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Reviewer’s report:

A well written debate paper on a topic not so much studied, ethical concerns about the use of animal-derived constituents in perioperative care. A paper worth publishing although I have some comments for improvement.

1. I would like the authors to consider the problem that might arise if one starts to ask questions about consent and there still is a lack of knowledge if animal-derived constituents are present or not, or one still need to use animal-derived constituents although one can take away some of them.

At the moment the text focus on either/or and somewhere in the paper I would like to see a discussion on my suggested two matters for a clarification on the kind of consent there will be. What happens if we at the moment cannot have a full disclosure as suggested at the end of the paper.

This is the reason why I marked no on the question whether the conclusions were drawn adequately.

2. In Background second paragraph, think about the several "-" in the same line.

3. Page 13, line 43-44. Make a correct reference for the Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board case.

4. Page 10, line 32-32: Specify and mention the suggestions made by Enoch et al.

5. Page 14, line 42-45: Starting with "The limited evidence available...". Why make a majority argument? Wouldn't it be better with a benefit of the doubt-argument?

6. Page 15, line 22: Starting with "Clinicians may consider...". A reference to the discussion from the Animal Rights position on the matter of feeling harm when animals are used could be added here.
7. Page 16, line 30-31: "There are documented cases..." How many?
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