

Point-by-Point Response to the Reviewers Comments on Manuscript NO.:**87553, Retrospective Cohort Study****Predictors of Graft Function and Survival in Second Kidney Transplantation:****A Single Center Experience**

Firstly, we would like to thank the Editors and Reviewers for their great efforts and time spent in reviewing this work to improve its quality.

Secondly, the responses to the instructions from the Editors are considered during preparation and submission of the revision files as per recommendations outlined in the first decision letter.

Thirdly, the responses to the reviewers' comments are presented as point-by-point report as following (Changes or corrections are performed in the text and they are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript text).

Responses to Reviewers Comments:**Responses to Comments of Reviewer #1:**

Comment: " In the manuscript "Predictors of Graft Function and Survival in Second Kidney Transplantation: A Single Center Experience", the authors worked to identify the risk factors affecting primary graft function and graft survival rates after second kidney transplantation (SKT). Out of 1861 cases of kidney transplantation, 48 cases with SKT were eligible. The authors found that high BMI and first graft loss due to acute rejection were the only significant predictors of PNF graft; the second graft survival was reduced by DGF in the first and second

grafts; censored graft/patient survival rates at 1, 3, 5 and 10 years were 90.5%/97.9%, 79.9%/95.6%, 73.7%/91.9%, and 51.6%/83.0%, respectively. In conclusion, non-immediate recovery modes of the first and second graft functions were significantly associated with unfavorable second graft survival rates. Patient and graft survival rates of SKT were similar to those of the first KT. The topic on SKT is interesting. The authors identified some parameters to impact on the outcomes of SKT, which is beneficial to form appropriate strategy to SKT."

Response: Thank you very much for your efforts.

Comment: "1. The authors give the information of SKT PRA level and HLA mismatches. Actually, more details is needed. I suggest to show more data such as donor-specific antibodies (DSA level), especially against the HLA alleles of the first graft."

Response: We apologize for the absence of these more details. This was a retrospective study and the data were taken from the center at Martin-Luther University, Germany. Now, we have tried to get an access, but it was not possible to access to these data. We added this missing of data to the limitations of the study.

(Page 13; last paragraph)

Comment: "2. I also suggest the authors give pathological evaluation on kidney donors."

Response: We apologize again. Also, we have no access to these data now. We added this missing of data to the limitations of the study. (Page).

Comments of the Science editor:

Comment: " The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it is ready for the first decision."

Response: Ok. Revision for language polishing has been performed. Now, many corrections are highlighted in yellow all over the text.

Response to comments of Company editor-in-chief:

Comment: " I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Transplantation, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the

source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. When revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>."

Response:

Yes. All required corrections and instructions have been addressed and corrected as per your recommendations.