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**Reviewer’s report:**

In this paper authors tried to evaluate a new self-management support intervention for kidney transplant patients

The paper is not well written, the results are described in a confounding way, with a lot of useless details and without clearness.

There are 3 major points that affect the validity of this study:

1) The number of evaluated patients. Only 15 patients completed the TAM questionnaire. This is not a sufficient sample size for this kind of study.

2) The study did not take into account the differences in pharmacological therapy nor between patients in the intervention groups, nor between patients in the control group. This factor is very important because can affect analyzed parameters as patient activation, building confidence and motivation, goal setting.

3) Results of the study showed that no significant differences were present in recipients' self-management knowledge nor within the intervention group (T0 vs T1) nor between the intervention and control group (T1 vs C). Moreover, no significant differences in quality of life between the intervention and control group were found. The further results that authors report in the study appear obvious. How can authors conclude that the nurse-led self-management support intervention we evaluated was found to be feasible and acceptable by professionals?

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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