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1. Importance of the paper  
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

*Only marginally (wrt developing countries).*  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

*Mostly yes - discussed from another country's/culture perspective*  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

*Yes may add to the discourse but much more than this has been written and with greater details.*   
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

*No*  
  
3. Originality

     Is the information /comment new?

*No*

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?  
  
*Difficult to say*

4. Conclusions

           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?  
  
*Unwarranted, inadequately argued at places – example the argument about delinking profits from sales is not clear in the absence of details as to how will the pharma sector function in a capitalist paradigm. If an alternative socio political paradigm is being advocated, it needs to be fleshed out and a road map indicated.*

*Value based pricing alluded to seems to be vague,*

           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

*The article is a broad brush survey and may not touch concerns in India without specific examples. Even for a Western audience it touches on various issues but they are not fleshed out. They do not deal with the politics of price gouging in US for instance and the response of the US Administration. The article does not interrogate the costs and prices unethically claimed by pharma companies.*   
  
           Are there any important omissions?  
 *Issues pertaining to WHO regulation, vaccine approval, GAVI, IP rights, et al and how they influence and are influenced by pharma companies.*

5. Other comments  
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style

- substance  
  
*Accept with substantial changes. I suggest the article mention the broad factors – somewhat well known – but focus on the how value based pricing can really work in the real world. That will be a new contribution to IJME readers.*  
  
7. Separate comments for the author

*Maybe do some search on issues relevant to India where majority of health care is in private hands,*