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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?

This paper is a standard ‘normal science’ publication that raises a general issue competently and professionally. The review of literature is adequate. The style terse, more forensic than literary or phenomenological. It however does not touch on medical ethics in developing countries in terms of ethnography or debate. Otherwise religion and community context would become more important in such a thing.   
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

This paper is relevant, topical but more focused on the western context of a social contract rather than communicative relationship between a doctor and patient. The sense of vulnerability, the fact that there are no clean solutions is not played out.   
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

The paper will make it to a few courses but I doubt whether it will substantively effect policy. It’s strength is it is written like a theorem. It could however do with storytelling capturing the poignancy of decision making especially if one is talking of organization as moral agency.   
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

It is academic but not specialized.   
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new? Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

I doubt if there is anything new in it. The footnotes are formidable but there is no sense of plagiarism

4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

The essay is competent, the interpretations careful. It is clear in its articulation but could do with a ‘Third world’ nuance. I would urge the authors to look at how different cultures formulate the problems, the structuring of alibi and the resolution of problems more comparatively. It will make the paper more playful and experimental.  
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?  
  
           Are there any important omissions?  
  
  
5. Other comments  
---  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
 I would accept the paper as it is. I wish I could be more excited by this. The problem is important but the problematic, a bit disappointing.   
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