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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective study about the impact of gender match on living kidney graft survival.

As graft survival rates have improved in the past decades due to improvements in immunosuppression, other factors that influence outcomes as gender match have already been pointed out in the literature by several authors.

Major comments

The manuscript is poorly written. In the abstract it seems that the aim of the study was to study the age of donor and recipients (Background).

Was the nephrectomy technique similar in all procedures (conventional vs. laparoscopy)?
Was the warm ischemia time similar?

Do they change they immunosuppresive management during the study period, for example use of cyclosporine in patients transplanted in 2002 and tacrolimus since 2008?

The definition they propose for transplant rejection is actually for graft loss.

How many patients were included in each gender match group?

What are they explanation for having donor hemoglobin as predictive for graft rejection?

Table 2 should have six columns (male to male, male to female, female to female, female to male and all population, and a column with the p value by Anova

Table 3. How the p value was obtained? Other studies have shown that female recipients of male donors have a better graft function/survival, why do they have the highest frequency of return to dialysis in this group?
It would be better to show the graft survival by gender match (4 curves)

The conclusion that it would be better to hesitate from female donors to male recipients cannot be drawn from their results.

Minor comments

Correct cratinnine for creatinine in the abstract

Please confirm that you have included your review in the ‘Comments to Author’ box?

As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors’ hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.

Please note that we may not be able to use your review if no comments are provided.

Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included as text in the ‘Comments to Author’ box.

Yes

Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?

Please state in the ‘Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

NA
Are you able to assess the statistics?

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?

- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?

Please can you confirm which of the following statements apply to your statistical assessment of the manuscript (Please include details of what the authors need to address in the ‘Comments to Author’ box):

I have been able to assess all of the statistics in this manuscript (please refer to checklist above)

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

No

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

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Should the manuscript be highlighted for promotional activity?**

Articles that are deemed of interest to a broad audience can be promoted in a variety of ways. This could be through email updates, postings on the BioMed Central homepage, social media, blogs and/or press releases. Please indicate in the text box below whether you think this manuscript should be considered for promotional activity, indicating your reasons why (e.g. what is the most newsworthy aspect of the research).
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