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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an exceedingly impressive piece of exhaustive research. The supplemental table alone merits dissemination in an online journal.

1. Major compulsory revisions: none required
2. Minor essential revisions: none identified
3. Discretionary revisions:
   (a) Given the title, I was expecting some form of qualifier in the Introduction section for the word "innovative." I understand that the definition used is described in the Methodology, but I also wonder whether an acknowledgment should be made in the Introduction section to reflect the fact that the meaning of the word in this context is not necessarily universally agreed upon. As an example, putting the first use of the term (e.g., in line 76) in quotations, perhaps with a brief defining statement.
   
   (b) The formatting of Table 1 could be improved. That there are multiple data elements contained within cells on the same line makes the information difficult to quickly digest, since families of data elements do not line up. For example: "South Asia-19.24 (26%)" is all on one line, and so the data elements do not line up well with those in the line below it.
   
   (c) The formatting of Annex B was odd in the printout that I received. The arrows and boxes do not seem to line up.
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