**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: **Nonmaleficence in Medical Training: Balancing Patient Care and Efficient Education**  
  
1. Importance of the paper  
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

Comment: Although the article has addressed the issue of Non-maleficence with respect to Medical training in the United states, the issue is very much applicable to the scenario that exists in developing countries as well. The article gives references of studies done and the scenario in the United states alone. Because this is an issue which is applicable to medical education all over the world and that it has been submitted to an Indian Journal, the authors could consider referring to studies done in developing countries as well and thereby widen the horizon of discussion so that it becomes more generalizable.  
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

Comment: The issue discussed here is something that the Medical education system is facing universally. Thereby the discussion and reference to review of literature could be elaborated further with respect to developing countries as well. (as suggested above)  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

Comment: It would add to the practice and policies in medical education.  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

Comment: The topic seems to be apt for this journal.  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

Comment: Yes

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

Comment: No  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

Comment: The interpretations are well developed. The conclusions could include some more possible solutions with inclusions of the above suggestions. (as listed under “Other comments” below).  
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

Comment: No  
  
           Are there any important omissions?

Comment: No  
  
  
5. Other comments

Below are the suggestions to consider under the specified headings mentioned in the article:

1. **Root Causes of Patient Harm: Special Cause and Common Cause Process Variation**

Comment: The authors could add the role of ‘Hidden curriculum’ under ‘common cause’ process variation and thereby elaborate the influence of observations and experiences of behavior of doctors, seniors and health care team on students which is a potential contributor to patient harm.

1. **Possible solutions: resolving the tension: Comments:**

The authors could consider including the following measures and elaborate as to how they would add to reduce the harm to patients:

1. To introduce the ethics teaching to students right from the preclinical years which would add value.
2. The regular faculty orientation and training to make them conscious that the students learn the issue of non-maleficence not only through formal teaching but largely by observing the behavior of faculty given the role of ‘Hidden curriculum’ in medical education.
3. Early clinical exposure during preclinical years which could include brief exposures like getting to know the hospital system, the first patient interaction, be an observer during doctor patient-interaction in the outpatient departments and clinical rounds, communication with patients, etc.
4. Although using simulation technology has many advantages, the shortcomings of simulated technology needs a mention. Simulated experiments are not without disadvantage that it does not provide the feel of interaction with humans, it is preprogrammed and thus limited in variation.

6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style

- substance: **considering the above suggestions.**  
  
  
  
7. Separate comments for the author: none
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