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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes a very high prevalence of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease in CKD patients, with higher prevalence among PD patients compared to Hemodialysis and CKD patients. Interestingly, mean age of these patients is rather young (about 40 yo). The big burden of CV disease in dialysis patients is well known and it has been described in the past. Here, the crucial point is the hypothesis of a direct role of PD in generating worse cardiovascular outcomes. PD is already an under-utilised RRT method and this negative message could lead to the concept that PD is dangerous and that HD should be preferred.

I respectfully point out that in order to have a strong evidence for this conclusion, an observational, cross-sectional study in a rather limited number of patients, from a single center, is not sufficient, because there are many possible biases affecting the Authors' result, especially selection bias. Therefore, I would suggest to the Authors to increase the sample size and especially to perform a second round of tests after 12 or 24 months, so that they can be more confident in their findings. Selection bias could still be present, but at least they could see if progression of CV disease is faster in PD, as should be expected if their hypothesis is true.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal