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Author’s response to reviews:

Our response to the editors comments is attached as a word file named "cover letter- revision 2":

Dear editor,

Many thanks to you for your valuable comments. We tried to do our best to answer all of them point by point. Here we answered to the comments using red font. Changes to the manuscript are indicated by track change.

Regards

Batool Eghbali, corresponding author

Technical Comments:

1. PRISMA Guidelines

A PRISMA checklist is added (file named: PRISMA 2009 checklist- revision 2)

2. Please state the role of funding body in your manuscript.

Financial support of the main project which this manuscript is a product of it.
Editor Comments:

1. The clear definitions of ‘curriculum monitoring’, ‘curriculum evaluation’ and ‘curriculum management’ have addressed most of the previous editorial and reviewer concerns.

In the light of the excellent definitions and the clear explanations of these three terms that you have provided, it is clear that the articles of the first group (i.e. developing computerized tools) mainly describe curriculum management with a few referring to curriculum monitoring. The second group of articles (i.e. survey of curriculum stakeholders and curriculum document review) exclusively reports curriculum monitoring, although the word ‘management’ has been erroneously used (either by the authors of this manuscript or by the authors of the original manuscripts). Only the data generated by the surveys and document reviews mentioned in most of these articles had been used for curriculum management purposes. Where necessary, please correct the use of the term ‘management’ when the data had been primarily collected for ‘monitoring’. Finally, the third group of articles (i.e. introducing managerial structures) mostly reports on curriculum management with a few referring to curriculum monitoring.

To maintain the flow of the ‘background’ section in the ‘results’ and beyond, please make the above clarification, perhaps in the discussion. Also, please correct the use of the term ‘management’ when the data had been primarily collected for ‘monitoring’.

It is done.

2. Although the tables are well documented, the narrative of the results seems still quite patchy, and may not convey the same meaning that the tables convey. How the authors selected only a few articles from each table to be described in the narrative of the results is not clear. It would be best to describe the articles of a particular group under sub-groups or themes. Please attempt to write such a description or please provide the rationale for describing only a few articles within each group.

It is done.

3. Please do not unnecessarily repeat the results in the discussion; e.g. the number of articles retrieved and selected, etc.

It is done.
4. The literature discussed in the discussion should be discussed in relation to the findings of this review.

It is done.

5. The last paragraph of Page 16 (with the last part of the same paragraph running into Page 17) is more suitable to be included in the results rather than in the discussion. Such a narrative would also address the point number 2 above.

It is deleted due to duplicate entries.

Language related revisions:

Please ensure that the entire manuscript is free of grammatical and typographical errors.

For example, on Page 8, Line 4 should be corrected as “Paper format: Anything other than…..” rather than “Paper format: Anything rather than…..”

Similarly, on Page 14, Line 9, the sentence starting with “In other hand…..” is both grammatically inappropriate and not in-keeping with academic writing.

Also on the same page (i.e. Page 14) Lines 18 and 19 contain a couple of typographical errors; e.g. “last 20 century years…..”.

Page 16, Line 5 (i.e. “In his following study…..”) is another example for such errors.

Page 18, point number 3 is not at all clear. Please re-write it.

Please consider the above as only a few examples, rather than a comprehensive list. Hence, please go through the entire text very carefully to identify and correct all language related omissions.

It is done. The manuscript is reviewed and edited by an English translator.
Please ensure that all tables and figures are numbered with titles; e.g. the figure at the end of the manuscript is not numbered and does not have a title.

It is done.