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Reviewer’s report:

The data is interesting. The Tables are informative. Therefore, despite my difficulty to accept the definition of authors’ relative productivity per country as the method of measurement, I would accept this manuscript for republication. However, I have the following request to the authors.

The conclusions in the abstract contain some overstatements which need revision.

1) “Canada was the most productive country”, which is the absolute statement, but it depends on what definition you used. The authors arbitrarily used “the relative publication productivity = the number of publication per medical school”. This definition is only one of many ways to define the productivity. I believe there are many other evaluation methods to determine what constitutes “the most productive”. I personally feel that the authors’ definition may not necessarily important; I would rather identify the medical schools with some of the highest number and/or highest h-index. In this regard, most important information in this manuscript may be the Table 2, where the authors identified the number of publications per city, which is helpful to identify those medical schools. As a researcher who would identify productive researchers for future collaboration, I keen to know The information is much more useful to know which group of educators/researchers contributed in this field. I would at least state as “In terms of the number of publications evaluative studies in medical education, Canada was the country with the highest relative publication productivity.

2) “A relatively small number of authors, networks…….contribute significantly the literature within medical education.” Where is the evidence to state this in the result section? No result indicating this statement. What is the definition of “a relatively small”? What comparison did you do to measure this? I would delete the statement.
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