



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 | <p>1- Please provide references for the following: introduction line 7; introduction 2nd paragraph lines 2 and 4;</p> <p>Page 2 line 7 and 16; Line 16: I would suggest the inclusion of an explanation saying that the regulations were provided by the governments not by the medical organization. They might have been key in this process, but they are not policy makers.</p> <p>Line 22: I would suggest from "deceased patients" or "deceased people"</p> <p>2- Page 2 last line: explain what do you mean by organ transfer.</p> <p>3- Page 3 lines 3-6: I would suggest you to rephrase it to make your point clearer.</p> <p>4- Page 3 in general obstacles for organ donation: I would suggest to specify that these obstacles are related to Egypt</p> <p>5- Page 4 lines 9-12: reference these statements</p> | <p>Done Done</p> <p>Done. The sentence has been added.</p> <p>Page 2 line 22: The text states: "deceased organ" donors. Not deceased patients..... Deceased organ donor is a terminology in organ transplantation medicine. We cannot say deceased patients nor can we say deceased people.</p> <p>2. It means organ transplant. It has been changed.</p> <p><u>NB.</u> Page numbers and line numbers all might have changed in the newly edited copy.</p> <p>3- Done. Sentence rephrased.</p> <p>4. Done. Title specified as to Egypt. All corrections are in yellow highlight, so can be easily recognized.</p> <p>5. The text is already modified from reference 18 to come 4 lines later. Anyway, I have advanced the same reference as early as line 9, as per your</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>6- Page 5: use methods instead of methodologies (methodologies are related to the theoretical assumptions of the methods used); describe the type of study (descriptive, exploratory, cohort....)</p> <p>7- Describe if the participants signed an informed consent form in the methods section</p> <p>8- Describe in more details the validation process of the questionnaire in the data collection section</p> <p>9- Page 9 second paragraph: I would say there was not a significant difference between recognition or not of brain death</p> <p>10- Page 12, line 2: use "brain death" instead of "brainstem death"</p> <p>11- Page 13 last paragraph: you should include in this discussion the possible future repercussions for the living donors and how they would be supported by the health care system if they develop organ failure.</p> <p>12- Page 14, second paragraph, line 26: there is a contradiction in the phrase, you suggest that there should be an insurance program for donation but in the end you say that it would open door for organ trafficking. Please state your position.</p> <p>13- The weaknesses of the study must also be described in the conclusion. Ex: are there threats to internal/external validity? The fact that only one setting was investigated could have</p> | <p>desire.</p> <p>6. I used methods instead of methodology, as per your desire. Type of study has been stated frankly "A cross sectional approach has been opted to achieve study aim", in line 3 methods.</p> <p>7- Described. See p.5 line 1-5</p> <p>8. It is already stated that the questionnaire is "revalidated" meaning that it has been tried before. Anyways, validation process has been described. Line 2-line 8, data collection paragraph.</p> <p>9. Done. All corrections are in yellow highlight, so can be easily recognized.</p> <p>10. Done. All corrections are in yellow highlight, so can be easily recognized.</p> <p>11. Done. 5 lines added to reflect your idea at the end of the paragraph, in a yellow highlight.</p> <p>12. The sentence states clearly that insurance minimizes out of pocket payment, whereas out-of pocket paying is the one that opens the door for organ trafficking. So insurance prevents trafficking not encourages it as you thought. The meaning is so clear and I do not think it can be clearer than that. I also do not think it needs rephrasing.</p> <p>13. Done. A title named "strengths and limitations" has been added to the paragraph before the</p> |
|--|--|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>influenced the outcomes? Etc...</p> <p>Ethical Issue- There should be described the used of informed consent form for the participants of the study, we need to check with the authors. If the informed consent was not sought, then I would describe it as an issue.</p> | <p>conclusion. The whole paragraph has been amended to highlight the strengths that assure validity and mention any possible limitations.</p> <p>Ethical Issue: I have assured and clarified this point more clearly at the end of the last paragraph of "Study sample" section.</p> |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction lines 3-7: the phrase is redundant; I would suggest to rephrase it. • I would suggest to write the acronym before you use it. You did in the abstract, but I would suggest to cite in your text as well (OD, QUH, OPD, EHA) • Page 4 line 1: specify which population you are talking about • Page 10, first paragraph after table 4: try to make this sentence clearer for the reader, explain what the high and low scores mean • Page 11, Discussion section 1st paragraph: lines 17-18 rephrase for more clarity; line 23 write "other OD researches" | <p>Done</p> <p>Although this will be a double work, and it is well agreed upon that if the acronyms were first spelled in the abstract they do not need to be respelled thereafter, but I have done what you want.</p> <p>Page 4 line 1: Specified as those who have higher education standard.</p> <p>Done. Corrections highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>Done.</p> |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results first paragraph: I would suggest "mean age" instead of "age averaged" <p>The topic of the study is not novel worldwide, but for Egypt I believe this paper would be a great advancement. It is important to understand the profile of the local population and their knowledge on organ donation to propose new studies that could contribute to the development of the organ donation and transplantation activities locally.</p> | <p>Done</p> |