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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: Internationalization in medical education and especially the educational consequences of transferring/exporting curricula or programs is very relevant. There is a clear need for more attention to the educational challenges and perspective in this form of internationalisation. The authors have provided a good structure and a clear outline of the context of the study, e.g., the various schools, characteristics of scholarly concentration programs and overview of the different types of obstacles.

A major point for improvement would be to have a more explicit research question. I think the rationale mentioned on page 4 is too thin. Why would it be relevant to know? Which obstacles are expected or already reported in literature? A theoretical framework is missing.

In the method section, the information provided about the research context is elaborate, but the information on the data analysis process is lacking. For instance, how is rigor applied in the identification of key terms. In addition, I am missing an explicit reporting of the methodology.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

See points mentioned above.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I think the application of the study to other contexts would increase if the authors could reveal more information about the obstacles they faced and the strategies they (implicitly) used to overcome the challenges/obstacles. The emphasis lies currently on the description of the translation at hand.

Perhaps consider another term for "translation" because it directs the reader too much to language issues, while in essence, the article deals with the exportation or transfer of a curriculum (component).
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.

No

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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