

REVIEWER 1

COMMENT 1: "I would suggest avoiding the citation and mention of literature at this point".

REPLY: The authors have removed the citation in the abstract. (page no 2, line 32, 33, 34)

COMMENT 2: While the main body text outlines the upto date argument for pros and cons regarding peritoneal dialysis and heamodialysis, However, it is somehow difficult to follow. It feels like authors are constantly jumping from one point to another and at the end the reader is left confused. I recommend the better organization of the text for example Line 151 mentions malnutrition of HD, then further line discuss financial issues, and in line 151 we read about malnutrition again.

REPLY: The authors have made changes in the respective section and now, hopefully the paragraph is coherent. (page no 5, line no 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157) .

COMMENT 3: Moreover, Hu YH et al. are mentioned 19 times in the text, yet we still do not know which specific study is being cited, from which year, how it has been referenced.

REPLY: The authors have added the respective reference. (page no 6, line no 209).

COMMENT 4: As this is high-yeild topic and one of the main issues clinicians are facing nowadays, I would like to read more about author's thoughts what are their suggestions and recommendations, and how we can" bypass" the problem by taking into account all the mentioned arguments .

REPLY: Relevant amendments were made in the conclusion part which reflects author's thoughts on the topic. (page no 6, line no 180, 184, 189)

COMMENT 5: My suggestion is to cite Hu YH et al. as they were mentioned many times in text, and if i am not wrong, they are not cited either ones

REPLY: The authors have cited the respective article in the manuscript. (line no 74).