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**REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Reviewer 1**

This paper makes an interesting attempt to understand the complex connection between infertility, ART and aging reproductive body. The linkage between infertility and the construction of aging body is a rarely addressed in the vast literatures on ARTs, reproductive health, and infertility studies. In that context this paper is very significant and it opens up various theoretical debates within critical gerontological studies, feminist theories on body, and health system studies. This paper thus makes an effective understanding of these rarely addressed problematic assumptions of infertility and construction of aging in reproduction. Using examples from the author's doctoral research, the paper looks at the way diagnostic tests are constructed. There is a possibility to take this discussion forward to contribute to the debates on feminist articulations of technology and body. This paper also generates discussions on the 'the biological clock' and the problematic stereotypes it creates around female body. The biopolitics of biological clock and and how the reigning of biological clock controls women's body and sexuality requires much more nuanced articulation. The paper enters into that debates, however, does not dwell further into that debate taking forward scholarships already available on biopolitics. Over all this paper is an interesting contribution to understand the diverse journey that ARTs have taken into to responding to declining reproduction as well as facilitating delayed reproduction. The paper brings out the contradictions in the medico-social conversations regarding this. One of the limitations of the paper is that it triggers discussions in diverse contexts and does not attempt to consolidate them. That is also because it is the nature of the debate currently on ARTs in India.

**Reviewer 2**

**Page 2**: The author writes: “In the West, emerging literature within the vast corpus of writing on infertility and technology…” Against this statement, the author provides only one reference, viz. Friese 2015; it would be good to have a couple more so as to help the readers understand the breadth of the said corpus.

The author links infertility with public health and this is an interesting connection which could be explored further.

**Page 3**: The author writes, “… signalling the ambiguity in the ways in which assisted reproduction seems to determine declining reproduction.”

It would be helpful for the readers to have some more light thrown on the ‘ambiguity’; as the paragraph stands now, the ambiguity is not critically unpacked.

The author writes, “This [i.e. the ambiguity] is especially stark when scientific articles seem to suggest that ARTs may not always provide certified results in facilitating a pregnancy in ‘aging’ mothers (Leader 2006; Lewis et al 2006). Suggestions seem to point towards the need for fertility planning before 35 for both women and men to facilitate assisted conception in a smoother, safer way.”

The author is saying that the scientific articles *seem* to suggest that ARTs might at times fail; is s/he suggesting there is any paradox here, or any inherent contradiction? It would be good to elaborate this part a bit more.

The author writes, “This form of ‘intensification’ in the onset of decline is most acute in its projection in medical and popular renderings (Tomlinson 1999). This intensification in language is not only evident in the anthropological rendering of medical representations of the ‘flawed’ female body heading towards menopause (Martin 2001, Tomlinson 1999), but also in the representation of the ‘aging’ mother herself.”

What do you mean by ‘intensification in language’? What is this language you are referring to? Is it the language of medical science? Is it the language used to medicalize women, especially those with diagnosed infertility? Is it the language used to pathologize the infertile woman? Is it something else?

Also, it would be good to get some more clarity on how the author is taking the notion of ‘intensification’ back to tie it to the larger thematic (or use it as an interlocutor) of the biological clock and the paradoxical politics impinging upon it?

In the section ‘biological clock’, it would interesting if the author can reflect on what it means when the man too comes to be circumscribed by the threats of the biological clock? What does this mean for questions of gender? How does the ARTs view men from this (infertility) point of view? How do the dynamics of gender hierarchies change when the man is also implicated alongside the woman? Does anything change at all?

**Page 4-5**: The author writes, “Nonetheless, the technologies are not without fault (Sarojini, Marwah and Shenoi 2011) and are based on notions of fertility that must match ideal-typical conditions to be able to mimic a ‘natural’ conception and birth.”

What are the faults the author refers to? Some light on this would be useful

The author writes, “In a ‘post-reproductive’ world …” It would be good to have this concept unpacked some more.