**Shroff Brain death dilemmas**

Comments of Reviewer 1:

A. General comments

1. Why has the medical profession in India remained silent on this issue for more than two decades after the law has been passed?
2. Do the authors have any suggestions on how the Govt/legislature can be convinced to bring about this change?
3. Till this happens why doesn't the medical profession do what is ethical rather than wait for legal clearance which may or may not come; which is to disconnect the ventilator after diagnosing brain death irrespective of organ donation?
4. Did other countries face the same dilemma? How did they move to a uniform definition of death? How was consensus built?

B. Specific comments have been inserted into the paper.

Comments of Reviewer 2:

1. The paper is well suited to the journal and covers an absolutely relevant and important topic.

2. It could certainly influence practice and policy. While the information is not new, the issue is rarely discussed formally. Hence it is important that such papers be published.

3. The interpretation is well warranted. However one omission is: Under the current laws and Supreme Court judgements, what is the likely status of withdrawal of life support in a brain-dead patient?

4. There are three themes running through this article:

The main theme: The problem of non-withdrawal life support in a brain-dead patient who is not an organ donor

Other themes introduced:

--Universal declaration of death (UDD)

--Donation after cardiac death (DCD)

All these concepts are important in themselves. Perhaps emphasize the need for the UDD, and that life support should be withdrawn whenever death by any criteria is declared.

DCD is an important concept to expand the donor pool; but does not fit in with the theme of unduly prolonged ventilation of brain dead patients who are not organ donors. UDD is more relevant in this regard

B. Specific comments have been inserted into the paper.