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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

thank you for submitting your work. You review the literature for speaking up and its influences and effects. Your paper provides and interesting source for many relevant references and as such is a valuable contribution to the field. You point out an important topic.

I personally would have tried to a slightly different approach to the paper and thus I am not sure, whether I should consider my suggestions as compulsory or discretionary. It might be a matter of styles. I would leave this decision to the editorial team.

My major challenge with your paper is that in my mind the results section and the discussion are too similar and both are kind of narratively describing the findings. I would have wished for a more "interpreting" section - in the discussion section, you began, but I think the points could be made more sharply.

I would wish for a table that summarized the findings that you had. You could have it by study and extract the respective keypoints. Or by key points, citing the studies that are relevant.

I would be interested in hearing more about the procedures that you used to content analyse the selected studies. How did you deal with studies, for example, that had many interesting points in them?

In the first paragraph of the results section your provide the percentages for the publication years for example. As your sample is 27 articles, I would simply report the relative frequencies.

You nicely discuss a limitation of the literature, mostly stemming form western cultures. I think for speaking up such cultural differences can be very interesting to analyse in more detail.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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