

**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

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 ] Grade E: Do not publish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

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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.

## 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="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**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:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-05 09:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-05 10:02

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

My comments have been well addressed by the authors.