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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses an important issue, and it is timely and needed. However, I have both major and minor remarks, as it is explained down.

Among many research problems found in this manuscript, two major problems have deeply affected research's value and validity. The first one is related to the research' objectives and the used methods, while the second is about research community (participants).

There are no clear objectives of this study. The authors failed to define their aims and how they can reach these aims. The used tool is not built on concrete bases, and lacks validity. The questions (especially in the questions presented in the tables 3 & 4) are fragmented, and could not been well gathered in the chosen themes which appeared vague and none harmonized. It is difficult to recognize how and why these questionnaires have been selected. Moreover, the questions were about many issues; however none of these issues had been sufficiently and deeply addressed.

The other problem is related to research community which may not be the proper participants for such research except for the first part about "Knowledge about the term Biobank", and the part titled: "Attitude about sample donation for research". When 81.1% of participants never heard about Biobank, how we expect they will be able to develop sufficient understanding of its ethical challenges, which in fact complicated aspects, such as privacy, confidentiality, ownership, etc. As an example, there is a question about maintaining privacy and confidentiality of information during courses scientific research. This is not an easy question! How we can expect participants (75% of them have less than university education, and 25% are illiterate) will be able to perfectly understand it, and how they can distinguish the two terms (privacy & confidentiality) even as we know that very educated people may not be able in fact to recognize the difference. In the same line, the sample size seems very small for a big country, such as Egypt, with a population around 100 million.
Besides these two major shortcomings, many minor remarks are found as well.

*The reference used to prove that limited studies were conducted in developing countries is an old reference (2005), while there are many other researches conducted later.

*A pilot study was not conducted. This should be done first, and it will be very helpful.

*The researchers did not refer to examining validity and reliability of the used questions.

*In the paragraph titled: "Attitude towards donations", only the first question was about biobanking, while the three other questions were about scientific research in general.

*Why the participants were asked about sending samples to persons and institutions outside, but not inside?

*The question; "Anyone can have an access to donated samples". What do you mean by "Anyone"?

*The discussion part was mainly just a comparison with other studies, but no real analysis was provided.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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