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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for submitting a carefully revised version of their manuscript. I really appreciate their effort to clarify their research objectives and provide a more detailed description of their methodology. I am quite satisfied with this second version of the paper and I think it can be a very valuable contribution to the ethical/empirical debate on BCI. Just two minor pre-publication remarks:

1- The "Results" section opens with the statement that "The search undertaken yielded a total of 73 publications". I suppose the authors here are confusing the number of papers yielded through the search with the number of papers they decided to include into the final synthesis based on their inclusion/exclusion criteria. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that the authors previously report that the sole screening of the PSYCINFO database yielded 188 entries. According to the PRISMA statement and analogous best review practices it would be advisable to report (i) how many articles were retrieved through the database search, and (ii) how many of those entries were included into the final synthesis after duplicate removal and full-text assessment.

2- In Table 1 it would be advisable to mention in the caption how white boxes should be interpreted. It is not as intuitive as it would seem.
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