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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the revisions you have made to the manuscript. From my perspective it is much improved. Based on the new version, I have a few additional comments and recommendations.

The most critical revision needs to be made in relation to the search strategy. The authors should include a detailed sample search strategy for at least one specific database. This would allow reviewers (and readers) to properly evaluate the proposed review. More detailed comments are included below.

Abstract, page 2 line 21 - typo

Should read "Data extraction and coding will occur using EPPI-Reviewer 4..."

Background, page 4, lines 3-4

Here are you referring to emerging economies in the OECD? If not I would remove as your review is focused on the OECD.

Background, page 4, lines 22-25 and page 5, lines 1-3

Is this paragraph needed? Suggest removing. It does not seem as clearly linked to the argument/rationale you are presenting.

Background, page 5, lines 8-10

Suggest rewording. Could be misinterpreted to suggest the violence is between health professionals and women seeking abortions. Option: "Despite the association between domestic violence, sexual assault and abortion, there are no studies synthesizing the discourses between health professionals and women seeking abortion who have experienced domestic violence or sexual assault"
Literature Search and Selection, page 8

See comments below related to Table 1 as they also apply here.

Literature Search and Selection, page 9, line 13

For clarity suggest changing, "Then, they will be filtered through…" to "Then, the remaining papers will be filtered through…"

Literature Search and Selection, page 9, line 20 - typo

"repeated PubMed" should be "repeated in PubMed" or "repeated for PubMed".

Study Screening, page 10, line 1

If you screen on full-text from the start, this means that you will have to retrieve full-text for all references in the StartSet. Is this feasible? I am not sure how many references you anticipate in the StartSet but it may be preferable to screen on title and abstract, and then only screen on full-text those that make it through Level 1 screening.

Appraisal, page 10, lines 18-20

Is this an issue in your review if the articles report on different results or themes from the same study? It depends on how you plan to use the information, but given that your focus seems primarily qualitative (and not about counting or statistics) I am not sure this matters.

Synthesis of Findings, page 11, line 23

Suggest removing "for each study" from end of sentence. Repetitive.

Synthesis of Findings, page 12, line 8 - typo

"lists of phrases, ideas…"

Authors Contributions, page 15, line 6 - typo

Should this be "LM modified and tested"? Something missing here.
References 3, 8, 16 and 18 - typos

Check spacing before year of publication

Table 1, page 19

I do not have confidence in your search strategy as currently outlined. For me it is a critical weakness. The exact search strategy you plan to use should be clearly indicated for at least one database and included as a supplementary document to increase transparency and reproducibility. See Rivas et al. (2015) Appendix 1 for an example at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD005043.pub3/epdf

Relying on Table 1 it is not clear if you are planning to include both "physician" and "physicians" etc. How does your search address the challenges of multiple terms for sexual assault, domestic violence, incest, and abortion used in the literature? Gerdts, Vohra, and Ahem (2013) (http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0053346) use the terms abortion and pregnancy termination in their search. Do you also need to include misoprostol (for example) as a search term, as it seems some articles do not include abortion although they focus on pregnancy termination? In addition, verify your Boolean search. For example, if you include "AND rape". If I am understanding correctly, this means you will not find references that use the term sexual assault. Is this correct?

Please add a paragraph under Literature Search and Selection to address how you will manage search strategy challenges. Have you already run pilot searches to test your strategy? You mentioned in the response to reviewers that you consulted with a librarian. Suggest including this detail in the methods section.

It should be acknowledged that this review requires a complex search strategy. Perhaps one way you plan to address challenges with search terms is the effort you will invest in forward and backward snowballing, and in pearl growing. But the other should be the way your own search builds on what has been learned from previous search strategies employed in this field of study. Are there other reviews you could reference in terms of how they have managed the multiple terms used in these fields?
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