Reviewer’s report

**Title:** Structural barriers in access to medical marijuana in the U.S.: A systematic review protocol

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 23 Mar 2017

**Reviewer:** Michael Burrows

**Reviewer’s report:**

The changes you have made, address a number of the issues identified during the first review, there is a in-depth discussion of the search methods, quality assessment and more understanding of why the review is needed and how the review findings can be used. this is excellent. However there are a few additional comments

Comment 1

You say you have changed the review to a scoping review rather than an intervention review however you still use the heading - description of the intervention? This doesn't appear to be an appropriate title to this section and the title doesn't work with the text you have written. Perhaps call the section Objective of the scoping review.

Comment 2

Description of the intervention section, you justify the use of structural violence by repeating the previous sentence with a separate reference. you could edit this section to be briefer and include more explanation of why these factors (economic and social factors) matter to what you are trying to do and why therefor this framework is appropriate and how this framework will inform the analysis.

Also this might be the better time to discuss that this is a scoping review, rather than later on in the search methods section. (its also not referred to in the abstract)

Comment 3

You have a data collection and analysis section, however you there is no discussion of the method of analysis, or how the different types of studies will be synthesised together. I think this is important information as the this will underscore the rigour of your review.

Comment 3

in the selection of studies section, the wording of lines 57-59 pg 6 and 4-5 pg 7 where you detail the second step in the review stage, is clunky and unclear, you might wish to edit for clarity.
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