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Reviewer’s report:

Major Comments

1. My biggest concern is that while a total of 3,722 kidney transplants were performed, data was only available on 278. Why so few out of the total, and why were these selected? Was there a selection process, and can these 278 be considered a random sample? It seems peculiar that data was not available on all transplants given it was taken from a waiting list registry. This selection has serious potential to bias results.

2. Some of the statements in the Background, e.g. 'As a consequence, it is not uncommon that donors and recipients wish to reduce the risk of an adverse outcome by selecting the best date for the transplantation procedure' are made without supporting references. These are important because they motivate the need for the study. It appears many references are available in the Discussion (e.g., lines 39-49 on 2nd page of Discussion), so some should be mentioned here as well (or moved here).

Minor Comments

3. The methods mentions Kaplan-Meier curves and log-rank tests, but were any multivariable (e.g., Cox regression) models performed?

4. Under 'Statistical analysis' - should be 'Kaplan-Meier estimates' instead of 'statistics' (line 44)

5. The authors make a few statements in the Discussion which are prima facie reasonable but are assumptions rather than statements of fact. E.g. "Accidents, violence, births rates and acute illnesses, however, can hardly be influenced or timely scheduled by humans, therefore these results remain observantly."

6. The Conclusions just mentions limitations rather than re-stating the main conclusions of the paper. It should be revised and limitations moved to the Discussion.
7. How does this work differ from the earlier work of Holzheimer (ref. #35) on lunar phase and surgical quality? Did the Holzheimer paper also have a null result?

8. Abstract: Either p-values should be provided or criteria for no statistical difference (p-value > 0.05?) stated clearly.

9. For Kaplan-Meier curves, the number at risk (e.g., the number still alive at a given follow-up time) should be displayed along the bottom of each graph for each group.

10. Minor grammar: 2nd paragraph of Discussion: "Since superstitious in general often tied to … " should be rephrased (e.g., 'Since superstitions are often tied to … or similar).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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