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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript fills a critical gap in competency framework literature, which- as noted by the authors- has increased substantially in recent years. I have some minor comments to share with the authors:

1. The methods are well structured, but steps 1-3 in Aim 2 can be more clearly presented. It is difficult to see how the selection matches with the figure 1. Is the denominator 623? I would be helpful to include the numerator and even the denominator if it differs. Detail added to Aim 2 on page 4 should potentially be added to figure 1 on page 5.
2. I'm unable to see figure 4 on page 9. Ensure formatting is correct for the publication process.

3. Various statements refer to references without including them. Please add for the following sentences:
   a. p 9, lines 23-26 "Frameworks apply the terms..."
   b. p 9, lines 26-28 "There is a tendency for..."
   c. p 9, lines 51-52 "Some frameworks focus solely..."
   d. p 10, lines 6-9 "Indeed, health-related competency..."

4. Three sentences with substantial information should be broken down to 2 or more sentences for clarity.
   a. p 11, lines 5-9 "However, in its definition..."
   b. p 11, lines 31-38 "Two highly influential conceptualisations…"
   c. p 13, lines 27-32 "Hager and Gonczi and ten Cate's..."

5. Describe durable where it first arises- p 12, line 4. Currently it is defined on p 18.
6. The proposed features of the re-conceptualized CF terminology for health are very nicely presented on pages 11-13. I strongly recommend that the authors include examples of application, such as from the WHO Rehabilitation Competency Framework in which the re-conceptualized terms were applied.
7. Feature 4, 'Conduciveness to translation,' is an extremely important point to include for broad application of a re-conceptualized approach to CF terminology, the recommendation made by the authors, after all.
8. In the discussion section, the authors should comment on the limitations of applying sampling methods to the selection of the sample
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