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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this very well conducted systematic review. There cannot be too many studies of this nature into SMAs as they are clearly gaining momentum as process or procedure in health care. Given the nature of SMA and the variety of formats and opportunities for its use, obtaining and/or reviewing reliable data to inform the community about its efficacy is at an all-time high.

Overall I have little negative to report about this manuscript.

Background: I found the background and rationale to be appropriate and consistent with what follows.

Methods: were appropriate to produce rigorous and reliable outcomes and followed known processes.

Results: were well described with rationales to support inclusion or articles and analysis of contents

Discussion: was logical and flowed from the data.

There was anomaly that I would suggest may require some consideration

Lines 78-80 'We hope these answers will guide future implementation, translational studies, and inclusion of SMAs within early, patient-centered, clinical experience in health professional education.'

These lines ambiguously suggest that the authors are actively looking for positive results in the use of SMA rather than objective analysis of efficacy. I would suggest that these lines be removed or modified to reflect greater objectivity.

I wish the authors and publishers well in pursuit of this very worthwhile publication.
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