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Yes the paper is relevant both for field of law and ethics.   
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           Is it too specialized for the journal? No it is most relevant to IJME  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new? Yes and well presented and well evidenced arguments.
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           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed? It is very well developed and balanced. Indeed the law must not act as barrier in access to medical technology, rather clear guidelines for its use as well as certification for health workers is the way forward

It would be good if the authors can access the evaluation of “Silent Observer” that was used in Maharashtra. This was not recommended as the district officials used the information to track pregnant women.   
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Would the authors like to expand on the existing petitions in SC by cardiologists and other specialists for the amendments in PCPNDT? That would make it more contextual. And if they can also look at the recommendations made in these petitions and refer/reiterate those in their own problem solution/conclusion, it would make this paper more robust.   
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Comments of Reviewer 2:

1. The paper is relevant both for field of law and ethics, and is very relevant to IJME.

2. It brings in critical evidence from the field and can influence policy and is well presented and supported.

3. It is very well developed and balanced. Indeed the law must not act as barrier in access to medical technology, rather clear guidelines for its use as well as certification for health workers is the way forward

It would be good if the authors can access the evaluation of “Silent Observer” that was used in Maharashtra. This was not recommended as the district officials used the information to track pregnant women.

4. No loose generalisations or omissions.

5. Would the authors like to expand on the existing petitions in the SC by cardiologists and other specialists for the amendments in PCPNDT? That would make it more contextual. And if they can also look at the recommendations made in these petitions and refer/reiterate those in their own problem solution/conclusion, it would make this paper more robust.