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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Major comments

1. This paper addresses a current gap in the literature in terms of reviewing approaches of medical education curriculum monitoring and management
2. There is a lack of a narrative in the discussion, which should be included in a systematized review. The discussion focusses on the different categories of papers and references papers in each category, but there is a lack of evaluation of the research articles, apart from some practical points at the end of the discussion
3. Table 2: It is confusing to have "descriptive" and "description" after some citations in this table. Do these terms refer to only the citation preceding it, or to more? Should the same terms be used?
4. The authors should include the work of Al-Eyd et al. BMC Medical Education (2018) 18:185.

Minor comments:

1. The authors should consider adding a PRISMA flowchart to show the process of sorting papers for the systematized review
2. At the end of the discussion, consider numbering the practical points
3. Many errors in grammar mainly pertaining to tense, which significantly impedes the readability of the manuscript.

Page 2, Line 2: "Manages" should read "management"
Line 13 "in" should read "at"

Page 3, Line 2: "…and quality of…” should read "…and the quality of…”

Page 4, Line 14: "clerkship" should read "clerkships"

Page 5, Line 11: "…following key words…” should read "…the following keywords…”
Line 15: "details" should read "detail"

Page 6, Line 12: "curriculum" should read "Curriculum"

Page 7, Line 2: "Totally" should read "In total"

Line 10: "Categories of papers' foci". Change this to be consistent with the headings for Table 3 etc. For example, "Classification of articles" would be more a more appropriate and consistent heading. Heading in table "Paper's focus" should also be changed accordingly

Page 8, Line 1: "is" should read "was"

Line 5: "all over" should read "in"

Line 7: "the" should read "a"

Line 15: "is" should read "was"

Line 18: "the" should read "an", and "Other studies are national ones" should read "A number of other studies were performed on a national scale"

Page 9, Line 5: delete "the"

Line 10: "is" should read "was" and "the" should read "a"

Line 12: Delete ","
Line 13: "are" should read "were"
Line 14: "are" should read "were"

Page 10, Line 3: "describes" should read "describe"
Line 4: "the" should read "a"
Line 11: "and" should read "as well as"
Line 18: "is" should read "was"
Line 19: "the UME curriculum" should read "UME curricula"
Line 19 and 20: "21 from" should read "21 were identified from"

Page 11, Line 2: "in" should read "at"
Line 3: "are" should read "were"
Line 5: "is" should read "were"
Line 7: "are" should read "were"
Line 13: "is" should read "was"
Line 14: "is" should read "was"
Line 15: "the" should read "a"
Line 16: "In the national level, CurrMIT is designed" should read "At the national level, CurrMIT was designed"

Page 12, Line 3: "named" should read "termed"
Line 12: "in" should read "at"

Lines 14 and 15: "The 2nd and 3rd categories comprise of papers in which curriculum stakeholders were surveyed…” should read "The 2nd and 3rd categories comprise of papers in which it was reported that curriculum stakeholders were surveyed…". Other papers may have also surveyed stakeholders but not reported it in their papers.

Line 19: "sources" should read "processes"
Page 13, Line 2: "is" should read "was"

Line 11: "are" should read "were"

Line 14: "dean" should read "Dean"

Line 15: "Hedricson" should read "Hendricson"

Line 18: "include" should read "included"

Page 14, Lines 12 and 13: "highlighted the importance of a medical education program institutional responsibility regarding curriculum management" should read "highlighted the importance of institutional responsibility of a medical education program regarding curriculum management"

Line 14: "Curriculum committee is a useful structure for monitoring the UME curriculum." should read "Having curriculum committees is a useful structure for monitoring UME curricula."

Line 15: "…no best organization for…" should read "…no best way to organize a…"

Page 15, Line 1: "levels" should read "ways"

Line 5: "besides" should read "and"

Page 17, line 19: remove capitalization of whole words

Page 20, line 6: remove capitalization of author surnames
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