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Reviewer's report:

Comments for authors:

In this study, the authors aimed to a) assess the effect of renal transplantation on the QRS-T angle and b) evaluate the possible factors influencing QRS-T changes in a group of selected renal transplant recipients. The study was performed in a single centre in Poland. Although not stated, they were testing the hypothesis that an improvement in the QRS-T angle is a manifestation of reverse electrical remodelling following renal transplantation in patients with end stage kidney disease. From their results, it was concluded that renal transplantation resulted in biphasic reverse electrical remodelling as assessed by the narrowing of the QRS-T angle. Although this is a reasonably well explained study, there are some issues which will need to be addressed.

MAJOR COMMENTS:

ABSTRACT

1. The are some spelling errors and grammatical errors which will need revision

2. In the objectives and methods section, the objective is not clearly stated. Could the authors please explicitly state the objective of the study?

3. This statement in the results section "The dynamics of the indices changes behaved, however, individually" is difficulty to understand. Could the author word this so it easier to understand?

THE MAIN MANUSCRIPT

1. It appears from their manuscript that the authors studied patients who were on haemodialysis before they got a kidney transplant so, the title should specify that this was end stage kidney disease patients on haemodialysis.
2. The authors need to clearly state the design of this study.

2. In the background page 3 in line 18, the authors should specify that they are referring to adverse cardiac events rather than just cardiac events.

3. In the methods section they need to specifically provide more information on the 60 controls so that it will be clearer to make comparisons with the studied group. Were the controls also dialysis or CKD patients for example?

4. In the results section, the authors mention that all patients had undergone RT from unrelated donors, were these living or deceased donors? It is not clear in the manuscript.

5. There are also several grammatical and spelling errors in the manuscript which will need to be addressed.

6. They authors clearly described some limitations of this study, but it is not clear whether they have done anything in their analysis to mitigate some of these limitations.

7. The authors need to list all the abbreviations in the manuscript as they have left some of them.

8. Table 4: The authors need to provide the specific p-values not a range of <0.05 or <0.001. They can provide additional columns in the table for the exact p-values. This will provide the readers with an understanding of the level of significance. For example, although both p=0.01 and p=0.044 are less than 0.05, their level of significance is different.

9. In figure 1 the authors need to label the axes.

MINOR COMMENTS:

1. A minor comment on the statistical analysis section is for the authors to specify whether the p-values were two-tailed or one-tailed, I assumed that it was two-tailed.

2. A minor comment for table 1, could the authors write the names of the treatments in full, for example sartans should be angiotensin 2 receptor blockers or add a foot note below the table to explain these. They should also use international nomenclature for units of measurement, for example, mg/dl should be mg/dL, mmol/l should be mmol/L, g/l should be g/L.
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