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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?

Yes, the issues discussed are very relevant

2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

Not really, but still it discusses issues of conflict of interest and human rights, which are relevant across countries  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

Bringing to notice the evident issues in the way this problem has been handled, it may provide impetus to take action   
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

No, it is appropriate for the journal  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

I am not fully well-versed in the literature on this specific subject, and so find it difficult to comment on this. I can say that I have not come across any other article discussing this specific issue.

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

The article has been well referenced but a substantial part of the text is direct quotations from various documents (which have been referenced). The author could consider converting some of the quotes into statements with her/his own words. There is also scope for greater inclusion of peer-reviewed literature (which I have mentioned in the attached manuscript. There are a couple of places where references should be introduced, which I have indicated in the manuscript.  
  
4. Conclusions

           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

It is warranted, but could be better developed. I have given some suggestions in the manuscript.

 Does the article contain loose generalisations?

There are some loose generalizations that could be avoided. These have been indicated in the manuscript.

           Are there any important omissions?

I have indicated aspects that could add to the overall substance of the article.   
  
5. Other comments

Specific comments in the article

6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept with modifications  
  
 - style: it will help the reader if the article is restructured with more sub-headings, and rearranging the text a bit

- substance: it would help to improve the substance keeping in mind some of my queries  
  
7. Separate comments for the author

It was nice to read this article. Informative to me, and an important issue. With a bit more work, it could be a more substantial and well-structured piece. Kindly consider my comments as included in the manuscript.
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