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7. Separate comments for the author

This is a useful descriptive piece of recent events relating to the He CRISPR issue in China. Its strength is that it is written from a position well informed about the Chinese context. However, I feel that the paper could be much clearer. There are various language issues, but I’m sure these can be fixed later in the journal processing. More important is that I think that the following issues need clarification:

1. CRISPR is never defined. Many people will be unfamiliar with what this technology is and why it might be thought to be a problem. The term CRISPR should be explained in in the first paragraph.
2. The case could be better described on its introduction. For example, we don't get to hear about why CRISPR was used (to prevent HIV) until the description of the second section: ‘Primary investigation results’. Again, I think this needs to come much earlier. There should be a neutral summary of what happened, before the investigations are reported.
3. It is worth keeping three different issues separate in the discussion: where the law was been broken (give details); where relevant guidelines (e.g. non-legal, non-regulatory documents – if any) have been breached (give details); alleged transgressions of ethical issues. These are all distinct issues and too often are run together, which is confusing to the reader.
4. Some ethical objections are briefly listed in paragraph 3 on p.1. I think these confuse ethical, legal and employment concerns. What exactly are the ethical objections? What are the risks? Who might be impacted by those risks? What are the benefits? Why think that the risks outweigh any benefits? Are there other possible objections? If so, what are they? Are best interests of the child separate from what the parents think that they are?
5. The author should separate out reflections on current gaps in the law in China (top p.4) and what an international audience can learn from this case.
6. The issue of conflict of interest is suddenly introduced as the first point of section 4. This seems like an important point and could be developed further. It seems like the ‘system’ in China may encourage such actions, even more that in other jurisdictions. This is not just about the ‘culture’ of science and academia, but specific financial incentives that go further than those of standard international patent law.
7. The section at the bottom of p.4 on moral judgment seems fundamental to me and I’d like to see more discussion on this. Science encourages the creation of new knowledge and often we don’t know what the overall balance of consequences may be. What might be thought to be different in this case? Why might we think that we should be more precautionary here than elsewhere? Is it because this is a medical case? It is genetics? It’s about children? To what extent is the author’s argument about science in general and to what degree specific to this case?
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