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Author's response to reviews: see over
We would like to sincerely thank Mr. Stuart Youngner and Misao Fujita for their valuable input. We are very happy that we have satisfactorily addressed their suggestions / concerns.

In addition, Mr. Leonardo D. de Castro raised only one additional concern which we have rectified in the revision.
Point by Point Reply to Mr. Leonardo D. de Castro’s Recommendations / Comments

Title: Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices survey on Organ Donation among a Selected Adult Population of Pakistan

Date: 6th June, 2009

Reviewer: Leonardo D. de Castro

Version: 3

Sir, we would like to thank you for your valuable suggestions and recommendations.

1. Bottom of page 6:

It is not clear to me how the following are "factors associated with the knowledge regarding organ transplantation and donation": blood type makes a difference in donation (69%), transplant survival rates are high (61.6%), transplants can come from living donors (75.9%). Sentence ought to be rewritten.

Reply: The sentence has been rewritten after discussion among the co-authors in accordance with the reference cited. The aim has been to make this sentence as clear as possible for the readers and we hope that we have been able to do that satisfactorily by removing any ambiguity.
Point by Point Reply to the Suggestions & Recommendations of Dr. Syed Ali Anwar Naqvi

Title: Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices survey on Organ Donation among a Selected Adult Population of Pakistan

Date: 6th June, 2009

Reviewer: Dr. Syed Ali Anwar Naqvi

Version: 3

Sir, thank you for your valuable suggestions and recommendations.

Reviewer's report:

1. The methodological problems with using a quantitative tool to assess attitudes and practices remain problematic. This is an inadequate tool to obtain the information that the authors wish to obtain by this study.

Authors: We have mentioned this as a shortcoming of the study in the last paragraph of the limitations section. While this tool may be inadequate as you suggest, it is still in accordance with standard practice to use a quantitative tool such as our questionnaire for gauging knowledge, attitude and practices. Perhaps a future study can be devised later on to employ a qualitative tool.

2. The questionnaire has some apparent weaknesses which will lead to flaws in interpretation. For instance in question 19 addressing donation after death, the
authors do not give the option of the deceased giving the consent during his lifetime (as is the normal practice). This will obviously lead to misleading results.

**Authors**: Thank you for pointing that out. It was an oversight which has been mentioned in the limitations section. We agree that this option should have been provided but unfortunately was not. However, by pointing out this limitation in the limitations section, we have tried our level best to avoid readers from misinterpreting the results. We are confident that the readers of the journal are discerning and will be able to make correct interpretations with this limitation in mind.

3. In the very next question, they ask about "donation in case of unclaimed dead bodies". This is also a misleading question, especially because lay public is being asked about this. Unclaimed bodies are considered to be in city morgues and are obviously not candidates for harvesting organs, with or without consent. Any response to this will be misleading.

**Authors**: The lay public surveyed in this study was explained an authentic working definition of “unclaimed bodies” to avoid any discrepancies while answering the question. Hence, this question and any response to it are not misleading because unclaimed bodies in our study were not regarded as bodies in city morgues despite the fact that question was being posed to the lay public.

4. As pointed out earlier, the authors have confused the donation of blood with solid organ donation. How will they tell apart those willing to donate blood but
refusing to donate a solid organ from those who are willing to donate a solid organ?

**Authors:** This point had already been addressed in the last revision of the manuscript.

We have tried our level best to improve the manuscript in accordance with your recommendations. As mentioned, this study is an important step in the future direction of organ donation in Pakistan and its publication is important to disseminate our findings to a wider audience.

Thank you

Authors