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I studied carefully the manuscript entitled "Acute Kidney Injury and the Compensation of Kidney Function after Nephrectomy in Living Donation" by Okumura et al. The present manuscript is in fact a narrative review; hence, specific inclusion or exclusion criteria lack. Moreover, since it cannot provide answer to the clinical question presented in its title, its conclusions reflect the author’s own views. Despite that such a kind of scientific approach might be of some value, a systematic review could contribute much more to what is called "evidence-based medicine". A systematic approach could be qualitative, if not quantitative; this kind of review ask a specific question and answer it by summarising evidence that meets a set of pre-specified criteria following a protocol. Under this perspective, the authors are wellcome to re-write their review in a systematic manner. This means to perform a literature search following a predefined protocol, include a PRISMA flow diagram (see: http://prisma-statement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram.aspx) and at least qualitatively evaluate the included studies (as these presented in Table 1). Moreover, it would be desirable if they could assess their summary of evidence usingGRADE (see: https://bestpractice.bmj.com/info/toolkit/learn-ebm/what-is-grade/).
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review authors focused on the compensation of kidney function after nephrectomy in living donors, discussing factors that have been identified as being associated with kidney recovery in donors including age, sex, BMI, remnant kidney volume, eGFR, and various comorbidities. The paper is well written and logically organized. The manuscript is clear and presented in a well structured manner. Just minor, would recommend to briefly introduce the role of histology/biopsy in the setting of AKI patients with particular reference to the potential role. In this regard please quote: