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Reviewer's report:
In the present paper, Wen-Yi Li et al. found that Peritoneal Dialysis (PD) initiation should be well planned with an effective education program and a timely catheter placement rather than an emerging start with hemodialysis (HD) catheter. This is a well written manuscript, with pretty interesting results, however the impact of the study is limited by the low number of patients taken in consideration (PD n=111). However due the poorly of reports on this topic, I suggest the present paper to be published on BMCNephrology

Major elements to consider in revision process:
- The aim of the authors was to make a "Comparison of outcomes between emergent-start and planned-start peritoneal dialysis": in my opinion data from HD patients shouldn't find such space in main results and discussion;
- baseline urine output is lacking

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:
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