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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for asking me to review this systematic review investigating training to reduce LGBTQ-related bias among medical students.

Before this paper is ready to be considered for publication there are a number of issues that need to be resolved. Primarily that as this paper stands it is not clearly a systematic review. There is very limited evidence that a systematic protocol was followed. This may be purely that the information has not been reported, rather than not followed and this needs to be addressed. Methodologically this paper does not adhere to the PRISMA guidelines that it claims to have used, which are required for systematic reviews. There are so many gaps in what is required for a systematic review and what is reported in this paper that the authors must revisit the PRISMA checklists and apply them to update their reporting. This need to start with the title of the review, which does not match their intent outlined which was for medicine nursing and dentistry? A justification for this population is needed alongside each element of their PICO question. The abstract can be aligned with PRISMA for abstracts and then a review of the PRISMA checklist will highlight the areas that this manuscript has not reported.

Hopefully these gaps in reporting are oversights and not reflective of the methodology used in this paper. Otherwise this cannot be considered a systematic review. Some examples of missing information include methodology of the searches themselves, data extraction, analysis, risk of bias. The PRISMA flow chart as currently reported in Figure 1 is not adequately detailed and needs more information regarding the reasons for exclusion, further it is standard practice to provide an example of the actual search strategy conducted for one database (eg Medline).

If these reporting gaps are able to be addressed this paper may be suitable for publication, but until that time this paper cannot be considered as a systematic review.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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