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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
In Page6, Paragraph2 I am not sure what does it mean by the phrase '...English language software risked compromising participation...'? In the same paragraph and after, I am not sure what do they mean by the word 'factor'. I think the word factor is used instead of 'statement'. If that is right, it needs to be changed to word 'Statement'.
Page7, 2nd paragraph (starts with 'In the second round ...') is not easy to follow and hard to understand it. It could be improved by some language corrections/improvement and/or example.

Discretionary Revisions:
It is not clear if the experts (participants) were asked to add their comment/s after rating (of each statement) or not. If 'yes', then it need to be explained how their comments were used in the following round of the study.
The calculation of 'average rating' is not quite clear. It is not clear if the average rating of each statement (factor) is the product of expert's rating in each country only or all countries? In 'Method' section, it sounds the average rating were calculated for each country separately but in the 'Result' section it seems the top 10 factors (with highest rating) in all countries were merged together. Therefore, my suggestion would be using a flow chart to illustrate the whole process of data collection and analysis will be very helpful for reader.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.