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Reviewer's report:

The paper's objective to present a "re-conceptualization of competency framework terminology for health" with a scoping review was very interesting. Overall, the article is appropriate in different aspects, such as: background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions. However, I have some questions regarding the methodological aspects:

1) What was the mnemonic strategy used to elaborate the exploratory questions, following the Mnemonic Strategy: PCC (Population, Concept, Context) (JBI, 2015)?
2) According to the paper (p.3), only one author was responsible for the research. However, JBI (2015) guidelines indicates that extraction should be performed by two independent researchers. Why was the search done by only one author? Such decision points to an important methodological limit to be presented at the end of the paper.
3) Figures 4 (unreadable in PDF) and 5 present a number of studies higher than the 70 selected. Why is that?
4) What were the reasons for the exclusion of the original 3.532 articles? On page 3, the authors report the selection of 70 articles from a number of 623. However, it is not understood if all 623 articles were fully read. Then, they present the reasons for the exclusion; however, it is not clearly understood if they were from the initial 3532 articles or from the subsequently 623. The reasons for the inclusion / exclusion of the data could be better explained.
5) As no previous filters were used, it is important to present a synthesis regarding the characteristics of the included studies, such as affiliation / origin of the authors, countries where the studies were developed, language of publication, journals, method types, etc.
6) In figures 4 and 5, there is a growth of publications since 2010, especially in the health field. Can you point out which is the reason for such growth?
7) In the conclusions, the authors should present the limitations of the study.
8) Table 4, which is very interesting, is not listed in the paper.
9) Finally, 70 records were selected, but in the references, not all appear. Why is that? My suggestion is to present a synoptic framework with all the data from the selected records

10) Regardless of the issues above mentioned, I reiterate that the paper is very interesting and presents innovations about health competencies.
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