

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 84040

Title: Randomized Intervention to Assess the Effectiveness of an Educational Video on Organ Donation Intent Among Hispanics in the New York Metropolitan Area

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04726030

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Lecturer, Research Fellow, Senior Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nigeria

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-02

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-01 13:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-01 14:24

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have just read the manuscript in which the authors investigated the effectiveness of an emotive educational video on organ donation intent among a subgroup of Hispanic individuals in New York City. This study is quite interesting but there are a few unanswered questions which I suggest the authors have to address. First, the core tips should be written more concisely without being structured. It should highlight the key message(s) to be taken from your study and fewer than the main abstract in word count. While I tend to like the introductory section and its subsections, the method section fall short of expectation in providing sufficient information about the intervention, randomization procedure, sampling technique and intervention fidelity. I suggest the authors provide the 18-item survey questions as appendix. Also why was there no report of its validity/reliability? A Table clearly describing each components of the intervention, length of each video sessions, and techniques used to increase compliance to

participation/learning activities, and intra-group activities would allow for replication of the study in other context. Despite attaching some evidence regarding ethical procedure, it is proper to highlight such information in the main manuscript's method section. Readers would expect to see at a glance issues of informed consent procedure, Institutional Ethics approval, and CT registration information. Also information about study period and duration should appear in the method section. A link to video samples might help future investigators. How did you manage attrition? Finally a CONCLUSION section should be added just before the acknowledgments section.

Review point by point

1. *First, the core tips should be written more concisely without being structured. It should highlight the key message(s) to be taken from your study and fewer than the main abstract in word count.*

Correction: The Hispanic community has a high demand for organ donation but a shortage of donors. A study conducted in New York City found that providing an emotive educational video on organ donation before taking a survey significantly increased the odds of organ donation intent among Hispanic individuals. By providing necessary information and education about the donation process, Hispanic residents can be just as willing to become organ donors as their non-Hispanic counterparts.

2. *While I tend to like the introductory section and its subsections, the method section falls short of expectation in providing sufficient information about the intervention, randomization procedure, sampling technique and intervention fidelity.*

Correction: This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Northwell Health. The approval reference number is #19-0009 (as presented in Appendix A). Eligible participants included Hispanic New York City (NYC) residents, 18 years of age and above, who were recruited voluntarily through Cloud Research and participated in a larger

randomized survey study of NYC residents. The survey an 85-item Redcap survey measured participant demographics, attitudes, and knowledge of organ donation as well as the intention to register as an organ donor. Attention checks were implemented throughout the survey, and responses were excluded for those who did fail. Participants were randomly assigned two-between subject conditions: to view a short video on organ donation and then proceed to complete the survey (i.e., Video First) and view the same video at the end of the survey (Video Last). No 3-group activities were conducted. This study utilized an evidenced-based emotive educational intervention (video) which was previously utilized and was shown to increase organ donation registration rates at the Ohio Department of Motor Vehicles. Results were analyzed using Jamovi statistical software.

365 Hispanic individuals were included in the analysis. Once consent was obtained and participants entered the survey (the survey sample is presented in Appendix B), participants were asked to report on demographic variables and their general impression of organ donation after death. The video depicted stories regarding organ donation after death from various viewpoints, including from the loved ones of a deceased person who died waiting for a transplant; from the loved ones of a deceased person whose organs were donated upon death; and, from those who were currently waiting for a transplant.

3. I suggest the authors provide the 18-item survey questions as appendix. Also why was there no report of its validity/reliability?

Correction: See appendix B

4. A Table clearly describing each component of the intervention, length of each video sessions, and techniques used to increase compliance to

participation/learning activities, and intra-group activities would allow for replication of the study in other context.

Correction: see Table 4

5. Despite attaching some evidence regarding ethical procedure, it is proper to highlight such information in the main manuscript's method section. Readers would expect to see at a glance issues of informed consent procedure, Institutional Ethics approval, and CT registration information.

Correction: Also see Appendix A

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Northwell Health. The approval reference number is #19-0009 (as presented in Appendix A). Eligible participants included Hispanic New York City (NYC) residents, 18 years of age and above, who were recruited voluntarily through Cloud Research and participated in a larger randomized survey study of NYC residents. The survey an 85-item Redcap survey measured participant demographics, attitudes, and knowledge of organ donation as well as the intention to register as an organ donor. Attention checks were implemented throughout the survey, and responses were excluded for those who did fail. Participants were randomly assigned two-between subject conditions: to view a short video on organ donation and then proceed to complete the survey (i.e., Video First) and view the same video at the end of the survey (Video Last). No 3-group activities were conducted. This study utilized an evidenced-based emotive educational intervention (video) which was previously utilized and was shown to increase organ donation registration rates at the Ohio Department of Motor Vehicles. Results were analyzed using Jamovi statistical software.

365 Hispanic individuals were included in the analysis. Once consent was obtained and participants entered the survey (the survey sample is presented in Appendix B), participants were asked to report on demographic variables and their general impression of organ donation after death. The video depicted stories regarding organ donation after death from various viewpoints, including from the loved ones of a deceased person who died waiting for a transplant; from the loved ones of a deceased

person whose organs were donated upon death; and, from those who were currently waiting for a transplant.

6. Also information about study period and duration should appear in the method section. A link to video samples might help future investigators. How did you manage attrition? Finally a CONCLUSION section should be added just before the acknowledgments section.

Correction: see appendix C

The study adheres to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki and all participants provided informed consent before their participation in the study. As described in table 4, participants (n = 365) were enrolled in part of a larger randomized survey study conducted with New York City residents who were recruited via a crowdsourcing online platform and were randomized to one of two groups, with exposure to viewing 1) an educational video before completing an 81-question survey on organ donation ("video first" condition) or 2) after completing the survey ("video last" condition). The survey instrument was investigator-developed in the absence of existing validated tools. Interviews with subject matter experts and review of the literature were utilized to ensure the topic of the survey is relevant to the population of interest during item creation. Logistic regression analysis compared organ donation intent (i.e., "how likely are you to become an organ donor") between the two groups. Additional variables related to organ donation (e.g., religious beliefs, financial incentives) were also evaluated between the two groups. Analyses were adjusted for organ donation registration status. Data were analyzed using Jamovi (Version 2.3.19), a software package that runs in tandem with R Statistical Software. Frequencies and percentages were used for categorical data. Summary statistics were utilized to describe sample characteristics. To determine parameters that might predict the likelihood of organ donation registration and to assess the effects of the video intervention, we used binomial logistic regression analysis. The clinical and research activities being reported are consistent with the Principles of the Declaration of Istanbul as outlined in the 'Declaration of Istanbul on Organ Trafficking and Transplant Tourism.

participants

Table 1 presents Hispanic participant characteristics for the total sample by registration status (registered organ donor, non-registered organ donor, and those



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

who did not specify). More than a quarter (35%) of participants identified as White or Caucasian, less than a quarter (15%) as Black or African American, and 18% as multiracial. The majority of participants were female. 72% of the sample participants said they were between the ages of 19 and 39; 60% of them reported being single or never married; and 67% said they were employed either full- or part-time. 38% of the sample as a whole had organ donation records after passing away. 40% and 38%, respectively, of those who described themselves as spiritual or religious had registered as organ donors. Additionally, 28% of participants with degrees of 2 years or less were registered as organ donors, compared to 45% of participants with graduate degrees or 4-year degrees.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Transplantation*

Manuscript NO: 84040

Title: Randomized Intervention to Assess the Effectiveness of an Educational Video on Organ Donation Intent Among Hispanics in the New York Metropolitan Area

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02734287

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FEBS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-02

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-02 19:12

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-05 09:51

Review time: 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair

	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a high-quality report on the results of an educational video on attitudes of Hispanic individuals toward organ donation. The paper is well-written, the results are clearly encouraging, and the research has considerable merit in terms of increasing organ donation rates in Hispanic population.