

Review of: "Conscientious objection to enforcing living wills: A conflict between beneficence and autonomy and a solution from Indian philosophy"

David Benbow¹

¹ University of Sheffield

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is a well-written and contains an interesting analysis as to how different Indian philosophical traditions (for example, Jain, Buddhist and Hindu) can inform cases involving conscientious objection and living wills. The paper contains a good explanation of the different philosophical concepts that the authors draw on. Nonetheless, the authors could have explained their understanding of the principles of autonomy and beneficence more thoroughly. The authors state, within the conclusion of the paper, that physicians should be sensitized with relevant principles of ethical conduct derived from relevant Indian philosophical traditions. The authors could have considered more thoroughly how this sensitization could take place. In addition, as the authors acknowledge that applied ethics is influenced by culture, they could have explained why the principles derived from Indian philosophical traditions have not already had the influence that the authors favour. There appear to be a few errors in the paper. For example, where the authors first mention the case of *Common Cause v. Union of India*, this should be in italics. I understand that the case was decided in 2018, but the author's subsequent reference to the case intimates that it was decided in 2019. In the following sentence, "bioethics, like all applied ethics, vary with culture", I believe that the word "vary" should be replaced with "varies". The sentence "however, a move towards this shift has started to occur in India only recently..." begins with odd phrasing. It may be better to state that "this shift has started to occur in India only recently...". There appears to be a word missing in the following sentence: "By prioritizing raja dharma, i.e., upholding the will the patient over whom they hold power,...". Overall, this is a well written paper with a clear argument and good analysis. Nonetheless, further clarity in places would be beneficial.