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We would like to sincerely thank all the referees for their valuable input. Mr. Sanju Sobnach raised only one concern regarding the spelling mistakes and we have done a thorough revision of the text to rectify this. We are happy that we have satisfactorily addressed the suggestions and concerns.
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Reviewer: Gernot Kaiser

Version: 2

We would like to thank you for your valuable suggestions and recommendations.

Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions:

1. Citation 9/10/13/27 have been corrected and the name of Journal, year have been added.

2. Please clarify the rate of response. How many students are in year 1 and 4? This results in approximately 50 % or 25 % response rate.... Authors: (Methodology first paragraph) The class strength of first year was 105 and of fourth year was 90 students. Using convenient sampling, a total of 158 medical students, filled out the questionnaire, 83 students from first year and 75 students from fourth year. (Results first paragraph) Response rate for first year was 79.04%, for fourth year was 83.3% and over all it is 81.02%.

3. Tabs are currently still unclear (% is defined as yes?). Authors: All values stated for first years and fourth years in the subsequent tables are “participants agreed to the mentioned statement.” This line has been added to the manuscript in the Results section. First line of page 8.
4. Give Company, country of SPSS and version  
   **Authors:** Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences version 20 by IBM corporation, America. This has been added in the section of Statistical Analysis a sub section of Methodology.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

5. Manuscript should be shortened significantly (especially Results).  
   **Authors:** We have tried to shorten the manuscript as much as we could. We have worked to shorten the results section, so that now only the most important findings of our research are included in the text.

6. Discussion should be focused more on the topic of students and other studies in this field (eg. from Turkey).  
   **Authors:** We have included additional reference (ref no.31 and 39) from Turkish studies. The discussion cites various researches that were done to assess student perception (ref no. 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41) We have talked about various researches conducted in Brazil, Germany, Ohio (ref no. 26,27,28) Hong Kong (ref no. 20), Italy (ref no. 37) amongst many others.

7. What defines lack of knowledge? For my understanding knowledge is not clear due to many undefined questions/possible answers (see questions Tab 1a, b different answers required for living donation and organ procurement after death). What means cadaver in Tab 2, Results in Tab 3 are given as "yes"?  
   **Authors:** The lack of knowledge is defined by firstly that even though the sample population were medical students they were not aware of all the organs/tissues that can be donated. Amongst all the options that were given only kidney reached approximately 100%. Secondly very few had any knowledge regarding the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Bill 2007. Thirdly questions asked about organ procurement, though, not
specified which was a short coming of our research, and still showed that on a general basis only few were aware of any age limit or time duration for organ procurement. Fourthly when asked ‘who is an ideal candidate for organ donation’ response for siblings was lowest among all other options. On a general basis one would have thought that parents and siblings would provide the closest match and so would be the best option for donation. Lastly only 35(22.2%) students, 24 (15.2%) first years and 11 (7%) fourth years, were confident that they possessed enough knowledge to counsel anyone on this issue ($P=0.043$). Majority 123 (77.8%) felt that there was a need to increase awareness regarding organ donation so more people could be encouraged to donate.

**Last paragraph on pg 16:**

Our purpose of the study was to obtain a general overview of the opinion medical students have regarding Organ Donation. We are following up with a more in depth Questionnaire that will concentrate on specifics and perceptions regarding cadaveric donation (donation after death) only.

Cadaver in Table 2 has been defined as Organ donation after death in brackets.

Results in table 3 are given as a yes. All values stated for first years and fourth years in the subsequent tables are “participants agreed to the mentioned statement.” This line has been added to the manuscript in the Results section. First line of page 8.

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

We thank you very much,
Authors