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Reviewer's report:

The paper addresses a topic of considerable interest. However, it requires compulsory major revisions before being accepted for publication.

1. The question posed by the authors needs a better definition. In particular it is required:
   - To provide a definition of HCA in accordance with the literature
   - To give further clarification of the purposes for undertaking a scoping review
   - To provide a background and relevant references supporting the second aim of the study
   - To provide references regarding also no-English speaking countries

2. The method requires greater appropriateness and a more detailed description:
   Methods
   Some methodological weaknesses regards the process of study evaluation:
   - A single researcher conducted the screening of citations for inclusion (this weakness has been described within study limitations)
   - Titles and abstracts were reviewed. However, in a scoping review, abstracts cannot be assumed to be representative of the full article that follows, or to capture the full scope of an article (Badger et al. Should all literature reviews be systematic? Evaluation and Research in Education, 2000; 14, 3&4, 220-230).
     The relevance of a study could be unclear from the abstract, then the full article should be retrieved.

Please, explain why studies published since 1995 are included. Moreover, the limit to articles published in peer review journals is a limitation of a scoping review, and conflicts with the aim to find what is the breadth of relevant literature.

Results

The authors described what information was recorded from the primary studies. It is also important to describe how the different results were summarized and compared and how the research gaps were identified. In fact, decisions must be made about what information should be recorded from the primary studies, and it is important to consider how comparisons between different interventions can be achieved.
In a scoping review the results should be reported with narrative detail by identifying volume and characteristics of research produced and the emerging topics. In a scoping review it is not appropriate to report or to aggregate the results of the included studies.

There is lack of consistency between the quotations within the text, and those listed in the summary lines and in the boxes of Table 1. For example in "Education", the references 32 and 33 cited for the perception of training in the text are not included in the summary Table; the same applies to the reference 39. Please check the consistency between all the records in the text and those in the table.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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