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Reviewer’s report:

General

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore):

- It would be preferable to summarize the results in one table for the purpose of a better clarification.
- Also, it would be preferable to include a survival chart (Kaplan-Meier curves) for graft and patient survival.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I-Some spelling errors are to be corrected:
1- Page 2, line 5: (12,8%) to be corrected to 12.8% and this error has to be corrected in other parts of the text.
2- Page 2, line 7: (reconstruction were done) to be corrected to was done.
3- Page 2, line 10: (occured) to be corrected occurred.
4- Page 2, line 12: (differences) to be corrected to difference and (multipl) to be corrected to multiple.
5- Page 2, line 13: (multipl) to be corrected to multiple.
6- Page 3, line 7: (multipl) to be corrected to multiple.
7- Page 3, line 18: (reconstruction were done) to be corrected to was done.
8- Page 4, line 16: (multipl) to be corrected to multiple.
9- Page 4, line 20: (patirnt) to be corrected to patient.

II-P value: p value is written as (> 0.05). It is better to state it as exact figure, for example p = 0.09.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached):

Section of RESULTS:
1- The details of the reconstructive techniques (in 17 cases reconstruction was......) are to be transferred to the section of PATIENTS and METHODS.
2- A comparison between the groups of grafts with single and with multiple arteries, regarding the incidence of relevant complications such as vascular complications, urologic complications, incidence of ATN and mean serum creatinine at 1 year and at last follow-up, should be added to the manuscript in order to strengthen the value of this paper.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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
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