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1. Importance of the paper  
  
Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

It does. It is however, a rather surprising paper. It talks about the reasons for parents to offer or deny consent, without interrogating those reasons. So, as a narrative of the stated reasons, it works well. However, as an interrogation of that narrative, it seems not to make an effort. Given the fact that it is perhaps one of the few papers to raise the subject here, it would be a pity if it stopped at just narration, and did not question. So why is it that these attitudes exist, what is it that we need to do to understand this better, what is the way forward?

It may also be a good idea to examine the views of the authors towards the subject. So is the involvement of families in research protocols ‘participation’ by the family, or is it ‘recruitment’ of the family to the study? This seemingly small shift in terminology is indicative perhaps of a rather large difference of perspective. The authors use the term interchangeably, and that is something that they may want to think about.

Also, statements like “This also showed a surprising degree of research sophistication*.”* are, in themselves, surprising. Why should we assume that the research participant’s ‘sophistication’ of thought would be any less than ours?

Most importantly, however, I would be interested in knowing what the authors thought of the responses, and what they thought the way forward was.   
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

No.   
  
            Will it influence practice or policy?

It could, but for that it certainly needs more work.   
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

Not at all.   
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new? .

Yes

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

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

The discussion and the conclusions need to be elaborated much more.  
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

No, but it needs more work.   
  
           Are there any important omissions?

As noted above.   
  
  
5. Other comments As above.   
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
   
  
 Accept with modifications (specify) As above

- substance As above.   
  
  
  
7. Separate comments for the author

I would be happy to have the above comments relayed to the authors.
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