Reviewer's report


Version: 1 Date: 09 Jun 2019

Reviewer: Heidi Beate Bentzen

Reviewer's report:

The article is much improved and most of the comments have been addressed. I only have a few minor comments:

- Thank you for explaining the SOP for including illiterate individuals in research in Egypt and for ensuring their rights in your rebuttal letter. Please also include this information in the paper itself, for instance under Declarations or under Subjects and Methods. Please also say how the research participants could withdraw from the research project and provide information about how you ensured data protection.

- Page 8 line 19: «apparently easily irritable patients» - what do you mean? What is the reason for excluding those that may get irritated?

- Throughout the survey and the article, the terms «donor» and «donating» are used. These are terms that are now increasingly avoided as the terms are loaded and indicate gift-giving or charity. Can this possibly have affected the answers you received, for instance the ones listed in table 4? It would be nice to see a problematization of the terms in the discussion section.

- Page 17: Please explain the difference in knowledge between males and females.

- Page 21: Regarding commercialization: Please elaborate on your proposed solution, explaining what you mean by fair distribution of benefits, and how this may enhance trust and foster commercialization.

- Page 22: Please reference examples of ethical guidelines stating that research participants own their samples after participation.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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