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Reviewer's report:

This article is well written and appropriately follows the methods of a scoping review. Given the purpose of the study a scoping review seems appropriate, notwithstanding this, the authors should recognise the limitations of such an approach and be careful not to overstate their case. With this in mind, I would strongly suggest the following amendments to the paper:

1. It would be appropriate to include a statement in the discussion that notes the limitations of this approach to literature review. In particular the fact that the lack of critical appraisal in a scoping review means that findings are taken at face value, thereby restricting the certainty with which it can be stated that certain outcomes or approaches are better than others.

2. The purpose of using the NHMRC levels of evidence hierarchy to categorise studies was not clear given a) no critical appraisal of studies is provided and b) this information does not appear to be 'used' at any point in the review. Why does it matter if studies were level II or III? If it does matter this should be explained. Otherwise I would suggest removing this information as irrelevant. A study is not inherently 'better' because it is an RCT. What matters is how well the study is carried out and how appropriate the design is to answer the research question posed.

3. Under 'Exclusion criteria' it is noted that 'Studies not reported in English and not in full text were excluded' This needs some explanation. It implies that if the library the authors were using did not subscribe to a journal a paper was not included, even if relevant. Even thought this is a scoping review not a systematic review this could be a major source of bias, thus limiting the findings of the review further still. Given that it is usually not difficult to access papers not held by a university quickly and without cost in this day and age, it would be useful to know how many, if any, studies were excluded for this reason and why attempts to locate the papers were not made.

4. On P13 (and later in the discussion) there is reference to 'Outcome measures'. This is an incorrect use of terminology since no actual measures are described. This should be rephrased simply as 'outcomes'. In fact it is a pity that no specific measures are described, since this might - to an extent - have indicated the quality of the included studies (without the need for critical appraisal). For example were validated measures used?
5. P14 In the discussion it is noted that: 'the training programmes not based on a theory or a learning style model appeared to be less effective than those that were'. The authors should consider that the lack of theory is an indicator of a weak study/intervention and that these programmes are therefore of a lesser quality, which is why they are at face value less effective.

There are also a few very minor grammatical/typographic matters that need to be addressed and these have been annotated on the attached copy of the manuscript.
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