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Reviewer's report:

I have already reviewed this manuscript for another journal, in such occasion I recommended rejection and provided detailed feedback to the authors. After reading this new iteration of the paper I realised that the authors decided not to follow or pay attention to any of my past comments so once again (and for the exact same reasons) I recommend rejection. Given that I am one of the few philosophers working on this topic I must tell the authors that if they decide to send the paper elsewhere most probably I will be selected as a reviewer, so I strongly recommend paying attention to my comments.

This article examines whether the introduction of human neural tissue and any consequent cognitive change is relevant to the way we ought to treat human-nonhuman chimeras. It also proposes a framework to guide ethical assessment of research involving chimeras with advanced cognitive capacities.

The paper is well-written and well-structured. There are no major flaws in its reasoning that this reviewer can detect, but this is mainly due to the overly broad terms of the discussion. For example, the author’s discussion of moral status (and what they call the 'principle of commensurability') just rehearsed in a very general and superficial way what is already present in the literature.

The article in its present form has two insurmountable problems. The first one is that its new proposal has already been presented and defended in a more detailed way by Shaw et al. (2014) "Using non-human primates to benefit humans: research and organ transplantation". Medicine, Health Care, and Philosophy, 17(4), 573-578. In that paper Shaw et al. explore, in depth, two principles: the proportionality principle and the subsidiarity principle.

The second problem is that the paper does not properly engage with the adequate literature that has addressed the specific issue of 'neural-chimeras':


Are the methods appropriate and well described? If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**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.

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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