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Reviewer's report:

This is a very good article which is very timely and can provide a very useful contribution. It is generally written very well, but there are a few things that need to be addressed before it is complete. These are:

1. The first aspect has to do with the terms used in the title and throughout the article. The article is entitled "Global health research in natural disaster." My understanding from reading the article is that it would be better titled "Analysis of health in natural disasters." The reasons for this are a few. First, the term "global" is used throughout the article in terms of "worldwide." The phrase "global health" has in recent years come to have a very specific meaning and is a growing field of research and practice. It does not seem to be what this article is examining. I think this is clear in the article itself where on page 4 the author uses the phrases "global research", "global health research," and "global field" in ways that seem interchangeable, but they all mean different things. In order that the article not be confused with one about "global health" I think this should be removed from the title and throughout the article (unless the author is referring to global health). The second aspect of this is that "research" in the title seems out of place. The search terms do not include research and instead, the authors is focused on finding articles about health in disasters. Maybe the author assumes that all the literature in Scopus is research-based, but this does not seem to be the case even from his own findings, where letters, etc. were included in the findings (p. 8). The conclusion also seems to affirm this since the focus is not on research (p. 16). These articles could include ones on clinical practice, humanitarian work, etc., and so this does not seem to actually be a review of research. If I am mistaken in this, the author needs to make it clear how research is a key search term and that his findings are only related to research.

2. The second general aspect has to do with the Methods. The paragraph on p. 5 distinguishes between systematic reviews, scoping reviews and bibliometric analysis. Some references to key literature on these methods are needed. Also, the author states that systematic reviews are analysed by meta-analysis, but this is not always the case (see the Cochrane Handbook, for example). Sometimes a systematic review can lead to a meta-analysis, but sometimes this is inappropriate. This needs to be corrected in the text. Secondly, the search strategy does not make it clear whether all the disaster-related terms were examined with an AND to the health terms, or whether this used an OR. This needs to be made explicit. Thirdly, the reasons for having the Exclusion step (p. 6) need to be
provided. It's not clear why this was done, or why it was justified. Finally, I wonder why "public health" was not a search term in the health words. This is such a key aspect of this area that I think it should be included (or its omission explained).

3. While the article is generally well written, it still has a lot of typos. These are mostly in areas such as mixing plural and singular nouns, incorrectly mixing definite and indefinite articles, and mistakes in the prepositions used. These are detailed issues, but many of these occur in the article. It would be a shame to have such a good piece of research left with these mistakes. One other term to be changed is where the author says Scopus is "the largest database known today" (p. 15). I question if this is the case, and wonder if the author meant largest database of peer-reviewed journals.

Overall, this is a very good article and I think it can't be accepted after these revisions are made.
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