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**Reviewer's report:**

General- This was a well written manuscript. It addresses a very important subject, it was timely, and it points out some potentially important shortcomings to the information available to potential organ and tissue donors if they use only the web to obtain their information. However, the authors have made a number of assumptions, leading to potentially misleading conclusions.

For example, they seem to have assumed that the web represents the primary focus of informed consent activities within the organ donation community. That seems unlikely to be the case; most OPOs currently still focus on the face to face consent process, including experienced professionals leading the discussion. Also, they expressed concern that consent forms did not disclose brain and cardiac death criteria, but this has been considered improper for the donation process. Rather, it has been considered the domain of the care giving professionals involved with the potential donor during the time leading to the declaration of death. The decision is NOT of the donation team, but it is that of the care giving team. Therefore, although it may be proper to provide a discussion (or a link to a discussion) describing the process, this does not seem appropriate for a donation consent form per se.

Consequently, the manuscript loses objectivity. Taken together, this manuscript presents important observations, on an important and timely subject. A revised manuscript, presenting the results objectively would be an important contribution to the literature.

---

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

1. Revise the manuscript to present the results more objectively
2. Focus the discussion section to the results presented, avoiding speculation about topics such as the definition of brain death, benefecial or non-beneficial testing, other aspects of end of life care, presumed consent or mandated choice, etc. Each of these subjects are important, but they were not the subject of this report.

---

**Minor Essential Revisions:** (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---

**Discretionary Revisions:** (which the author can choose to ignore)

---

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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