**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Comparison of outcomes between emergent-start and planned-start peritoneal dialysis in incident ESRD patients: a prospective observational study

**Version:** 0  **Date:** 09 Aug 2017

**Reviewer:** Marco Colucci

**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript. The topic is quite interesting because the study deals with those late referral patient who lack a pre-dialysis planning program and need to start dialysis urgently due to uremic emergencies by mean of CVC (and thus are not suitable for urgent-start PD), and, in common clinical practice, are rarely shifted to PD. The literature focusing on this sub-population is quite scarce, providing additional interest for your work.

**MAJOR COMMENTS:**

- In Results section, in "Baseline patient characteristics", several statements are done about differences between the PD and HD populations, referring to data shown in Table 1; however, p value for these difference is (apparently) not shown, as in Table 1 p values seem to reflect significance of the difference between planned start and emergent start patients in each of the two groups separately, so I kindly ask you to clarify.

- The remaining part of the article is good, methods are well described, there are no gross methodological errors, statistics seem correctly performed.

- The main pitfall of this study can be considered the lack of a protocol for patient allocation to various groups; however this was just an observational study, and the potential bias is clearly stated in Discussion.

**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:
Acceptable
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