Manuscript ID 106451v1

This paper is related to reviewing the manuscript titled **" Validation and modification of existing bleeding complications prediction models for percutaneous renal biopsy: a prospective study**"

This study aimed to validate and refine prediction models for post-biopsy bleeding complications in 471 PRB patients. The study found that BMI, hemoglobin, and ultrasound findings were significant predictors of bleeding complications. In multivariable analysis, BMI, immediate, and six-hour ultrasound data remained significant. The study also compared three Kidney Biopsy Risk Calculators (KBRC): KBRC-5, IKBRC, and SKBRC.

Firstly, Although the proposed study is successful, performance analysis, evaluation results, organization, presentation, content and results are poor of the paper. So, major revision given in the following items need to be performed.

1) Improve the conclusion section, enhance the manuscript to convey the purpose, objectives, method and major findings, especially results in the items of convenience, interest, comfort, enhancing student's self-confidence and subjective initiative.

2) Use abbreviations after the first use in the text, in the abstract and throughout the paper.

3) Neither the mathematical nor algorithmic expressions of these methods are given in the paper text. The authors urgently need to find a solution to this issue, and the mathematical equations of the methods must be given in the paper.

4) What are the contributions of the authors in this study in terms of for percutaneous renal biopsy? It is essential to clarify this issue.

5) In addition, the proposed model should be compared with new methods, from the results except some figures (Only three figures available).

6) Performance analyses and results are very few and insufficient. Increasing the results and including more detailed analyses in the paper would increase the value and scope of this paper.

7) The interpretation of the results and the discussion section are insufficient. These sections should definitely be increased and improved.

8) The conclusion section really needs to be improved

9) The resolution of the figures giving the analysis results should be increased.

10) Clean the paper of English spelling and punctuation errors

My decision is major revision. I would like to inform you that if all the requested items are not completed in this revision, my decision will be to reject the application in the second round. Otherwise, I do not see any harm in publishing the manuscript once the above revisions are made.

I believe that the results obtained in this study (In this form) do not meet the standard quality of this journal.

Best regards.