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Reviewer’s report:

The article should be of use to both RECs and researchers dealing with the ethics of disaster research. The following concern minor points, and/or formalities that should be put in order before publication.

MINOR POINT REGARDING CONTENT

While the methods seem appropriate and generally well described, the authors might consider providing information about how many interviewees were recruited by means of networks, Internet searches, article reviewing, and snowball sampling, respectively, and about the amount of overlapping among them.

REFERENCES

Reference 12 on p6 names a paper by Curry et al about an ethics review framework for humanitarian crises, but in the 'References' section, No. 12 lists an article by Dall et al on the vascular effects of exercise.

Reference 13 is used on p6 as source concerning an MSF framework, but in the 'References' section, No. 13 lists an article by Plank et al on nutrition in liver transplantation.

SPELLING/GRAMMAR

On p6, the following sentence is not grammatically correct: 'Increased understanding of these ethical considerations will support researchers to anticipate the types of concerns that could arise in disaster research.'

On p6, first para on methodology, 'REB' should read 'REC'.

On p12, the following sentence is not grammatically correct: 'For this reason, interviewees reported considered the research team's skill and experience in conducting disaster research with vulnerable groups when evaluating proposals.'
In Table 3, the final bullet point under 'Vulnerability' lacks a question mark.

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

Yes

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

Unable to assess

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

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal