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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written report. The comparison between SPK in DMI and DMII and KTA in DMII is highly interesting and still debated controversially. Hence this report is a valuable contribution to the field. The content and data are well presented. The only shortcoming is the natural limitation resulting from a comparison between different patient groups with diverse demographics and different prioritization on the waiting list.

It is surprising to see the difference in the donor profile between SPK in DMI vs DMII. The authors could elaborate on the cause.

The comparison between the outcome of the KTx in SPK vs KTA alone is most likely impacted by the different organ quality. Further to this the time on the waiting list my impact on the results. This could be discussed in greater depth in the discussion. Also the limitation in the comparison between these groups should be emphasised in the discussion.

The assessment displayed the picture of the clinical reality. The one element most underrepresented in the discussion is the indirect effect of the longer waiting time and the inferior organ quality when listed for a KTx alone. The authors could focus their manuscript on this aspect. Ideally, an intention to treat analysis looking at the outcome staring on the initiation of dialysis could be added.

Well done!
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