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Reviewer’s report:

Compulsory revisions
As a review of literature, it is fairly hands off and there is little expression of authors’ leanings. In fact, it is a little too bland and I think could do with a bit more analysis.

As a review of literature, it seems balanced with a clear and relatively simple methodology. Since it is a review of literature, the gaps in methodology are acceptable since the conclusion is simply to raise the fact that there are not many empirical studies and that the answers to their (very important) questions cannot be deduced from the studies as such – they only give indications. I think this point needs to be made clearer in the abstract and the conclusion.

Minor revisions
language check - grammar particularly and phrasing of sentences.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
I feel a lot of info is in the tables but little reference is made to them in the articles (BTW, the figures are missing in my version…) – would be be possible to link tables and article together better? Bery few studies are mentioned by name in the article and it would be good to mention groups of authors/articles under each category of, for instance, type of methodology on prices. These kinds of indicators would help readers/researchers who want to continue on this work.

While this is a literature review, I would have liked to see a little more analysis. Or if analysis is not relevant, then at least raise some new questions from the literature survey – why is FDI from US/EU inversely proportional to IPR protection? What are exceptions in some of the conclusions and how indicative of the situation are they? Is Attaran right? The conclusions are a little insubstantive and I think calling for more empirical studies is a good idea but it would be great to give some guidance on what empirical analysis needs to be done.

The 3 questions the authors ask are not touched on again clearly in the article – I would like to see them picked up again in the conclusions and tied to questions which need to be answered before we can get to those questions…
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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