**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Review by Dr. Megan DohertyTitle: **Is Perinatal Palliative Care an option for Termination of Pregnancy in the Case of Incompatible to live fetus??**  
  
  
1. *Importance of the paper*  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

This paper addresses issues related to continuing or terminating a pregnancy where the fetus has a very severe (likely lethal) condition, which is very relevant in LMICs. It is highly relevant.  
  
2. *Is it topical?*  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

-the issue is evaluated from a Christian religious perspective  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

-this paper could inform practice or policy, but its overly religious perspective, is likely to limit its reach.  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal? No, this is an appropriate journal  
  
3. *Originality*  
           Is the information /comment new? Yes

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism? Some references, although it is not clear to me why there are footnote references and a bibliography, which is not a common format for a scientific journal.  
  
  
4. *Conclusions*  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

A major weakness of this paper is a lack of a clear and well developed structure of arguments. Overall the paper’s organization needs significant work to improve the clarity of the writing.

The author does not provide a short description of his/her personal experience (or the case which this paper centres on), which would be relevant for this type of paper. The author should then discuss several ethical aspects of the case or provide a personal reflection of the case. Instead in the paper’s current form these elements are mixed together, without clear indication of what is the case, the author’s reflections and the link to ethical principles is not clearly stated.

Additionally, there are also too many points discussed, and the author should limit him/herself to a discussion of several more specific points on the topic, and avoid discussion of very broad principles (such as competence).   
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations? There are some generalizations which should be avoided. The author should like such statements to observations from this case or use scientific literature on the subject to support such statements.  
  
           Are there any important omissions? No, this paper is actually overly inclusive and too long. I would suggest that this paper be revised to a much shorter length of around 2000 words to provide a much more clear and concise reflection on the subject. The topic of perinatal palliative care, which the title suggests is the focus, is discussed very briefly and should be expanded and discussed in more detail.   
  
  
5. *Other comments*  
  
6. *Recommendation:*  I would recommend against acceptance at this stage. The author could be invited to re-submit after significant revisions to the structure and content of the paper to make the paper a personal reflection with a focus on author’s personal experience of the case as it relates to relevant medical ethics principles and previous scientific literature.   
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style- The paper has moderate issues with writing and grammar, which should be addressed. In perinatal palliative care, “incompatible with life” or “lethal condition” is not considered an appropriate term given the judgement it implies. Preferred terms include “condition which is expected to significantly shorten the child’s life-span” or “life-limiting condition” are more commonly used (see recent perinatal palliative care literature for more phrasing options).

- substance  
  
  
  
7*. Separate comments for the author-* I have included some comments directly on the author’s manuscript.
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N.B. **Please let us know whether you would like your name to be published as a reviewer of the manuscript. This is optional.**

I would be willing to review the paper again, should it be re-submitted.