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Reviewer's report:

In the manuscript by Englechalk et al., the authors present the results of questionnaire given to several groups of people which queries their opinion on how to measure success in liver transplantation and whether this alters their decision to donate. The authors conclude that many of the groups feel that the "prospect of success" should be incorporated in the allocation policy and not just the sickest-first. This has always has and continues to be a huge debating point in liver transplantation. This manuscript is timely and well-written as many geographical regions are currently closely examining their allocation policies to not only improve transplant outcomes. This data offers interesting insight into the psyche of the several of the stakeholders in liver transplantation.

Specific questions/comments:

1. In the background, the authors state that the regular allocation threshold went from 25 to 34. What is meant by "allocation threshold"?

2. A comment on the current donation rates in Germany would be helpful to gauge the current donor environment and set the stage for the questionnaire.

3. Group 2 likely represents two subgroups with very different mindsets? I would think that a pre-transplant patient's opinion on how to measure the success of a liver transplant and how to allocate an organ is very different to a post-transplant patient's opinion. What was the rationale for putting these two groups together? Was any sub-group analysis performed to see whether these two subgroups actually were similar in their responses?

4. The response rate for group 4 seemed to be pretty weak and likely highly biased.

5. In table 1, percentages should be provided for the data as its hard to quickly make much sense of the data. Some general statistics should be provided also to determine the
significance of any of the differences. Not sure the last column ("total") provides any useful data.

6. What was the rationale for including BMI in the personal data?

7. Would have been interesting to include whether the person answering the questionnaire knew a person that had either donated or received an organ transplant.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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