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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and largely well written manuscript. The aim of the review is timely, given the policy focus on rural immersion for medical students. I think the manuscript could be further strengthened by attention to the following:

1. The structure from page 7 could be improved considerably. On page 7, there is a major heading titled results, but then on page 8 there is a heading, study selection, that describes how the articles were chosen and how many were included. This seems an odd ordering of the content. Detail on study selection should be included at the end of the methods section and I believe a PRISMA diagram should be included so the process can be clearly followed. A clear description of included studies should be provided at the end of the methods section or at the start of the results

2. I was disappointed not to see the usual table of included studies in tabulated format with information given about the studies. I was a little intrigued that you made a statement about small sample sizes etc but did not present data in tabulated format. The manuscript would be significantly strengthened if a table was added that showed author, location, major findings and some comment on quality for each of the included studies. I think some sort of a table of all included studies is standard in this type of review. I fully understand that Arksey and O'Malley argue that the purpose is to scope the literature, however, critics of their method highlight the lack of even simple quality assessment. I think this should be included as it has been highlighted in the abstract and body of the paper and has become far more usual in scoping reviews. This does not have to be detailed.

3. There are some clumsy sentences throughout and I would encourage a strong proof read to improve the readability of all sections.

Overall, though I think it is really interesting but would be so much stronger if there were a summary table of all included studies.
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