Reply of the Authors:

We very much appreciate Scheib and Ruby's comments and the insight they have brought to this very topical issue. They have made some valid and interesting points regarding criteria for determining birth limits for donor insemination (DI). As they mentioned, here in Australia there is a view that, in an environment open to disclosure and where children are informed of their donor roots, psychological factors may well be the primary determinant of donor limits. However, the risk of donor-linked individuals having children together is still present, as is currently the case in the U.S. where anonymity is still the norm (1, 2). So, although the authors agree that with open-identity donation the psychological factors should be the primary determinant, they believe that there is still a need for modeling if open identity is not being practiced and jurisdictions require criteria on which to base limits. We agree that there is a need to more closely consider how DI is practiced and suggest that the establishment of a nationally

mandated gamete registry would assist in the establishment of limits based on both psychological factors and risk of inadvertent incest.

Neroli Sawyer, B.Sc. (Hons)

*School of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Humanities
University of Ballarat*

Mount Helen, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia

November 6, 2008

REFERENCES

1. Cahn N. Necessary subjects: the need for a mandatory national donor gamete registry. *DePaul J Health Care Law*, 2008.
2. Sylvester T. The case against sperm donor anonymity. New Haven: Yale University; 2007.

doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2008.12.072