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Reviewer's report:

The response is raising questions about a paper that summarised views on areas where there was no substantial literature so consensus was developed using the Delphi method. Almost by definition this is likely to raise debate on conclusions.

Having said that, the response below is not clearly written and unreferenced (but see above). I am unsure quite what is being said by Dr Angst. Indeed the original paper doesn’t seem to suggest use of a gold standard - rather it states that "it was agreed that no gold standards exist for change scores on HR-PROs".

On the other hand the original paper reports measures that were felt "inappropriate" by the Delphi panel, but doesn’t explain why they were felt to be inappropriate. Perhaps the author below can make more of an argument as to why he feels they are?

My suggestion would be to ask the author to clarify his comments and reference them. Then give the original authors a chance to respond.