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Reviewer's report:

An interesting study. I enjoyed reading it but needs detailed methodology and results to enhance its credibility and transferability.

Clear and interesting title

Introduction: Needs a definition for principles and competencies with reference to the literature for clarity. Discuss literature or documents suggesting competencies and principles or explicitly mention if there are none. A clear research question or objective is missing.

Methods: I think you need to explain the process of developing principles and competencies in detail. Discuss the recruitment, data collection and analysis. This will help judge the rigor of this study. Also, why students or graduates were not invited to participate at any stage?

Results: Demographics table is missing. You have reported the competencies - I was expecting results in stages e.g. stages and basis for the refinement, addition, amendment or removal of any competencies or principles. How consensus was built - Any medians or ranks table? Also any analysis on how different groups had different priorities?

Discussion: How this adds to the literature? What are the implications for policy and practice? What are the limitations of this study?

References: Ensure accuracy in references

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.

Unable to assess

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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