**Title: "Are we ready for a "Nudge"?"**

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

A: It does, as it does among many other disciplines in the field of behavioral science. The concept of "nudge" is not new. It has been evolving and has been extensively written about in the last decade. The authors of this manuscript acknowledge this: "Pubmed reveals that there are hundreds of publications related to the field of Nudging, public health and ethics."  There has been a resurgence of interest after Thaler was awarded the Nobel last year.   
   
2. Is it topical?

A: I'm afraid not "cutting edge" topical anymore.   
   
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

A: Mostly, yes, as the majority of references show.   
   
           Will it influence practice or policy?

A: Probably not, at least not immediately.   
   
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

A: On the contrary, it may be too general.   
   
3. Originality   
   
           Is the information /comment new?

A: No.

           Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

A: Very little, if any.   
   
   
4. Conclusions   
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

A: There is no main conclusion, but a series of speculative statements preceded by "I believe" [last para]. I wished the author[s] presented at least some "evidence".   
   
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

A: Yes. The manuscript is a review of selected literature on nudge theory. Neither the concept, nor the interpretations are new. The author[s] neither present any data of their own, nor write of their own experience in the field. Statements such as: "The use of nudges in India should, thus, not be a replacement for the greater issue of addressing the social determinants of health, including poverty. " are therefore arbitrary, and generalizations unsupported by evidence.   
   
           Are there any important omissions?

A: The manuscript lacks focus. There is much literature available on this subject, this review cannot claim to be comprehensive.    
   
5. Other comments   
A: Unfortunately, the manuscript is about 10 years too late. Unless this is review was invited by the journal, in which case the editors may take the call to publish, I cannot recommend publication.    
   
6. Recommendation   
   
          A: NOT RECOMMENDED for publication.   
   
7. Separate comments for the author

A: No
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