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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your scoping review focussed on SRL in medical students. The manuscript is clearly written and the topic is one that is gaining increasing recognition in HPE. However, there are a few issues that limit the utility of the current paper for a clinical educator audience. First, the search is out of date considering that a lot of work has been published in 2015 and 2016 on this topic and thus the conclusions of this scoping review lag behind the current literature. Second, my understanding of scoping reviews is that they can go beyond the primary literature into the grey literature to aid in understanding the topic of interest. Thus I was expecting the search to include searching the web (such as google scholar) for relevant material. Third, the review does not provide a deeper analysis of the included papers in order to help a reader understand what aspects of SRL are or aren’t present in the studies or how SRL is or isn't fostered in the studies' educational interventions. Rather than repeating the findings presented in the results, it would be very helpful if the discussion section attempted to tie the studies back to the conceptual framework outlined in the introduction, highlighting which aspects of the framework were or weren't addressed in the studies. Finally, the scoping review doesn't provide a clear outline of where additional research is needed or how to help the field move forward.

A few additional Methods items to address:

1. What sources were used to identify the 6 additional records in Figure 1?

2. Limiting the search to SRL only. I'm concerned that by excluding some of the terms that are used synonymously with SRL (such as SDL), you may have missed key early articles on the topic. A better strategy may have been to search broadly, and then narrow based on inclusion/exclusion criteria.

3. What definition of SRL was used for inclusion/exclusion? How many authors reviewed the abstracts and papers for inclusion/exclusion?

4. Data extraction and collation--who did this? How many authors? What checks did you have in place to ensure all relevant information was abstracted?

5. Synthesis--what process was used to review the studies and synthesize the findings across studies? How many authors were involved in this process?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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