**Title: Gaurav Unrelated renal transplantation**

**Reviewer 1:**

1. Well rounded review of facts and figures related to renal transplantation.

The article begins and ends with a stance that is sympathetic to unrelated kidney donation and a hypothetical case is presented to highlight the ethical dilemma. This is validated with data that sheds light on the key issues that make moral and legal and statistical arguments in favor of unrelated renal transplantation.: thank you

2. The subject is of substantial importance in medical ethics both in India and worldwide. The article aims to bring about changes in ethical perspective and legislation in India that would facilitate unrelated renal transplantation. thank you

3. Much debate, literature and legislation already exists on ESRD and renal transplantation in India and elsewhere. However, since the problem of ESRD is acute and worsening in magnitude worldwide, the topic warrants continuing attention. thank you

4. The article is PRO unrelated organ donation as one solution to the very real crisis in renal transplantation in India. The facts and ethical arguments presented in this regard are valid and comprehensively outlined. thank you

5. However the arguments against unrelated organ donation have not been presented and should be included in order to engage “head to head” with the subject.: now included under the subheading **Legalisation of Unrelated transplants: the good, the bad or ugly?**

The article may be accepted with suggestion of the following modifications:

1. Arguments should be presented to strengthen the debate. In particular the perspectives of poor donors who “suffer” from financial disability as ESRD patients suffer medically. Whereas transplant recipients have “net gain” the impoverished kidney donors may incur “net loss”. How is this imbalance best addressed?: This is the point to debate, now incorporated in the last stanza, thank you.

If legislation is unable to curb illegal sale of organs, how will this same legislation ensure the rights of donors? How much should a kidney cost in India?

Should this price be standardized by law? Who will “bell the cat” and get the donor a fair deal?: mentioned in “The Indian Scene & State of Mind”. Thank you. That is the reason, the argument of Organ Auction is mentioned. Thank you.

1. The article will read more powerfully if it begins with a “real story”, perhaps one from the press or media: the hypothetical story is very much akin to a real life scenario, which we encounter quite often in our daily practice, thank you.
2. The opening and ending paragraphs will carry more weight if written with less emotional content which somewhat muddies and otherwise critically important debate.: our aim was to start off on a light note, with a self-written poem/quote on the importance of kidneys, and to end on a grimmer note, with self introspection as the need of the day, by another of our own written poem. However, as suggested, we have modified the ending paragraph to make it less emotional, thank you.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer 2:**

1.       The author should mention whether the verses in the beginning and the end are their own In case it they are someone else’s, they should cite the reference. : These are self written by us, thanks.

2.       It would be useful if the author can list out reasons for why the THO Act has not been useful in curbing illegal transplantations and trafficking and commerce of organs in India- has been already mentioned, under the heading of THO Act and its pitfalls.

3.       The author makes some interesting recommendations to regularize unrelated transplants, such as organ swap or pair transplants. It would be useful to organize these ideas into a separate subheading on ‘making unrelated transplants ethical’ or some such subheading: new subheadings have been incorporated.

-------------------------------------------------------------

 We would like to thank the reviewers for taking the time to read and suggest changes to our work, to improve the same.

Subsequent review:

We still have a few review comments which need incorporation:

.1.  Under the subhead "Problem", the authors make a statement for the first time in the text saying the following:

*'This entire social scenario has led to a boom in unrelated transplantation mostly under the cloak of a legal authority from an authorization committee, to take advantage of the loopholes of the interpretation of this act.'*

There is no reference. What is the basis of the assertion?

Reference has now been cited with a few examples of the scams having occurred till date, thank you.

2. Later on in the text it says that such unrelated donors are estimated to be about 15% of all donors - for which a reference No. 10 is given but it is not an Indian estimate. What is the basis of assuming that in India also it is 15% - could it be less or more? Is it author's estimate?-

The following paragraph has been added to the text: *“Being done against the legal appellate authority’s knowledge, it is impossible to judge the exact numbers of such unrelated transplants being done both in India as well as elsewhere, and these figures could just be those that can be extrapolated from the microscopic to the gross level. This however, doesn’t dampen the overall issue, rather makes it all the more significant to be dealt with.”*

However, there is no way whatsoever that the exact numbers can be obtained either in India or elsewhere worldwide, as this is an illegal domain (currently illegal) of unrelated transplantation. So, whatever statistics have been brought out either in India or worldwide, are safe presumptions, on the basis of those reported instances in the media.

Regarding reference: the reference no 10 (of the main article) is an Indian reference (now has become number 11, due to addition of a new reference number 8)

3. Further, what is the basis of calling this a boom? Why is just 15% is not appropriate? Is the proportion of unrelated donors using the loopholes increasing over the years or has 15% remained static? Is there a point being made that the data of authorisation committees of all transplant centres or regional committees of that kind be made public to understand whether there is such increase and loopholes are unfairly being used?

Sir, as stated above, there is no way that any “trial” or study can be done to get exact figures for any illegal activity. That is precisely the point of writing this article, to highlight the problem, and all facts and figures are extrapolations, be it in India or worldwide.

Everywhere, (barring a few countries) this unrelated renal transplantation is illegal, till date, and so no data can be obtained.

15% is what we extrapolate, which may be even higher, as there are no records. Even Authorisation committees, when authorizing the cases are “unaware” of the “unrelated status”, as these cases are presented in a way to take advantage of the “love and affection” nomenclature of the THO act- this is what we have put forth as well in our article.

Thanking the reviewers once again.

Regards

Authors.