SD) vintages for patients in low and high length of dialysis groups

2. Determining the predictors of Qol for HD and PD patients eg psychological variables, clinical data and vintage, would be an interesting addition to the analysis.

3. Differences between dialysis time (high and low) for HD and PD patients seems to have been compared (page 7). The wording, to me, was not clear. If the authors compared difference between high vs. low HD patients and then high vs. low PD they need to report the descriptive statistics. The “differences between early and later years” section could be re-written to clarify.

Discretionary revisions

1 The use of ANOVA is generally appropriate however the small group of PD patients on dialysis for >5 years is a concern. It may be better to control for clinical data here i.e. use ANCOVA controlling for say co-morbidity etc.... as there may be differences between treatment groups with respect to clinical status.
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