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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 topic is of considerable importance in the field of public health and ethics. It is of great importance in India and in several other countries due to thigh prevalence of tuberculosis we continue to have****.*  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

***There are many countries both high and low incidence, where tb reporting is mandatory. It will be good to include some data on their experience with mandatory reporting***  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

***If this paper is more comprehensive, it will certainly influence the development of a fair polity for tb reporting***  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

***No, this topic is very much in line with the IJME’s publications***  
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

***Though the notification is recent, this topic is an old one in the field of public health ethics, the dilemma between a autonomy and public good.***

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism? ***No***  
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

           Does the article contain loose generalisations?  
           Are there any important omissions?

***The title of the paper suggests that the authors will discuss the ethical issues in mandatory reporting to TB, However much of the paper is devoted to the logistics of reporting and practical outcomes. There is little discussion on the experience of other countries, or other diseases where mandatory reporting has been implemented.***

***A paper with this title should discuss the implications on the autonomy of the patient to maintain his privacy, the autonomy of the treating doctor, the conflict between the fiduciary duty of a doctor to his patient and to the government. Does the principle of beneficence or justice over-ride non – maleficence in this case? What are the public health goals of this policy, and does its method of implementation justify its goals? Are the expected outcomes feasible, and do they balance the burdens placed on individuals to achieve them?***  
  
  
5. Other comments: ***More discussion on ethical aspects is needed***  
6. Recommendation  
  
 Accept as is  
 **Accept with modifications (specify)**  
  
 - style

- substance: ***inclusion of a more robust discussion on the ethics of mandatory reporting***  
  
7. Separate comments for the author:

***Use any of the available frameworks in ethics to help you write a comprehensive discussion.***
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