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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I would like to congratulate the authors on being able to collect this very significant data from all these centers and with excellent response rates, which are much higher than usual. The authors provide us with important information regarding the status of renal transplantation in Turkey, especially having to do with living donation. Could the authors please respond to the following questions/comments? 1) Do the authors have any data regarding the donors: epidemiological, donor follow-up, complications, etc? 2) Do the authors have any data regarding the function of the renal grafts, for example what was the % of delayed graft function?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors surveyed current practices of live donor nephrectomy (LDN) in Turkish transplant centers in year 2019. Questionnaire was sent to all 72 transplant centers in May 2022 and again in September. All responded. Five centers were excluded as no LDN were performed. They concluded that Turkish transplant centers performed LDN surgeries successfully through various techniques. Centers implementing minimally invasive techniques had a relatively higher number of live donor kidney transplants in 2019. This is an important study, who results will be of interest to research community throughout the world in general and in Turkey, in particular. However, the paper needs revision. There are many points which need to be addressed, as under:

Major points: There is some discrepancy regarding COVID-19 and the study year. The paper says it analyzed the practice of live kidney donation in 2019, whereas the chief impact of COVID-19 was seen in year 2020. As such, the study duration encompasses pre-COVID-19 era and not COVID-19 era. Please reconcile this. Or remove the COVID-19 part from the manuscript. Please provide key words form MeSH after abstract. In abstract: Give IQR or min-max values along with median values. Give percentage after 28 for living kidney transplants. Main paper: Add et al. to Ratner name in Introduction. Give year after September in Methods. Please also give date when all questionnaire were received? What was the closing date of data collection? Use standardized approach to the use of abbreviations. Once abbreviated, then only abbreviation should be used. Eg. LDN, but in paper, full term is again used. Whether residents who have completed the training are allowed to perform transplant surgeries without qualifying examination? Results of main paper: Give IQR or minimum-maximum of no. of transplants (as given in Table 1) and all other data
displayed as central tendency. In Table 1, per center is written as percenter in 4th row. Add “and composition and training of the surgical team” in the caption of Table 1. “The average blood loss was 0-100 ml during” should be changed to “The average blood loss ranged between 0-100 ml during” and so on. Figure 2, donor nephrectomy types labels should be coloured or otherwise highlighted. Currently, they are undistinguishable. Rates of hernia should be moved down into the subheading of complications and should not be in variations of techniques subheading. Complete the sentence “performing less than live donor kidney transplants (10).” in discussion. Determiner/determiners should be changed to determinants. A few minor English language mistakes should be corrected throughout the manuscript.