**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**

**Title**: Sanskari Surrogacy? Commentary on the Surrogacy Bill 2019

**1. Importance of the paper**

**Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?**

Surrogacy and the rights of the surrogate, and the child, and the roles and responsibilities of the intending couple and the state have been a leading debate topic for India these past few years; in 2019 too the issue remains in a limbo, legally speaking. Against this backdrop the manuscript definitely focuses on issues that are very relevant to issues and concerns in bioethics in a developing country, viz. India.

**2. Is it topical?  
Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?** No, it is focused on India.   
**Will it influence practice or policy?** It will not practically speaking, influence policy, but yes, the arguments are addressed to policy makers.  
**Is it too specialized for the journal?** No, it is apt.   
  
**3. Originality  
Is the information /comment new?** It is not new, as it is very difficult to be new in this space anymore! This is a short piece and we cannot hold it up for lack of novelty; it is a commentary on the most recent Surrogacy Bill, and does a fair job of it.

**Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?** The references are fairly robust; I do not suspect plagiarism.   
  
**4. Conclusions  
Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?** There is a single conclusion; it is not well developed, and I would be keen to have that part made more robust.   
**Does the article contain loose generalisations?** No.  
**Are there any important omissions?** It does a fair overview as a commentary on the Bill piece.   
  
**5. Other comments**

The only gap is the absence of linkage with discussions on reproductive justice, a gap that stands out especially because the author has mentioned it in the abstract, flagging it as the ‘conclusion’ of the commentary; it’s also a keyword. So, it *has* to be fleshed out much more. In the text as of now, ‘reproductive justice’ is discussed in exactly one line – “… the Bill is regressive and if it becomes a legislation, does not aim to achieve any ideals of “reproductive justice”. Reproductive justice is a human right, moves beyond liberal notions of choice, aims towards access and adopts a more comprehensive approach”. This is not woven into the argument of the piece at all and thus cannot be suddenly invoked at the end. This is the major gap in this piece and can be easily attended to. A robust engagement with the theory of reproductive justice, and a strong argument showing how it links up, or, as in this case, is denied to the surrogate, needs to come in.

6. Recommendation  
Accept as is  
**Accept with modifications** (specify) – Yes   
 - style: Nothing to change

- substance: Discussion on reproductive justice has to be developed and linked to the piece; discussed in point 5.   
  
**7. Separate comments for the author:**

It is a concisely written piece, timely and relevant; I especially appreciate the terse way in which a robust overview of the scenario is provided. The references are thorough. There is one gap however, and that is significant, but can be easily attended to.

The gap is the absence of linkage with discussions on reproductive justice, a gap that stands out especially because you have mentioned it in the abstract, as the conclusion that this commentary makes. You have also placed it as a keyword, implying that when others look up for articles on ‘reproductive justice’, this would show up, and this would offer those readers a fair insight into aspects of discussion on reproductive justice. But the commentary does not do that. There is no real discussion on reproductive justice – it *has* to be fleshed out much more. In the text as of now, ‘reproductive justice’ is mentioned in exactly one line – “… the Bill is regressive and if it becomes a legislation, does not aim to achieve any ideals of “reproductive justice”. Reproductive justice is a human right, moves beyond liberal notions of choice, aims towards access and adopts a more comprehensive approach”. This is a definition and you have clearly taken it from elsewhere as there is a reference at the end of this line. You have not shown or argued for *how* the idea of reproductive justice is failed in the context of the Bill. *Why* can this form of justice not be attained, what is impeding the attainment? These are conceptual and theoretical arguments that cannot be overlooked if you are pegging the ultimate argument on this. And I strongly urge that this has to be done, and this is very doable for an author who wrote this commentary.

All the best with the revisions.
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