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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?

*The paper does address the issue of incorporating medical ethics in the current MBBS curriculum which is very relevant. However, it would have been appropriate to comment on the currently introduced AETCOM module for undergraduates.*  
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

*It is discussed with the Indian Medical Graduate in mind.*   
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

*There is already an impetus to formally roll out medical ethics in the medical curriculum. The study could’ve discussed how further to strengthen it rather than again suggesting a formal training in medical ethics.*  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

*It is appropriate for the journal as it focusses on healthcare ethics for Indian Medical Graduates.*3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

*The information may not be novel but it addresses the need for imparting ethics training to medical students.*

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

*No.*  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

*The conclusions are appropriate*.

           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

*No.*  
  
           Are there any important omissions?  
*The article should have discussed the significance of the current AETCOM module as it is a drive towards what the authors have suggested i.e. formal introduction and training in ethics for medical graduates.*  
  
5. Other comments  
*Some of the questions to test knowledge on medical ethics or the perception of students towards healthcare ethics do not truly reflect that. The recommendation of the study seems to already have been partly implemented.*

*The introduction does not flow too well. Rearranging and rephrasing of some sentences maybe required.*

*Grammatical errors in terms of tenses and capitalisations are present. Careful proof reading is required by the authors.*

*The attached article has some corrections already made and a few comments as well.*  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style

- substance  
  
*The article can be accepted with modifications. There is a need to address that the recommendation by the authors is already done in the medical curriculum and perhaps discussing with improving the current module maybe more suitable. Also, language errors need to be rectified.*  
  
7. Separate comments for the author
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