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Reviewer's report:

Comments made on a previous version have been dealt with adequately. I have two recommendations that are linked to the comments made previously:

1. The authors seem to insist on using the word 'developed' - although placing it in inverted commas. Then use this to say that 'most people would consider the USA a developed country'. I want to point out that this is outdated terminology entirely, and may be taken as offensive by anyone where one is not sure it is 'developed'. That is the reason terminology has changed. Instead - using a 'low / middle / high income' terminology is, at least, neutral in a value sense as it is based on an international classification.

As it happens - all the countries that are productive are 'high income countries' - is more meaningful and less value-judging that stating they are 'developed'.

2. In the conclusion section, this should then become a solid recommendation: i.e. that medical education research also become more prominent in 'low and middle income countries'.

[As an example: I just visited the Philippines, was informed that there are 31 medical journals for 100 million people; none of which are listed in the NLIM system - in fact, because of stringent requirements for maintaining scheduled publications on time, all that were listed before have been de-listed over the last decades. Only one is now back on track to become re-listed following a 5 year record of regular publication. Many of these journals do, in fact, have more 'soft research' such as on medical education and on health systems research.]

So, my recommendation is to make it very clear that the search strategy is very skewed, that there may well be much more research in LMICs, and that this become a specific recommendation forward.
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