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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This paper focuses on a very important issue and presents a great deal of information that deserves our attention, however the overall organization and
presentation of the paper needs to be improved so that the final publication has the greatest possible impact. Below I provide some suggestions for how to re-organize the content.

Abstract

* general editing needed — e.g. line 33, page 2 — LGBTQ rights …. remain underdeveloped (you have remainS).

* page 2, line 38 - missing word - should say same-sex sexuality not just same-sex

* page 3, line 49 - this population should say this population's

Background

* It seems the paper was written before the most recent election in Brazil, the outcome of which places LGBTQ rights in jeopardy — it may be useful to revise the paper with the new information that is now available and discussions of the trajectory that such countries may end up going - and the impact that this would have on others in the region.

* page 6 - line 104 - ensures should be ensure

* page 6, line 112 - avoid starting a sentence with "And" - just start with Most recently, …. 

Method

* The use of the term "selected documents" makes it sound like only a portion of the documents used were analyzed, is this true? Please clarify.

* Page 7, line 132 - should say These data were then compared, not This data were then …

* Consider providing a table to summarize each of the documents examined and consider providing a link to an Open Science Framework (OSF) page that would provide copies of the documents and any other materials related to the study.

* Is there anything more that can be said about the methodology? How were the documents analyzed? was a coding scheme used? Were specific issues identified in advance or after looking through the documents?

Results

* Some sections here are repetitive of what has been said above - e.g., the sentence on buggery and gross indecency

* Many of the countries with the strictest prohibitions are also popular vacation destinations for North Americans — including LGBTQ North Americans — perhaps one way to encourage legal
changes would be to leverage the tourism issue by encouraging those supportive of LGBTQ rights to only visit the islands that have LGBTQ protections.

* The results section reads more like a narrative of the situation than a description of the specific analyses conducted. The results should be limited to a dry description and quantification of the issues, and then the discussion should elaborate further. Much of what is in the results section should likely be in the discussion section instead.

* The methods said that the documents would be analyzed to summarize existing legislation and to identify gaps. Therefore the results section should have these sections clearly marked out and should address these two areas. Instead, there seems to be other information being discussed within the results (e.g., crime rates etc, and it's not clear if these are coming from the analyzed documents or not. It would seem that crime (trans murders etc.) would be a consequence of policy/legislation (or lack thereof). Providing a table that presents each document and a summary of what the document covers would also help add clarity to this issue in terms of understanding where the analysis is coming from.

Discussion

* As is, the discussion is more of a conclusion, which is fine. Overall, I recommend re-organizing to add more content to the method, to create a results section that is clearly just outlining the information gathered from the analysis of the various documents, and then a discussion section that incorporates much of what is already in the results section to flesh out the consequences and implications of the actual results and information gleaned from the documents. The current discussion could then make for a conclusion.

Figure 1 should have the axes properly labelled — what does 0 to 1 represent? Likely percentages, but this isn't immediately obvious.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The methodology needs to be more clearly explained - what exactly was done, and how? The results also need to be made more clear. What precisely was gleaned from the review, and from where? The two questions proposed in the method can help to guide the reorganization of the results section.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The paper requires general editing for grammar.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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