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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
This is a small neat study with some interesting and useful results. However, it requires some language editing to make it tighter and more readable.

Major compulsory revisions:
1. In the background, the authors could go into a little more detail about barriers. There are several studies on barriers to eye donation that could cited.
2. The mapping and identification of stakeholders needs a little more elaboration. Can they be classified in any way? Are there stakeholder groups that are more or less influential in this particular context?
3. Para 3 under methods points to "previous published reports" in the area of eye donation based on which the questionnaire was prepared. Only one citation is provided. Are there others? To what extent did this questionnaire match or diverge from the others?
4. A few more details on the questionnaire would be useful--how many items overall (does the score of 13 refer to the number of questions?) and how many in each of the three sections (KAP)?
5. It is not clear whether the demographic groups are mutually exclusive within each stakeholder category, with reference to the kin of family members who had donated--is this a completely separate group? Or are there some who might also be teachers/students/social workers? Perhaps a sentence to clarify this would be sufficient.
6. The discussion could be developed a little more in terms of what these different stakeholder groups could bring to the cause of eye donation, based on the understanding gained from the survey.

Minor essential revisions:
1. What was the score for "high" or "low" awareness? All correct or was it fixed at 2?
2. The discussion (third last paragraph) notes that "in our study...females were more willing to donate eyes" which contradicts the earlier mentioned result that there was no difference across gender. Perhaps this needs to be rephrased to make the point that unlike the cited study, females were no less willing than males to donate.
3. The difference among stakeholder groups needs to be more succinctly summarised so that the take away from the study is stronger. Where should interventions be targeted? And should they be different for different stakeholder groups?

Discretionary revisions:

1. The last points in both sets of suggestions above could be considered discretionary but I think they would really strengthen the paper and take it beyond a mere descriptive study.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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