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| 1.       A key area of concern with this manuscript relates to the methodology. The authors have said data from 26 papers retrieved from PubMed on ‘public perception on biobanking’ have been used to complement (to juxtapose) the primary data from their own study involving EC members and scientists.  While quoting extensively from these papers in the ‘Results’ section, they don’t present any detailed content analysis and findings of this analysis of these 26 papers.  2.       The materials presented in the supplementary document present types of methodologies employed in research presented in the 26 papers alongside geographical areas/sites of these studies. It doesn’t present any data or content analysis of these data.  3.       More importantly, authors don’t offer robust methodological justification to use the insights (which are not presented in the manuscript or the supplementary materials in any case) from these studies done elsewhere in different populations, and different contexts for such juxtaposition. This is especially intriguing since authors mention in the manuscript,  “ ….earlier study with the Indian public which achieved data saturation on a relatively small sample, possibly because of a general lack of awareness of biobanking(16), …”  4.       Juxtaposition: In the current form, it is like the usual sourcing/referencing which generally should be done in a ‘Discussion’ section. Since no extensive treatment is offered to the content of secondary data from literature (26 papers), there is no clarity for readers about the said juxtaposition. However, the major constraint is mentioned earlier in ‘3’.  5.       There are a number of other constraints (eg: Title: one city based study is being referred to as ‘… perspectives from India’; and also public perspectives are entirely drawn on secondary sources which are based on studies elsewhere, except for one study done in India by the authors; in the supplementary materials the insights from MRs and ECs are presented in the same column (table 2) indicating these two constituencies have the same perspectives on the said four dimensions/themes which doesn’t seem to be the case as seen in the main manuscript)  6.       We are unable to consider your manuscript due to these major constraints. |
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