Manuscript evaluation guidelines:  
  
Title: **Doctors’ voyage from Civil Court to the Ethical Committee of MCI- Report of three cases**  
  
Importance of the paper:   
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of medical ethics and bioethics in the developing countries? Not really  
  
Is it topical? NO  
  
           Is the issue discussed mainly from another country's/culture perspective? No  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy? It won’t  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal? No  
  
  
Originality   
  
           Is the information /comment new?  
  
  
  
Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed? It is not well developed. The author has written an article in point form, and assumes the reader to interpret it!

In the first case discussed:- The father of the deceased filed the appeal. The objection of the author is that the father has no locus as he is not a Class I heir. But, this is not a suit for succession. Besides the objection of locus standi should have been raised by the Respondent at the appeal stage. There is no point of the author raising this objection. Besides, any person can file a complaint in case of negligence or professional misconduct. One does not know if the father was a party in the complaint, or had filed an intervention either.

In any event, it cannot be understood what the author is attempting to get at. Is it that the MCI should not look at such cases? Why not? Persons aggrieved have the option of filing cases of professional misconduct, suits for damages and criminal cases, each being distinct from each other. Besides the author has just stated the provisions, but has not analysed it or stated what the author’s interpretation is of the relevant provisions?

Case No.2 – the author seems to be stating that the authorities looking into the case did not have the authority, even though the High Court stated that there is no illegality in the orders passed!! If the author wants to challenge that the appellate authorites hearing appeals of cases in which doctors have been found guilty of professional misconduct is not the appropriate authority, then the author needs to give cogent reasons why s/he thinks so, and what should be the appropriate authority? But, where the High Courts also do not think there is any illegality, it is difficult to understand the authors point here.

Case 3 – it appears that the aggrieved got justice at last, and after much struggle. Is the author stating that such cases ought not to have been heard by the MCI at all?

The conclusion of the author is not well articulated at all. After discussing 3 cases, the author simply states Professional code needs to be amended! But, has not made out a strong enough case as to why it needs to be amended? Based on 3 cases the code should be amended? Why?

           Does the article contain loose generalisations?   
  
           Are there any important omissions?  
  
  
  
Other comments  
  
  
  
Recommendation – Reject, unless the author substantially amends the article.  
  
Accept as is  
  
Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
- style  
  
- substance  
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