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1. Importance of the paper  
  
           Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

The paper is very important, especially for LMICs such as India, since it addresses the issue of confidentiality from within the junction of the right to individual privacy, clinical ethics, and the nascent field of organizational ethics, which is currently poorly represented in the literature.   
  
2. Is it topical?

Yes, the issue is both topical and relevant.  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

The issue is discussed from a perspective of the moral as well as the contextual, and this makes it relevant to all cultures.  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

The Indian policy on confidentiality for HIV infected people (HIV/AIDS Act 2017), is already a well-thought out piece of legislation and adequately addresses related to confidentiality rights of individuals.

However, this paper will help to frame SoPs on the basis of organizational and clinical ethics, that are rarely addressed in India.  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

No. It is a good fit, although it could be written more simply. Sometimes, the sentences seem convoluted.  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

Not particularly, but the perspective from which it is argued is because it overlaps the terrains of individual rights, moral responsibility, clinical ethics, and organizational ethics. The sections on organizational ethics provide a clear overview of the issues involved, and this is an addition to this nascent field, at least in India.

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

Not as far as I can see.  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

Yes to all three.  
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

None  
  
           Are there any important omissions?

Empirical evidence on the issues discussed could be make this paper more robust.  
  
  
5. Other comments

Very interesting, well written, and timely.  
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 - style

- substance  
  
  
  
7. Separate comments for the author
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