



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_29797
Title of the Manuscript:	“Public’s attitude toward organ donation in Egypt: A social and conceptual approach”
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a comprehensive article which provides in-depth insights on organ donation and its challenges in a predominantly Muslim society. Organ donation and changing the people's attitudes is difficult in the Middle East and Asian societies -- I appreciate the hard work and research that the authors did. Pls ensure that all the abbreviations are spelt out when they are first mentioned in the article. Some abbreviations such as "OPD" and "OT" are not spelled out. The "Introduction" section usually provides a brief background and history to the subject-matter. In this article, some parts of the "Introduction", such as "<i>General obstacles to organ donation</i>", "<i>Obstacles to implementing organ donation law</i>" and "<i>Sources of knowledge and information about organ donation</i>" appear to be more suitable in the "Discussion" section where literature reviews support the discussion of results. Pls change accordingly. The "Introduction" and "Discussion" sections are lengthy. Pls try to keep the article concise wherever possible. 	<p>Abbreviations are spelled out as early as in in the abstract. Re-spelling them in the intro will be double work and will not be professional. However, I have spelled them for your convenience.</p> <p>This desire will disrupt the whole manuscript. It will turn it upside down. Also it contradicts severely with other reviewers' critique plans. None endorsed that. Above all, moving this part of the introduction to the discussion section will not have any significant outcome on the paper. The same concepts will be reiterated in the discussion instead of the introduction. Besides, many of those concepts are already retrieved in the discussion for comparative purpose. I believe taking such major decision should be agreed upon first by all reviewers.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>General</u> comments	Copyediting will be required to amend grammatical or spelling errors before it is suitable for publication.	