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Reviewer’s report:

Zhang and colleagues present a systematic review on the association of periodontal disease and mortality in patients with chronic kidney disease and I appreciate the opportunity to read the manuscript.

The topic is clinically important and my comments are as follows:

Eligibility criteria should be reworded to assure they are clear and unambiguous. As only cohort studies were eligible, it is needless to report that all included studies were cohort studies in the results section. It should also be clearly stated if any (co-)interventions were done/compared in the included studies or whether this was an exclusion criterion.

It needs a more extensive and clear description of how outcome data were extracted and pooled, especially be the methods section states that multivariable adjusted risk estimates were pooled, while pooled estimates for specific adjustment variables are reported in table 3 (e.g. 'adjusted for smoking'...). Also the methods section states that random effects models were used, but there are plenty of fixed effects models in the results section/tables.

As for the subgroup analyses, it seems difficult to combine hemodialysis patients with transplant recipients as they have a totally different baseline risk to die.

Evaluating publication bias with a funnel plot usually requires >10 studies and seems not feasible here given the small number of included studies.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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