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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

**OBJECTIVE** - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

**DESIGN** - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

**EXECUTION** - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

**INTERPRETATION** - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

**OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL** - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is a largely descriptive study of prevalence of pruritus in hemodialysis patients. This topic has been studied in detail earlier and this study does not contribute significantly to the available literature. Certain crucial details are missing 1) What is the dialysis vintage in terms of months with SD 2) Were the patients on antihistaminic/ other medication for pruritus and if so it is important to mention which ones 3) Was any association noted with regard to diabetic status, Hepatitis status ,liver disease since these are important factors. 4) It is unclear what the multidimensional approach that is mentioned by the authors is ...? further details will need to be added.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Extensive English language editing is necessary

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The presentation is haphazard and needs to be streamlined . The study has several drawbacks which are highlighted by the authors while the take away message from the study needs to be highlighted.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.
No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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