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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?
   
   The idea of allowing opt-out consent for fully anonymised material is sufficiently novel. The rest of the article reviews issues and ideas that have already been the subject of much debate and many publications.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?
   
   Yes

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?
   
   The piece is reasonably well argued. There is a fair bit of repetition and it is not entirely clear whether concepts such as donation, solidarity and concern for public benefit are intended to mean subtly different things. Ultimately, the argument centres around the need to balance patient rights/autonomy against solidarity/public benefit, and the terminology could perhaps be simplified.

4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?
   
   See above

5. Is the piece written well enough for publication?
   
   The writing is adequate. It would, however, benefit greatly from some "tightening up" as it is currently a bit repetitive.

Revisions required

**Major compulsory revisions:** None

**Minor essential revisions:** None

**Discretionary revisions:** Tightening up of the article, reducing repetition and simplifying terminology as discussed above.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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