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Reviewer's report:

Thank for you revision.

Improvements have been made since the last version of your manuscript, especially in the Methods section.

However, I feel that the flow of the Background remains unclear at some places. I read it a couple of times and I don't feel I fully understand the logic and flow of your ideas.

For example, in the section "Contribution to the field", I suggest to add some subheadings, to highlight the important ideas (e.g. PM methods and practices, challenges…) and to link them to your research objectives. This section is a little bit heavy because there are many concepts (e.g. HR, HRM…) and the links between them and your scoping review objectives are not obvious.

Also, in my opinion, the expression "quality of care among nurses" remains unclear. This need to be defined.

Your research questions are clearer in the Methods section than in the Background section. Instead of naming your research objectives/questions twice, they could be cited only once in the Background?

The remaining comments are in the PDF file.
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