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Reviewer's report:

1. Good study addressing an interesting question regarding retrograde perfusion.

2. There are a few typos that should be easy to fix.

3. The warm ischemia time is very short! Typical warm ischemia time for human kidneys is ~20 minutes (K Marzouk 2013 and KK Tennankore 2016 - see discussion re: WIT < 10 minutes). The method of calculating WIT should be described and the numbers verified.

4. Ideally the histology would be scored (ATN score, apoptosis score) by a pathologist in a blinded fashion. Also, since needle biopsies of kidney grafts were taken immediately after perfusion, before revascularization, after 24 hours storage, and on day 7 following transplantation, it would be good to show all of the histology with scores in the 2 groups.

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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