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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?

Indeed it does. It addresses a very topical and core concern, that is in the public discourse at the present moment.   
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
           Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

No. It addresses it from both the macro and micro levels.  
  
           Will it influence practice or policy?

If the point is made succinctly and with clarity, it may certainly stimulate thought.  
  
           Is it too specialized for the journal?

Not at all.   
  
3. Originality  
  
           Is the information /comment new?

Yes.

Is there any likelihood of plagiarism?

No.   
  
  
4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

No. The ‘conclusion’ section, however needs to be redrafted and elaborated, in my opinion.   
  
           Does the article contain loose generalisations?

I don’t think so, but please see detailed comment below.

           Are there any important omissions?

See comment.   
  
  
5. Other comments

I think this is certainly a very important paper, and extremely topical. This is exactly what the core debates of medical ethics are about. In that sense, it puts a finger on an important pulse. I think however, that it needs to be constructed better to be more effective. It needs proper editing. It needs to be divested of jargon- both the jargon of the medical discourse, and the jargon of the social sciences. It also needs a more elaborate discussion of both the clinical dilemma and the choices. It also needs a deeper excavation of motive. Foe example, it is not clear to me why the therapists disinclination for referral to an in-patient facility is not reflective also of a sense of failure on the part of the therapist. The author(s) may also want to consider larger systemic ethic as a possibility- ehat is the nature of the conversation between the client, the family, the therapist and the in-patient team? Should we be thinking about that? Would our focus on our micro-decision be helped by a larger understanding?

I apologise for the level of detail- but I think that this is a particularly important paper, and that to make its point better, it may need to be constructed better.   
  
  
6. Recommendation  
  
   
  
 Accept with modifications (specify)  
  
 I would suggest modifications in both, as I have elaborated on above.

7. Separate comments for the author

Please offer the author my compliments on raising a very important point, and I would be happy to share the above comments.
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Please let us know whether you would like your name to be published as a reviewer of the manuscript.

This is optional.

I would be happy for my name to be shared. It is, as I said, an important discussion.