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**Reviewer 1;**

1. This is a paper with a lot of potential. The authors have done some really good work too. But there are certain fundamental problems in conceptualization and interpretation, which need to be addressed.
2. While the paper is very relevant to ethics, it needs better organization.
3. The authors do not focus on the areas where they need to theorize and generalize. There is one sentence which I found speculative, which I have highlighted in the text of the paper.
4. A major omission is that they have discussed the paper devoid of its context and hence missed the “elephant in the room”, namely power.
5. The paper needs a major re-examination and re-structuring after which it could be an important contribution in the area. I have inserted comments into the text which need to be addressed.  
   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer 2:**

1. The paper does address issues relevant to medical ethics in India and the developing countries. 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?
2. It may also be a good idea to examine the views of the authors towards the subject. 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.
3. 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?
4. I would also be interested in knowing what the authors thought of the responses, and what they think the way forward is.

**Editorial Comments**:

1. The authors could describe in greater detail the method of qualitative analysis and how the themes were developed.
2. The conclusion appears somewhat superficial. It could be strengthened.
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