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Reviewer's report:

This paper makes an important contribution to the world literature on organ transplantation. I think it can be substantially improved as follows.

Background: The reader needs more details about Pakistan that may seem obvious to the authors but are not to readers, at least from the Europe and the United States.

For example, in the introduction, there is no mention of how many transplants take place in Pakistan every year, how many are live donors and how many deceased. Are the deceased donors brain-dead or is donation done after cardiac death?

You mention the 2007 Ordinance. What did it address? What exploitation of human rights issues did it address? What were these problems, if any, in Pakistan?

On page 4-5 you make the assertion that “most of the undesirable practices…are due to insufficient public awareness… Is there any data to support this assertion? How do you know it is so? What are examples of undesirable practices?

Materials and Methods

In your questionnaire, questions 18 and 19 ask about informed consent using the word “can” not “should”. Does this mean you are asking subjects what is permitted by law or what they think should be permitted? Perhaps, this is a translation problem, but it should be clarified. “Can” would make it a factual question. Do they know the law? “Should would make it an opinion question.

Results

Tables 1 and 2 do not mention the self identified religion of subjects. You asked the question, why not report the data?

The data reported on page 12 is very confusing to me. The data in the first paragraph seems different from that reported from Table 4 at the bottom of the page. For example, at the top you report that 32.1% would donate to a person of their own religion (and, does this mean only to a person of their own religion?) while at the bottom of the page 29.6% made religion most important. I think I see the difference, but juxtaposing
the two results without clarification confused me. At the top of the page you say a “sizable majority” but give data that except for drinking is not indicative of a majority.

On page 16, you say religion didn’t have an association… To which of the religions you asked about in your questionnaire do you refer? All of them?. And when you say “religion” here, was it the person’s self-identified religious identity or their answer that religion told them not to donate.

Top of page 17: Only 3.5% had themselves donated. Only?? That seems like an incredibly high figure to me. Considering that Pakistan has 160 million people, that would mean that 5,600,000 Pakistanis have donated. Even allowing for children and people who have not heard of organ transplant, the figure is unbelievably high. How do you explain this?

Bottom of page 19: Again, you mention religion. You say “none of the religions”—but the reference is to Islam. Explain.

Bottom page 20: What do you mean by “effective legislation?”
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