Title: **Conflict of Interest in Research and its Current Status in India**

Review Comments:

This paper deals with an important concern in research especially biomedical research in the country. However, it needs major rewriting. I have the following suggestions for the paper:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comments**   * The authors have structured their introduction as a collection of different definitions of COI. Instead they should attempt to present the background of the topic globally and contextually, establish why such a review becomes necessary and state an objective as to what do they intend with this paper. | **Responses** |
| * It is not clear, why they have a title for types of COI. That could very well be a part of the introduction. Such sub headings would suit a book chapter better. |  |
| * Even though it is a narrative review or maybe even a commentary, since the authors have used existing literature extensively, a brief methodology segment is needed. It should mention details like what data sources (databases, websites etc) they accessed, whether they followed any search strategy and the duration of the review. |  |
| * There could be a subtitle such as “Results” under which the major findings – the occurrence of COIs in India in the past, the existent guidelines, regulations and management of COIs in India could be briefly mentioned. |  |
| * This can be followed by a Discussion component, where the authors can specifically identify the lacunae in the existing systems – for instance, lack of foolproof mechanisms to manage COIs in the country or need for implementation of better systems to inform patients about COIs of physicians – can be discussed. |  |
| * In the discussion, the system in India can be critiqued against culturally comparable better system/systems internationally and this could also lead us to a segment on recommendations. |  |
| * The conclusion needs to be built from the discussion and should be logically linked to the content of the paper. |  |
| * Separate paragraphs have been created for no specific reason. For instance, in the introduction, every definition is a separate paragraph, which is unnecessary. |  |

6. **Recommendation**

The paper cannot be considered for publication in its current form. But the topic is relevant and the authors do have the content. They just need to work on the material to build a meaningful critique. So, I would recommend that it be resubmitted with major modifications in both style and substance.