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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   
  
**2. *Is it topical?***

 Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective? No  
  
Will it influence practice or policy?

The paper is dealing with an important and topical issue, area that has the potential to bring in a policy change on the regulation of uterus transplant procedure which is in its nascent stage in the country. But the way it is being presented and discussed does not allow for any new or relevant contribution to practice or policy changes. This needs to be strengthened and hence do not present any entry points to make meaningful recommendations to policy or practice.

Is it too specialized for the journal? No  
  
**3. *Originality***  
  Is the information /comment new? No

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism? Unlikely  
 **4. *Conclusions***  
 Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

The interpretation or comments by the author are not well developed. The conclusion need to be written cautiously, since the comments made here are very superficial.

Does the article contain loose generalisations?

Yes, I feel there are loose generalisations. The author has mentioned there is high demand for uterus transplantation in India, how is such a conclusion drawn without appropriate denominators. This is just from the figure reported by the hospital based on those registered for the procedure. And we are not sure under what circumstance those women would have registered for the transplant. The author has to be cautious when unreflectively suggesting that media reports are positive on the procedure.

The author also mentions ‘public confidence’, I am not quite clear about what it means here. If we have to be sure of the public’s opinion about the procedure, we need to talk to them about what they feel about the procedure and what are their apprehensions rather than commenting if we bring about regulatory changes the public confidence about the procedure will increase.

**5. *Other comments***

The paper discusses a very important issue in the field of bioethics. But I find that the paper doesn’t bring in any new arguments vis-à-vis the regulation of uterus transplant in India. The author here points to the fact that there are regulatory pitfalls in uterus transplant procedure that is being carried out in the country. The same issue has been pointed out by Srinivasan, S (2017) in an editorial written in IJME.

It would have been interesting if the author could have gone a step further to explain why there is a low momentum by the regulatory bodies in propping up a body to look into this. What are the regulatory difficulties and why is such a regulation important in uterus transplantation?

The facts and figures regarding uterus transplant in India has been presented well, but I think the author has failed when it comes to critically discussing the facts. The conclusion is very vague and it did not bring out the essence of the write up.

**6. *Recommendation***  
The paper in the present form does not bring in any new insights or arguments that is very crucial for the topic under discussion. I feel it cannot be accepted in the present form.

7*. Separate comments for the author*
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