Imaging and Image management:- current outlook and awareness in pathology practice

Comments of Reviewer 1:

This is a very interesting study dealing with an important issue in publication ethics and research ethics. Here are some comments:

1. The methodology section of the paper is weak. It needs to be strengthened by reporting the mode of administration of the questionnaires - personal administration, mailed questionnaires, email questionnaire etc?

2. The authors have to report the response rate, the characteristics of non-responders and the number of reminders given to the responders if it was a self administered questionnaire.

3. Did authors take informed consent from the respondents? Was the study approved by an ethics committee?

4. The authors report several p values. However the hypothesis they tested is not clear. Nor it is not clear what method was used to arrive at these p values.

5. The authors make a statement in the discussion that "For photographing internal organs and microscopic details, permission of the patient is not necessary." This is a highly debated issue. There is a need for more literature review on this matter and a balanced discussion.

6. The authors make several dogmatic statements like "If the patient is unable to give consent when the image was taken, image cannot be used until the patient has the capacity to give consent." There is plenty of scope for discussion about this issue also.

7. While discussing the issue of consent, the authors should take a more balanced view and discuss various aspects of consent such as "who", "when", "what" etc.

8. It would be very useful if the authors discuss the issue of medical photography from an Indian context. What are the perceived issues of confidentiality and privacy of medical photographs and images in the Indian context?

9. The authors could work on the title. *Imaging and image management* sounds somewhat vague. Can they change the topic to indicate medical photography, medical imaging etc?

Comments of Reviewer 2:

1. The paper addresses issues relevant to the medical ethics and bioethics field in India.

2. It discusses issues partly from the perspective of other countries; but could influence policy in the country.

3. The interpretation is well developed.

4. If the authors could add recommendations as points at the end of the article on what would be good clinical practices in India in the context of imaging and image management, it would help all readers
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