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Reviewer's report:

The topic is important and timely, but I do not believe the authors have adequately addressed the comments and concerns of the previous reviewer in their revised manuscript.

1) Please provide more details of the literature review.

A precise, operational definition of "intersectionality" as pertaining to the literature review remains lacking. As described, it is impossible for a researcher to independently replicate the findings of the review, and to eventually update it. The rationale for the review's economic focus (LMICs) was not clearly articulated, since the constructs and issues are presented in a fragmented manner and do not logically lead to a particular focus. It is especially unclear where "the 'white women from the West' benchmark" fits within the operationalization of the literature review, or even what researchers and policy makers would be able to take away for future work in this area (as echoing a concern raised by the previous reviewer).

Moreover, the citations within the article itself are sometimes deficient. Care has not been taken to cite original sources. This shortcoming starts with the article's first sentences; the statistic on the global health workforce gender ratio is attributed to a source but which itself is citing another source.

2) Revise the commentary to also cover (and critically discuss) their concept [of "intersectionality"] with other concepts/theories.

The authors fail to convince this reader of the importance of "intersectionality" because of the article's failure to clearly define how it is (or should be?) operationalized in the existing research (see comments above) and, in turn, how such an approach would inform health workforce policy and practice better than other approaches.

3) The commentary needs to be expanded and include (...) [how intersectionality] could be explored.
The authors claim in their response they have ideas and questions in the final paragraph, but the article's final paragraph is essentially a quote and an opinion, lacking research operationalization. In this paragraph or the preceding one, there are no articulated research questions, research designs or evidence-informed priorities specifically related to human resources for health.
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