Reviewer’s report

Title: A Qualitative Review of the Design Thinking Framework in Health Professions Education

Version: 0 Date: 11 Jan 2019

Reviewer: John Sandars

Reviewer’s report:

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.

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.

- 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.

- 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.

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

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'.

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

No

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

Unable to assess

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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