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Reviewer's report:

Comments to Ramphul et al paper

Ramphul et al screened a cohort of patients on waiting list for kidney transplantation for coronary artery disease. The cardiovascular screening method applied consists in the clinical evaluation protocol in use in author's transplant center and based on the European Renal Best Practice, UK Renal Association and British Transplant Society published recommendations. The outcomes were described in terms of cardiac, cardiovascular events and death.

The work-up cardiovascular screening suggested in this article is currently used in many others transplantation centers.

Despite the relatively small sample size and the follow-up period of medium length, this study is equally informative in the light of the rapid evolution of the ischemic heart disease in End Stage Renal Disease patients. The authors themselves declare these points as the main limits of the study.

The results are clear and well reported thanks to easily consultable figures and tables.

A suggestion for the authors is to expand the "discussion section" with a brief reflection on the role of dobutamine stress echocardiography in diabetic and nephropathic patients, since in these patients the basal coronary flow could be elevated already in condition of rest, so with a poor increase in response to dobutamine.

The statistical methods applied are consistent and correct.

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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