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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a very important topic. Both researchers and ethics boards are struggling with how best to review these types of studies.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Unfortunately, the structure of this article does not help us sort out how best to review such studies. It may have been more helpful to use the ethical frameworks to develop a logical argument about the best approaches to resolving the issues raised regarding autonomy (consent), justice (inclusion of all relevant data), and beneficience (providing the best care for patients). There is a lot of good information embedded in the article. However, the lack of a coherent argument about the pros and cons in the different approaches is a major limitation.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject as not sufficiently sound

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.