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Reviewer's report:

This is a timely and original contribution to the debate on the ethics of human-animal chimera research. Even though, as the authors carefully and cautiously explain, the quantitative approach taken does not tell anything about the quality of the argument for and against this kind of biotechnological intervention the paper will allow future authors in the field to clearly situate their own contribution and it will prevent unnecessary repetition of arguments already found in the literature. I have only four comments that I would like the authors to deal with / respond to:

1. I think a bit more reflection is needed about the biases created by only looking at papers published in peer review journals. My guess would be that among those who publish in such journals there will be an overrepresentation of bioethicists working in close collaboration with natural scientists, whereas those working in philosophy departments are more likely to seek other avenues of publication. Also many of those who work in a more applied fashion close to authorities and advisory boards are more likely to publish in reports and the like. Also there is likely to be a geographical bias with overrepresentation of scholars from the English-speaking world. My guess would be that this means that the results will give a more pro-biotech impression than if a wider search of sources had been undertaken. Anyway a bit of reflection would be nice to have.

2) The authors draw a sharp distinction between "ethical" reasons given (which is their subject of study) as opposed to "theological, legal or political reasons", l. 151, (which are not recorded). However more need to be said how they draw this distinction. And personally I find it hard to see why some of the reasons recorded under B, C and D cannot just as well be seen as theological, legal or political reasons.

3) The authors draw a distinction between what they call "normative" and "factual" concerns (for example in l. 322). I think this is confused. All the concerns stated are normative. The difference is between concerns which are more about consequences and concerns of a more "intrinsic" nature. This should be explained and developed much better than is the case now.

4) There is a nice classification of different kinds of reasons. These should be named and referred to in an intuitive and easily understandable way, rather than with letters. For example instead of A the authors could refer to "Human and animal health and welfare". This will make the text much easier to read.
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