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Reviewer's report:

I think this topic is important in Nephrology field. I strongly suggest the revision/modification of published protocol as below for transparency:

1. Timeline for searching needs to be specified in the protocol according to the timeline that the investigators used in PROSPERO registration in both abstract and fulltext.

2. Two independent reviewers need to be specified in the protocol; who are the two reviewers by using the initial.

3. Who is "a third person"? need to be specify.

4. It is recommended that Kappa coefficient should also be calculated to determine the agreement between the investigators of two reviewers.

5. Data management should be more specified? How would the investigators deal with duplication from each database? Manually vs software e.g. Endnote or Mendeley to check for duplicate publications.

6. Can RevMan 5 software provide data on Egger’s test? Please elucidate me.

There are misspelled/misused words as below:

1. "Adults and children with end-stage kidney disease who receiving any type of PD"; "who receiving any type of PD" is not correct in grammar.

2. "insulin resistance in non-diabetic patients"; "resistence" should be "resistance"
3. "each language" should be re-written to represent better meaning of no restrictions in language.
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