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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you very much for the interesting manuscript and your work. It is a very timely and interesting topic. Below in the text are some edits and some major points to address.

Maybe it would be good to not use the wording competencies in the headline. Otherwise please future explain what is meant by Global Health (GH) competence.

Background:
You are missing the theoretical introduction of certain aspects of your manuscript. Using the term `conceptual knowledge` what does that mean? Please clarify the concepts you are measuring: `conceptual knowledge` Global Health competence.

Please clarify the terms `Global Health` and `refugee health` is it the same?

In the Background you are naming some aspects why GH is important. This is very important. But it is lacking why this research is needed and interesting?

Please highlight the research question more clearly. Please use RQ 1 RQ 2.

Please make it clear in the research question what you measure and then explain the concept of the concepts behind it.

Methods:
Please give more information about the participants. Maybe it would be good to put line 171 – 183 into the method section.

It is unclear if participants had to complete the same knowledge quiz pre/ and post. If they were identical then it is quite clear why they gained knowledge. Please clarify on that.

Line 136 – 140 How was it adapted? What has been really measured with the test?

Line 144 Could you future describe how you have developed the Knowledge Quiz and how you know that you are measuring `conceptual knowledge`?

Could you name the Cronbach's Alpha (#) of scales?
Could you describe assessment tool in more detail?
Results:
177 – 183: Maybe it is better to put this section into the methods. Does it have an influence that 71% were considering a cross-cultural medical exchange and 93% had traveled outside Canada? Could you find out if this group distinguishes to others?
184: Have you used the same Knowledge Quiz two times? Then the knowledge gains would maybe cause from other causes?
229 – 249: Can be shortened
It would be interesting to get more information on the quantitative results. Therefore the qualitative results can be shortened
279-280: Why is it consistent with the literature? The present study showed no differences.
302-303: This is an very interesting result. Here one would normally expect the highest increases (see also the Publications). Do you have an explanation way it was already so high? Could you elaborate on it?
318-320: very good.
333-334: very good.
Could you elaborate if maybe only some aspects of Global Health was supported

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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