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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. p.5 Other data bases related to education has to be screened.
2. p.5 At the third step of paper search, process of establishing inclusion criteria and reviewing process was not clear.
3. p.6 Screening and search process repeated in Results should be deleted.
4. p.6 Explanation of each searched manuscript in the text is lengthy. Table 1 should be shortened.
5. p.7 Table 2 can be omitted.
6. p.11 Even though authors explained that there were many definition of mentoring and they used one of them, authors said that a huge set of papers did not fit the definition. This is the nonsense discussion.
7. p.11 Geological uneven distribution of authors who published research paper does not directly indicate unevenly distributed mentoring programs. Because this discussion elucidated the conclusion, proper explanations based on data and references are recommended.
8. p.12 Authors used ‘less described’ and 'less recommendations'. All manuscript described in different manners and focused on different topics using different methods. 'Not described' does not mean 'not done' or 'not important'. Authors should discuss base on what were described in references.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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