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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. The novel methods for qualitative analysis included in this article is of interest to the academic community. I have some minor comments that I believe may strengthen the paper.

1. The focus of the paper is novel methods of qualitative analysis, using the role of Institutionalized Bioethics Commissions (IBC/ICB) as a case to exemplify the novel methods. However, when reading the article, the large emphasis on IBC/ICB in the results distracts from the novel methods. This is further exemplified by the aim of the article appears to answer "What is the role of IBC in public health policies? How does the institutional arrangement work? What faculties, scope and limitations of power, as well as the exercise thereof, have been granted to these institutions? What political and social tendency does it show when exercising of authority over matters that can directly affect health and life?" The results, discussion and conclusions are then structured to answer these questions.

Instead, I recommend the article is restructured so that less emphasis is placed on IBC/ICB and more is placed on the novel methods. Some suggestions are:

a. Change the aim of the article to highlight the difference between the novel method and traditional methods, and what benefits it can bring to the literature.

b. With the new aim, it would be helpful to present all traditional methods that could be used to investigate the role of IBC/ICB and list the pros and cons of each method. Then compare these methods with the novel method

c. Highlight what results/conclusions could be highlighted from the novel method that cannot be answered by the traditional methods

I believe the increased focus on the novel method, how it's different to traditional methods and its benefits will strengthen this paper. This change will ensure the results, discussion and conclusions are structured around the novel method instead of the role of IBC/ICB.
2. As noted above, you use the acronym IBC and ICB for Institutionalized Bioethics Commissions. Please be consistent and only use one acronym.
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