**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: **Fake Fades Cost Lives: Lessons from the Sociolegal Struggle with Jeans Sandblasting in Turkey**  
  
  
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? **Yes**  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy? **Yes, we have a big silicosis issue in India, there is a very vibrant movement of victims and CBOs working on this – this article will be very interesting for the Indian groups.**   
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal? **Not sure – if such descriptions of movements have featured in IJME before – but if the ethical issues are more clearly articulated – I think it should fit the bill.**   
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new? **Yes – the description from Turkey is new – the generic issues are not substantially new (in the present form) – some features that stand out could be highlighted – by comparing this case with other similar movements in other countries either for silicosis or other similar diseases – this will substantially increase the value of this work.**

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism? **Not sure – but the authors have been open about submitting to IJOEH and it being rejected.**  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed? **I think the issues arising are described – but need to be articulated more clearly as ethical / public health issues. I would suggested sharper articulation which could be helped by sub-titles.**  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations? No  
  
           Are there any important omissions? **As mentioned above – though not an omission – the case study will hugely benefit from a few sentences even of comparison from other countries / other similar issues.**   
  
  
5. Other comments – I think that the bulk of the results / findings section is presently just one long set of descriptive paragraphs setting out the case. It would be much more readable and informative if this can be broken up into sub-headings – indicating perhaps what the authors feel are the different stages of the campaign (for example, or they could use any other analytic hook to make these sub-headings). Secondly it will be good to give a visual representation in the form of a timeline that show both the significant moments in the campaign, as well as the developments in the law and other official responses. Finally as mentioned above – it would be great to highlight some of the unique aspects of the Turkish case (compared to other countries and settings).

6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify) – mentioned above  
  
 - style

- substance  
  
  
  
7. Separate comments for the author

I think that the bulk of the results / findings section is presently just one long set of descriptive paragraphs setting out the case. **It would be much more readable and informative if this can be broken up into sub-headings – indicating perhaps what the authors feel are the different stages of the campaign** (for example, or they could use any other analytic hook to make these sub-headings). Secondly it will be good to give a visual representation in the form of a timeline that show both the significant moments in the campaign, as well as the developments in the law and other official responses. Finally as mentioned below – it would be great to highlight some of the unique aspects of the Turkish case (compared to other countries and settings).

The generic issues are not substantially new (in the present form) – some features that stand out could be highlighted – by comparing this case with other similar movements in other countries either for silicosis or other similar diseases – this will substantially increase the value of this work.

In the discussion - I think the issues arising are described – but need to be articulated more clearly as ethical / public health issues. I would suggest sharper articulation which could be helped by sub-titles.
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