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Reviewer's report:

We appreciate the opportunity to reevaluate this excellent and provocative manuscript.

The authors have clearly dissociated the question of research ethics from that of circumcision. Furthermore, their revisions have capably dealt with the points we raised in our comments. We have just two remaining concerns, neither of which is major.

1. On page 4, the authors allude to "formal aspects relating to the lines of responsibility." By "formal," do they mean "administrative" or something in addition. A small amount of revision should clarify this brief passage.

2. Regarding our comments on informed consent as a cure for the problems they describe, we certainly do not expect them to change their established and legitimate views on this subject. Nor is it reasonable to ask them to recapitulate opposing arguments and provide detailed refutations. (If only reviewers treated our own manuscripts with these courtesies!) However, they should acknowledge contrary views in a few lines, with citation. This would facilitate efforts of readers who wish to familiarize themselves more thoroughly with the field.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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