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The authors of this paper used a scoping review methodology of published trials of digital pills to examine the ethical issues discussed in these trials. This is a very well written and robust paper. I have very few suggestions and believe that it makes an important contribution to the examination of the ethical issues raised by digital pills. The authors provide a very thoughtful and critical examination of the ethical claims raised in these trials. The paper will make a very important and transparent addition to the field. I have identified a few minor corrections.

Background

* Line 83: should be "chooses"
* Line 131: should be studies

Methods:

* What was the concordance rate between the assessors at each stage?

Results:

* Line 196: studies
* Line 204: patients
* Line 206: define TB
Discussion:

* Many papers did not discuss challenges to the claims that privacy was protected through encryption. It would be worth discussing the limitations of encryption and informed consent in situations involving a complex technology in situations where there may be real or perceived coercion.

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.

Yes

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:
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