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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions:

1/ Methods: Inform consent understanding is directly related to the written information to be provided to the patient/donor. Therefore, it could be very useful to include the translation of the used “Patient’s Information Sheet”.

Minor Essential Revisions

2/ Methods: Authors analyze different sources of information to patients/donors for biobanking. Personal information appeared as the most important source but it would be of the greatest interest to know more details about the interview, mainly the time dedicated.

3/ Discussion: Paragraph 8: “The study revealed the awareness of the participants to be considerable: 95.5% of patients were aware of their involvement in a biobank. These data are in accordance with Toccaceli et al.’s studies (89.9%) [2] or the work by Nakayama et al. (92%) [22] and in contrast with Moutel et al.’s studies (0%) [16].” It could be important to analyze the reasons of the discrepancy of figures: characteristics of the cohort, country, disease or healthy donors, type of disease, etc.

4/ References: Several references include web pages. It is a best practice to cited the last access date of the reference.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

5/ Discussion/ Paragraph 6: “The results of the study indicated that our efforts were successful in 30.7% of our patients (compared to 4.7% in other hospitals).” Source (reference) of the information should be provided.

6/ Acknowledgements/ It is not correct that the first author (Silvia Cervo) cite herself in acknowledgements. Her participation in the study should be only included in “Author’s contributions”
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