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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the editor for the chance to review this article, this article is well written and interesting which addressed one of the defects in the literature. The authors studied the Effects of Low versus Standard Pressure Pneumoperitoneum on Renal Tubular Epithelial and Peritubular Endothelial Cells Injury in Living-Donor Nephrectomy, my comments are following:

1- The authors stated in their clinical trial application that they will combine general and epidural anaesthesia; however, general anaesthesia only was described in the manuscript??

Epidural anaesthesia might affect the inflammatory mediators, therefore if used what is the regimen in both groups? was it similar?

2- The time points of measurement were stated to be "1st hour, 2nd hour and 24th hour after baseline" in the clinical trial registration while in the methodology "baseline, 2 hours after insufflation and 2 hours after desufflation" and in the results different timings "baseline, 2hours after insufflation and 2hours after surgery", please explain?

3- How was the sample size calculated?

4- The small sample size is not enough to prove such difference between groups

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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