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Reviewer’s report:

I think the authors attempt to "address the problem of creating a valid, high-quality ethics committee proposal for medical registries by suggesting groups of tasks (building blocks), information sources and appropriate methods for collecting and analyzing the information as well as a process model to compile an ethics committee proposal" is a good one. It is difficult for me to determine, however, how the authors get to how this building block approach gets information to the ethics committee, if it does. I think the article would benefit from a more thorough explanation in this regard.

I found the manuscript to be somewhat difficult to follow because of the numerous abbreviations and also the explanations for what is contained in the colored chart at the end. The chart I have a copy of is difficult to read because it appears quite fuzzy. It would be better to have a clearer picture for readability. The manuscript might read and flow better if the authors could reduce the number of abbreviations and simply the discussion of the building blocks.

The manuscript might benefit from a thorough editing. It may be that the authors first language is not English, and if that is the case, they may have done a good job in penning this draft. However, there are a number of areas where there are awkward clauses and/or sentence constructions, where a simpler word or word might make for easier reading, and there are a number of typographical errors. I could do a handwritten mark up with thoughts, questions, and comments, if that is appropriate, but it would be quite an extensive effort to outline all of them in these Reviewer Comments. It might be more appropriate for the authors to address the first two comments and then seek editorial assistance.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.
Unable to assess

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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