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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1: This is an really interesting review examining the application of design thinking in health professions education research. The paper is well written, the limitations of the review are and the conclusions drawn supported.

Thank you for your comments.

Reviewer 2:

There is increasing interest in the topic and use of Design Thinking in HPE and this review is of potential relevance to the global readership of BMC Medical Education.

Thank you for this comment.

Overall, there is a reasonable description of the justification, presentation of the findings and discussion but I consider that several major aspects should be addressed:

- I recommend that it is made clear by the authors whether this is the first review on the topic.

We have added text to the introduction to indicate that this is the first review on the topic.
The term "Design Thinking in HPE research" is used throughout but this term implies that DT has been used to research HPE. The review appears to focus on research in the use of DT in HPE. This difference needs to be clarified / modified.

Language has been edited throughout to indicate ‘the use of DT in HPE’

- The authors use a ‘qualitative review’ methodology but I find the presentation of the review questions vague eg 'landscape'. For me, this type of 'landscape' review requires the use of scoping review methodology and this methodology appears to have been performed but not made explicit. I recommend that this review is rewritten and presented as a scoping review, following the explicit criteria for a scoping review. This approach would provide an initial list of clear questions which need to be answered and provide an overall enhanced clarity to this review.

We agree that our methodology aligned with scoping review and have added text to indicate this point. We also reorganized the methods and added some edits to align explicitly with scoping review.

- There are a few terms that require rephrasing / explaining to ensure clarity eg 'by quering' and 'educational programming'

Edits made throughout for clarity.

In conclusion, this review appears to be timely, the mechanism of the review process of search, flow chart etc is appropriate and important findings for future practice and research are identified and presented. However, in my opinion, the overall presentation and clarity could be improved by following the explicit process of scoping review methodology. Scoping review methodology is widely used in HPE reviews and there are several excellent guides to inform 'best practice'.

Thank you for these comments. We have made edits for clarity and revised the methods to explicate the scoping review methodology.