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| Title: **Regulatory Deprofessionalization and Reorganization of Medicine in India**  **Review comments**  At the moment I would not recommend publication without some fairly major revisions, taking into account the following the issues listed below.   1. The author works with a definition of professionalism that seems to require complete self-regulation by the professional group and that any deviation from such autonomy implies de-professionalisation. I am not convinced by this. Modern medicine is seldom entirely self-regulated in that way. Legal and government oversight, to varying degrees, is an integral part of modern medicine. This usually works with, and alongside, professional ethics and institutional professional regulation. It can at least be plausibly argued – and should be acknowledged in the paper – that professionalism is changing its shape and nature in response to a host of social, legal, political and professional developments, and that it is simply too crude to call this process ‘de-professionalisation.’  2. There are many other aspects of a profession that seem to me to be more determinative – and necessary – than self-regulation, such as knowledge, ethical codes, other-regarding moral obligations etc that don’t feature in the paper at all.  3. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that there is a deep political hinterland to the Indian Government’s decision to dissolve the Medical Council of India (MCI). There is some mention, in passing, of corruption, and of a failure by the MCI to comply with the Oversight Committee. At no point does the paper make substantive reference to this political backdrop. Are we seeing a deliberate attempt on behalf of the Indian Government to restrict the power of independent professions or is there something else going on? The gravitational pull of these hidden political issues rather disturbs the paper, giving the impression that the important issues are happening off stage.  4. The section on the NMC Bill on p.4 is confusing. Despite earlier making some fairly strong claims about de-professionalisation, the author states here that ‘the move from the MCI to the NMC is likely to be somewhat superfluous’. But I thought the author was arguing that this was a strong example of Government driven de-professionalisation? Similarly in this section it is not clear what claims the author is making in relation to the various proposed changes to the composition of the various councils.  5. I found the discussion of the relationship between professionalism and the acknowledgement that there are many other stakeholders with a legitimate interest in medical services rushed and confusing. Does the acknowledgement that patients have deep interests in medical provision – and may therefore have a legitimate voice in medical regulation – constitute ‘de-professionalisation’, or is it a necessary corrective to overweening medical power? The statement that ‘it is unlikely for patients to have requisite information or education to regulate medical education and practice’, is over-hasty. The point would not be about patients regulating the practice, but ensuring that a strong and informed patient voice plays a part in that regulation. |

Top of Form

|  |
| --- |
| Subject |