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Reviewer's report:

This article attempts to compare the outcomes of kidney graft realized from uncontrolled donor after circulatory death using 2 preservation methods: normothermic recirculation recently and cold in situ perfusion. The authors showed that renal graft function was better at one year in the normothermic perfusion group.

This is a retrospective study comparing graft survival, graft filtration rate at short term and at one year.

The study is well done with clear objectives, results and conclusions. These results are interesting as very few studies are available on the topic.

Few data are however missing.

Regarding the donor, the cause of death should have been given. The distribution of Maastricht I and II category should have been given for each type of perfusion.

The global follow up should have been mentioned in the text. Regarding the follow up and the fact that the inclusions end in 2013 it would have been interesting to have a longer follow up.

The mean day of restart of the diuresis should have been indicated as well as the time for diuresis > 1000ml.

The complications should have been detailed: thrombosis, ureteral leak,...

Regarding the difference on cold ischemia time it is indeed a confounder, even if the data were adjusted.

The authors should indicated how long the kidney remain on pulsatile perfusion machine and what were the resistance index immediately before the graft as it can also be a confounder.
Recent references regarding normothermic perfusion should also be included as: Oniscu et al, Am J Transplant, 2014 or Demiselle and al, Transplant Int, 2016.
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