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Reviewer's report:

p.1 Line 24 - reference in relation to Ellen Roche and Jesse Gelsinger?

p.4 line 21 - can you provide more explanation about why the nature of research means that research participants will have difficulty proving these elements?

page 5, line 54 "no-fault compensation" (hyphen in wrong place)

Table 1 - is there a more straightforward and clearer way of presenting this information given that most of the search terms are the same? e.g. say that "all databases used the following search times" and then state them, and in the table just include the extra search terms that were used for some databases.

p.12 line 7 - "In Brazilian research..."

Some inconsistencies in referencing style

In general, I think it is a good, interesting and valuable paper. I think it could do with a read-through by a third party for clear English, as some of the phrasing seems unnecessarily complex. Also, some paragraphs are very long and need reducing.

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
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