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**Abstract**

Purpose: Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.

Methods: Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched. Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies. Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results.

Results: Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies. Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).

Conclusion: Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications .

Keywords: Cohort studies; Educational measurement; Program evaluation; Republic of Korea; Research design

(It is mandatory to use **MeSH** terms through MeSH on Demand, available at: [https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MeSHonDemand.html](https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MeSHonDemand.html%29)). The use of other terms is negotiable with the editorial board.

**Introduction**

Background

Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported: what is known, what is unknown and important to know; what is the specific topic addressed in the manuscript; and why addressing that particular topic is important

Objectives:

Specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses or research questions, should be described in one paragraph.

**Methods**

Ethics statement: It is a literature-based study; therefore, neither approval by the institutional review board nor the obtainment of informed consent is required.

Study design: It is a systematic review, which was described according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) available from: http://www.prisma-statement.org.

Eligibility criteria: Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.

Information sources: Specify all databases, registers, websites, organizations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.

Search strategy: Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.

Selection process: Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.

Data collection process: Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.

Data items: List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.

List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.

Study risk of bias assessment: Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.

Effect measures: Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.

Synthesis methods: Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis). Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.

Reporting bias assessment: Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).

Certainty assessment: Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.

**Results**

Study selection: Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.

Study characteristics: Cite each included study and present its characteristics.

Risk of bias in studies: Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.

Results of individual studies: For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.

Results of syntheses: For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.

Reporting biases: Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.

Certainty of evidence: Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.

**Discussion**

Interpretation: Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.

Comparison with previous studies: Compare the result of the study with previous studies.

Limitation: Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review and the review processes.

Implications: Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.

Conclusion**:** Deduce the conclusion from the main text. If there were research hypotheses or questions in the introduction section, they should be answered. It is meaningful to mention the usefulness of the content in educational evaluations to promote medical or health education.
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**Legends for figures**

Fig. 1. The legends should contain a precise description so that the figure can be understood by readers without reading the main text.