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Reviewer's report:

Well-written article. It contributes significantly to conversations about geographic bias in knowledge production and dissemination. Please see below a few comments:

In terms of the inclusion criteria:

"One reviewer (MS) screened retrieved titles and a consensus was reached with a second author (MH) surrounding subsequent inclusion of reviewed abstracts and full-text articles." Did the first reviewer screen titles, abstracts and full-text, and then only reach consensus with the second reviewer for those titles, abstracts and full-text that the he/she was uncertain about? Although it may be justifiable, why did only one reviewer screen? Also, were there no conflicts that required resolution with a third reviewer?

In terms of data abstraction:

"The form was piloted on a selection of included studies." This is a bit vague. How many studies were used for piloting out of those included?

For Figure 1:

Two studies are excluded because the full-texts could not be found, could those rather be classified as studies awaiting classification?
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