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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors have used a quantitative analysis to assess perceptions and attitudes. This approach has limits and can actually be misleading, as was obvious in this manuscript. A qualitative approach or at least a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis would have been more appropriate for the topic.

Here are some observations:

· On page 4, last paragraph, the authors say “Wider public awareness of this Ordinance is crucial for its reinforcement and implementation. Moreover, most of the undesirable practices related to organ transplantation are due to insufficient public awareness regarding organ transplantation and pertaining policy and legislation, low motivation for organ donation, misconceptions related to health risks for donors and religious constraints”. This statement needs to be substantiated by references.

· The authors are equating blood donation with solid viscera donation. There are major differences between donating blood (a renewable substance) and a Kidney. A person may be willing to donate blood every few months to complete strangers and may be reluctant to give a kidney. The two cannot be compared. In order for the study to be meaningful, this distinction must be made.

· The authors state that “with the exception of a few open ended questions, the interview was based on prompted questions”. In order to assess attitudes and perceptions, surveys only tend to skim the surface and a much better tool is a qualitative analysis which the authors have not employed or done so sparingly. This weakens the study.

· On page 11, the authors mention “Eighty one (50.1%) people knew that organs for donation can come from people who have recently died...”. It is unclear as to what the authors mean when they say “recently died”. There is a very specific spectrum of individuals who qualify as deceased donors and the term “recently dead” can indicate a variety of situations. This cannot be assessed without actually examining the question related to this bit of information.

· On page 15, the authors are lumping together a variety of disparate entities together when they speak in one breath about “.....organ donation is out of compassion/sympathy, for money and as a responsibility”. Organ donation driven...
by altruistic reasons of compassion is entirely different from vending a kidney because of poverty and a lack of other options.

- On page 16, the authors say that “With regards to consent, 76.1% respondents thought that the donor should be the one who can give consent for a living donation”. That implies that, regarding living donations, 24% respondents were of the view that no consent was required from the donor? This response needs further exploration.

- In the same paragraph, further down the authors say that “In the case of unclaimed bodies, a majority (35.2%) felt that the charitable organizations should have the right to decide on this issue while 22.3% felt that no one has the right to make such decisions”. In framing the question, it is unclear what the authors mean by “unclaimed bodies”. Those that are left in morgues or of a homeless person found dead on the street? If this is what the respondent understood, then this was a flawed question. As stated before, not all individuals qualify to be deceased donors. Clarification is needed.

- Discretionary Revisions

I feel that in addition to the above mentioned points, since the authors addressing a very important area in organ transplantation in Pakistan, they need to strengthen their literature review by going beyond the solitary paper they quote which they themselves indicate as a weak one due to its limitations. I suggest that the authors review the following papers that address some of the issues that the authors have studied:
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