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Thank you for submitting this interesting and topical paper. You have made a good case and I am certainly in broad sympathy with the issues you raise however in my opinion your paper would be strengthened by attending to the following points.

1. I think you should give a slightly more detailed (and clearer) account of what PM is (in your account you might also evaluate the claim that there are reasons to think the PM 'ideally' is a more equitable strategy for treating people). Perhaps a few more references at p 3 (the reference you do use #2 is mainly about trust which isn't the point at hand).
2. I am not sure that your use of 'Animal Farm' helps your argument (though I can see why you have used it). It isn't obvious to me that the introduction of PM will necessarily go in that direction.
3. At page 4 your example using the two examples e.g. failing of black mothers and kidney transplantation should be expanded to bring out the specific link to PM. I agree with the issue regarding black mothers (recent reports in UK have shown similar patterns) however you really need to make a stronger and more explicit link to PM Similarly with the kidney example - surely cause of kidney failure is not the issue here/ I don't think you are doing justice to the complexity of ethnicity as a factor in kidney transplantation.
4. The argument at p 7 -8 doesn't really explain or substantiate the claim that PM approaches will be based on biased data (again you are moving too quickly from examples of racial bias in clinical practice to the presumption that PM will also be so tainted) - I don't think you give enough evidence or develop the plausibility of your claim.
5. The argument you develop at 9-11 is a very important one but again it could be more robustly defended with evidence. (I would also like some explanation of your comment at line 281 'except for the United Kingdom and Ireland' - because I couldn't follow it.
6. The discussion/ comparison of CF and SCD is important but again I find your speculation about the future of PM being one that will merely reinforce existing discrepancies thinly argued for.
I think your proposed 'strategies for solutions are interesting and important.
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