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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have performed a review of SRL in clinical medical students. The topic is of current interest and has potential to inform a global audience of medical educators.

A clear description of how the scoping literature review was performed using a standard approach is presented. The method is appropriate.

The review questions are clear and the summary of the studies is also clear.

An important review question and area for discussion are the methods used to identify SRL processes.

The important differences in the methods are described but I recommend greater critical awareness of the debate on the methods that can be used to identify SRL. Different methods identify different aspects of SRL and for longitudinal studies there are additional methods that are not discussed eg diary. This aspect is important since the authors are suggesting further research and readers need to have clear information and guidance if future research is to provide greater insights into SRL in the clinical environment. The authors may find the following articles useful to inform their discussion:


Azevedo R. Theoretical, conceptual, methodological, and instructional issues in research on metacognition and self-regulated learning: A discussion. Metacognition and Learning. 2009 Apr 1;4(1):87-95. This is an editorial summary of a theme issue that contains many useful studies.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

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.
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