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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved from their last submission. Please find my comments below:

Introduction: The term 'Outcomes' are more commonly used in UK and not 'Competencies' which are commonly used in North America. I would like to see a reference for the claims made by the authors: "Competencies were selected to be identified since these are used throughout undergraduate and postgraduate medical/healthcare training in the United Kingdom (UK)."

Methods: The operational definitions of the terms/jargon they have used in the paper needs a reference. Needs a definition for the principles. This is important because when I look at the results Table 1: What the authors call 'Principles' - appear as competencies to me and what the authors have called 'Competencies' - appear as objectives or outcomes. The participants for stage 1 and 2 were not selected by the researchers purposively. This might have affected the quality of data? I will suggest adding this to the limitations. Also, I would like to see the demographics for both the national working group and medical education experts. The principles did not seem mutually exclusive e.g. 'Work as a practitioner in digital healthcare environment' covers all other principles identified in 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.

Yes

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.
Yes

**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:

Acceptable
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