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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting survey addressing the perception of patients about blood transfusions and the one offered by caregivers. As I understood, the aim was to see if the communication between patients and caregivers obtaining permission for transfusion could be done by other than the clinicians involved.

First the issue of control isn't one since this is a survey.

A few thoughts as I review the manuscript arose. One is the fact that no benefits (other than risks) were addressed. Consent (or better yet, permission), involves risks, benefits and other alternatives. Perception under these conditions could change the results of the survey. In addition, patients, may not be wrong since the authors address envelop viruses (HIV, HCV) but the media is concerned with newer agents such as SARS, Zika and other hemorrhagic viruses. Risk is dynamic since the literature is replete with other concerns that aren't part of the usual consent format. In the absence of well described benefits, the risk may be underestimated.

Other data suggests that the ones currently obtaining "consent" from patients when it comes to blood transfusions exhibit significant knowledge deficit.

I think the authors should include these (unless they argue against) in their discussion and possibly in the methods on why the numerator (benefit) wasn't addressed.

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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