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Reviewer's report:

The authors made a great effort in updating a systematic review on pregnancy after kidney transplantation; I have however some major points to make:

1. The novelty also with respect to the famous and very well done systematic review by Deshpande should be clearly highlighted: why do we need a new systematic review? (I agree that this is very useful, but this should be clearly stated)

2. On the account of the deep changes in indications, follow-up and maternofoetal care I strongly argue that a systematic review has no advantage of starting since 1947; would the authors like to discuss data before 2000, it should be done separately and not included into the present review

3. All systematic reviews should be recorded in a database; did the Authors do it?

4. The review should follow the MOOSE criteria; a statement should be added; I did not find the MOOSE table in the attachment

5. The authors should be highly cautious in drawing conclusions on miscarriages (reporting bias very likely)

6. I suggest changing the heading on "ideal age" in age at conception; such a heading may be misleading

7. The discussion is very long; the novelty of the study is not evident

8. The difficulties in classifying superimposed preeclampsia should be highlighted

Minor:

The images are of a very low quality
The tables should follow a conventional order based upon publication date

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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