

Dear Editor,

Greetings, we have interestingly read the reviewers comments and it is your kindness which with these comments let us to improve our manuscript. All the comments were answered in below. We have added Fig2 and Fig3 also to improve the quality of the article. Also we have added the table1 which we think it would completely clear the study design respectively.

We also edited our manuscript with native editor

We hope that the changes make your interest grow up

With the best regards

Dr.Shemshaki

Corresponding author

Reviewer 1:

C: Dear authors for this interesting meta-analysis, it nice to make nice meticulous English revision as there are a lot of grammar mistakes all over the manuscript.

R: Edited. the manuscript is edited by native American editor.

C: I think that the authors did not include some other important retrospective studies which can enrich their meta-analysis.

R: we have analyzed the quality of the studies with the questionnaire (QAS) and only the studies which had higher score of 8 were included in our study. This may limit our included study however can increase the power of analysis. We mention it in method section and also as figure1.

C: authors did not mention the degree of HLA match in different studies in their analysis.

R: Yes, in previous studies by Opelz (Analysis of transplantation data by on The Cardio Thoracic Systems registries) revealed that HLA mismatches have an important role in the outcome of transplantation. Nevertheless, many single center studies have reported equal short, medium and long term outcomes of transplantation in LURD series compared with LRDs. In the other hand, we could not include this item as our outcome because of only 2-3 studies determined this factor. Therefore, we mentioned it as our limitation in discussion section

Reviewer 2:

The systematic review has not included some important studies which have compared the rejection rates and outcomes between living related and unrelated kidney transplants.

C: There are several grammatical and typographical errors.

R: Edited. the manuscript is edited by native American editor.

C: The discussion section does not compare and contrast outcomes of the meta-analysis.

R: Edited

Reviewer 3:

In this manuscript authors performed a meta-analysis to compare related and unrelated living donor kidney transplant outcome. Results indicate a better outcome of kidney transplant from living related donors in the long term. Nevertheless, many issues need to be addressed regarding the search strategy and result report. The following issues should be addressed. In Materials and Methods section, Study identification and data abstraction, the full search strategy is missing and should be added: for each database please specify the search strategy with search terms, synonyms, Boolean operators, number of papers retrieved and the search period. It is necessary to clarify eligibility criteria for study selection (Figure 1 and Results): it is not clear how many studies were excluded because are duplicates (in Figure 1 it seems that almost all studies, 365/376, were excluded because are duplicates, while in Results it is stated that “We excluded 10 of the studies after applying our eligibility criteria to their title and/or abstracts, including exclusion of duplicates. These left 10 studies were included”. Please explain, describe criteria for detection of duplicates and report how many studies were excluded for other reasons. A description of contacts with authors, if any, is missing.

R: Edited in the text. We also provide a Table1 in which all the study design, strategies, terms and etc was explained. Also we changed the study flowchart which explains the search in details

C: The “Study presentation” section should be moved in the Result section.

R: Edited.

C :Discussion on potential biases, exclusions, quality of the included studies should be added in Discussion section.

R: Edited

C: Efforts to recover missing data are not explained (i.e. request to the authors).

R: Edited

C: Data on ethnicity and country are not taken into consideration and should be added.

R: Edited in Table 2

Reviewer 4:

C: You have done an important service in clarifying the Issue being addressed and the importance of the subject to those engaged in performing Human Kidney Transplants. Your review of previous studies is a superb collection of vital publications and should be distributed to all teams currently involved in performing human kidney transplants. Good for You!

R: Thank You!

Dear Chief Editor,

Greetings, Thanks a lot for your comments. on behalf of Prof. Simforoosh i edited the manuscript and sent back you respectively. In order to the Editor-in-chief comments, we have added another two major studies which recently published recently. Therefore, as you see, we have re-analysed the data and new findings were inserted in the manuscript (all changes are as Track change). As a consequence, i have changed the figure 3 which i added the new format in the manuscript file. the new format of voice file is attached too respectively.

I hope the change could catch your attention

It would be your favor if you inform us from receiving this email

regards

Dr. Shemshaki