Puliyel Sathyamala Infanrix hexa deaths: Review comments:

**Review comments:**

1. This paper is relevant to the journal and the discussion includes the Indian perspective adequately.

2. Much of it has appeared elsewhere in the public domain, as informed by the authors themselves. There is some new contribution in terms of information, but ethical debate is limited and the article merely resonates the stand of the authors in the earlier mentioned works.

3. The conclusions are warranted, but not well developed. Only one perspective is.   
  
4. There are no loose generalisations but it does have assumptions on the part of the authors, and these are not critiqued adequately, while assumptions made by others referred to in the paper are acutely critiqued.

5. The approach to risk of death is unidirectional – “thereby it exposed numerous children unnecessarily to the risk of death” – only deaths due to vaccines (assumed) is considered. The risk of death due to infectious diseases is inadequately discussed.   
  
6. Ethical discussions generally try to address multiple angles of the issue, and to help with the dilemmas arising in decision making. Customary examples such as the “trolley” and ‘transplant” discuss one situation vis-a-vis the other, and even try to unravel layers in each situation. This paper does not reach that level, and remains a propaganda piece, albeit with important questions asked.

7. While there are two authors – the phrase “I have previously commented” , suggests otherwise.