REVIEW COMMENTS/RESPONSES TABLE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Editor’s comments | Author’s Responses |
| 1. | There is still a lack of coherence for a first time reader of this paper, although one gets the idea that this is an important ethical and health issue of national importance. The author is obviously steeped in the subject as he is complainant in the legal case filed against the NHRC. For this reason, there are assumptions that readers will follow the compilation of events. |  |
| 2. | It would be good to have a timeline attached to events. Also the brief outcome/conclusion of each meeting/decision referred to in the paper |  |
| 3. | The conclusion should summarize the events leading to the current scenario in India, its stand at the International forum, and the need/call for action/appeal |  |
| 4. | The ethical arguments should be discussed following each event of significance, or can be discussed as a complete section at the end of the paper. |  |
| 5. | The cause of cancer of the minister, in the final paragraphs, is speculative and does not really lend any further credibility to the discussion. It just appears to be a karmic/cosmic attribution to circumstances. |  |
| 6. | The author may like to rearrange his presentation and resubmit it. We are not convinced that all the reviewers’ comments have been adequately addressed. There is scope for the narrative to be sequential and demonstrative. |  |