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well written study however this manuscript is not eligible for the World Journal of Transplantation. The content of the manuscript requires submission to a different journal.
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The article is within the scope of the journal and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and organized. The reading is fluent. This is original and innovative research, and a contribution to the area of knowledge. However, some aspects should be improved to be accepted: a) The state of the art of the article should be expanded. b) The discussion of the results is fine, but it should be improved by including a discussion about the advantages and limitations of the results presented in comparison with other similar works. c) The conclusions should show the scientific contribution of the article.
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I find it very interesting to read. My comments are as follows:

1. Is there any psychological assessment of potential donors?
2. There is mention of 3rd and 4th-degree relatives. It is very challenging to identify any financial agreements in genetically unrelated donations. What processes are in place to pick these issues to ensure that the whole process is transparent?
3. Table 2 is very long and very complicated. It should be divided into tables where it is easy to understand outcomes.
4. A clear mention of genetically related and genetically unrelated is needed.
5. The usual first step in donor evaluation is taking donor history, particularly about DM, HTN, renal issues etc. This initial step is not mentioned in this study. Does this mean that at initial screening all potential donors were healthy candidates?
6. "In the 144 excluded PLDs, the causes of exclusion were immunological mismatches in 54" Does this mean immunological incompatibility rather than mismatch? Add kidney-sharing related issues in the discussion which can help with better transplant rates in ABOi and HLAi cases.
7. Table 2 and its related work do not make any correlation with the current study. Please justify its significance.
8. What methods of GFR calculations were used? What were GFR cut-offs for various age groups?
9. Were any donors declined due to anatomical issues in the donor's kidney? Multiple vessels, cysts, AML etc
10. Also needs English polishing