1. **Title: Between dispelling hope and leaving them in the state of ‘inbetweeness’: Moral dilemmas of research on infertility treatment seeking in Kerala.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S. No. | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s response |
| 1 | The paper does address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries, and is not too specialised for the journal. |  |
| 2. | The information is new to some extent, especially the quantitative data being discussed. |  |
| 3. | The interpretation needs to be developed further. Right now, the author has presented a simplistic interpretation of a mountain of data. There is need to pick on some data and reflect on findings through existing studies of IVF and infertility in India: Sama, Kalindi Vora, Unisa, Majumdar, Catherine Riesmann, Aditya Bharadwaj |  |
| 4. | The paper is peppered with loose generalisations. What is care seeking? How is it different from infertility treatment? There is very little conceptual engagement with Franklin’s idea of hope technology though the author keeps calling her respondents hopeless. |  |
| 5. | The concept of morality and ethics cannot be restricted to a paragraph long discussion of tangibility and intangibility. It seems fleeting and not in-depth enough. Also, the author’s self-reflexivity is not fully explored in the paper, except in the beginning. |  |
| 6. | We get no idea of the questionnaire distributed to the 600 + women: what kind of questions were asked, what was the majority class, caste, religious background? How much money did individuals and couples spend on the treatment? These are important markers of hopelessness as well. |  |
| 7. | The idea of ‘inbetweeness’ comes in at the end. It’s not completely articulated considering it appears so prominently in the title. If a theoretical conceptualization would help, then Janet Carsten’s article on children and inbetweenness might be useful. |  |
| 8. | Figure 1 is very convoluted and needs redrafting. |  |
| 9. | The present manuscript lacks an overall objective, and the stated aim of the paper is too specialized for the journal. However, most of the paper only describes the issue in a peripheral way. |  |
| 10. | The main arguments are not new nor are they well grounded.. Detailed analysis and in-depth discussion is lacking |  |
| 11. | Analysis is not carried out with reference to important literature. |  |
| 12. | The paper has potential, but the present manuscript lacks logical coherence, depth and rigor in its presentation. |  |
| 13. | The paper needs a complete revision to achieve its stated objective, along with rich analysis and engagement with existing literature and studies. Detailed comments for the author have been made in a separate document. |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |