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Reviewer’s report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The revised manuscript must reflect the issues raised in the earlier review and how the authors have chosen to address them with specific mention of the appropriate section (page & paragraph). e.g. timing and methodology for administering the questionnaire.

2. The related paper addressing the relationship between assistive technology and negative attitudes should be cited in this manuscript.

3. In response to a request that the similarities and differences among users of hearing aids and wheelchairs in relation to human rights should be clarified the authors stated that this issue had already been addressed “satisfactorily” – i.e. to the authors' satisfaction. Please state the relevant section(s) of the manuscript where this information can be found to enable the reviewer determine if this is truly satisfactory for the benefit of the readers.

4. The statement “we followed the method usually practiced in Bangladesh” as regards the issue of patient consent is vague. The subject of valid/informed consent especially in a paper that is being considered for publication in a journal on human rights cannot be treated lightly. More so as the objective of this study was to determine the enjoyment of human rights in Bangladesh – a country where the authors themselves have reported significant deficiencies. For example, is thumb printing culturally forbidden in Bangladesh as an alternative to written consent? Verbal consent is not consistent with Helsinki Declaration on research ethics which requires non-written consent to be formally documented and witnessed if consent cannot be obtained in writing. It would appear that this research was not subject to rigorous ethical scrutiny by the overseas authors’ institutional ethical committee regardless of the local practice in Bangladesh or that the authors have exploited the current situation by failing to follow established guidelines.

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.