**TITLE: Reflecting on the nature of the ‘Invisible Women’ in Reproductive Technologies**

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The author addresses a range of thematics in this paper and as a result, does not engage with any of them critically or address all their respective nuances. Having gone through the previous round of revisions made by the author in response to the reviewer’s comments, we make the following concrete suggestions for the author to consider:

* The word count needs to be cut down to a maximum of 6000 (inclusive of references).In order to do this, the article could focus on reproductive autonomy and examine the debates under that. It is suggested that she focus only on how the embryo gets posited in an antagonistic way to the woman carrying it, focus on the ART scenario and debates in India, and relate the discussion to the SC privacy judgement. From page 1 to page 9, the matter could be condensed significantly (maybe bring all this matter down to 2000+ words maximum). The rest 3000+ could be used to discuss ART, surrogacy and how the maternal-embryonic dyad gets problematized with related arguments; the privacy judgement issue is an interesting link here and could constitute the conclusion.
* The discussion on maternal subjectivity is important but that needs to be woven into the discussion on woman-embryo dyad for instance. The section on ART is important and should be foregrounded, brought in much sooner; the topic of surrogacy is important but sweeping statements such as “Such women in India are now taking resort to surrogacy” should mandatorily have a reference. Also after the August 2017 Parliamentary Standing Committee Report was presented, much in surrogacy in India has changed. What you have written and referred to (for instance Saravanan 2010) is very dated data in a field where changes are taking place every year. To use 2010 data and say there are 3000 clinics in India is very dated.
* Should the author agree to consider these changes, she would need to rewrite substantial sections of the paper.
* Several assertions need to be referenced; sweeping and generalised statements should be avoided. Certain sections have to be taken off, quotations shortened or removed unless very essential to the argument; the author should concentrate only on the basic three thematics in mind while redrafting.
* The focus on the ethical issues should be foregrounded and highlighted; the author needs to keep alive the following question while reworking the paper: *why* is this paper being written? *What* is the ethical urgency or imperative to argue what you are arguing? *Why* are you writing for this specific journal? *What* is it that you wish to locate within the larger debate/discourse of medical ethics?
* This paper linking literature from philosophy with pregnancy, gestation and the relation with the embryo and ART has an interesting approach. However, ours is an ethics journal and can only consider papers with a strong ethics focus. We would like the author to revise keeping these comments in mind, ideally by March 11th in order to be considered for the next issue. We look forward to hearing from you.

All the best for the reworking; we hope you shall rework and resubmit.

Thank you