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**REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Reviewer 2:**

**General comments**

1. The paper addresses issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries and is topical and original.
2. The interpretation is also warranted.

**Specific comments**

(1). The title is framed as a question. Authors should clearly provide an answer to this question at the conclusion. This is missing in the final sentence of the paper and that of the abstract. Revision is requested to address this issue.

(2) Abstract and the text contain an alphabet soup of agencies. Though Indian readers may be able to comprehend which agencies are referred to by the alphabets, for the benefit of non-Indian readers of the journal, complete names of the agencies need to be given at least once, when they are first mentioned. UGC is common in Commonwealth countries, but other alphabets seems endemic to India.

(3) Page 2 – Re: paragraph mentioning h-index. The original reference by Jorge E. Hirsch should be cited for h-index.

Hirsch, J.E.: An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. Proc. Natl.Acad.Sci. USA, 2005; 102: 16569^16572.

(4) Page 3 – Lines 1-2. Zare, in the cited reference mentions that h-index is a poor measure “in judging researchers early in their career’. This needs to be added.

(5) Page 3 – First line following the sub-head ‘Reports on S&T in India. Mention is made about the use of IF and h-index in bizarre ways. Authors can mention, since when, these metrics came to be used in India for evaluation purposes.

(6) Page 6. Re: NAAC request form details. ‘h-index for each paper’ is hilarious indeed. Why is a specific reference missing here? Please add a specific reference.

(7) Page 6: Re: Fig. 1 and penultimate line mentioning, *Acta Crystallographica* section A. The text mentions *Acta Crystallographica* section A, But the Fig.1, includes *Acta Crystallographica* section D data. I would suggest changing Fig.1 information to *Acta Crystallographica* section A data.

(8) Again Fig. 1. Number values to three decimal places in ordinate for Impact factor, seems so unscientific. Please limit the decimals to one place.  
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