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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

The Authors have followed most of the Reviewer’s suggestions and the revised manuscript is improved. However, the discussion could still benefit from more substantive analysis. For example, page 15 in the Discussion section, the Authors mention the point that both panels made in prioritizing “exploring the fundamental goals and ideals of the profession”. Nevertheless, these goals are not clearly stated and could be subject to personal interpretations. The statement about goals and ideals could mean different things for different physicians and it is unsure what the panel members would define as “goals” and “ideals”. Is there or can there be agreement regarding these goals? How such an agreement could guide all physicians (better than legislation)? The Authors could explore more around such issues in the discussion section, based on the Delphi panel discussion. Additionally, they could propose concrete ways of including such issues on the curricula.

Please also revise for typos in the text. Please refer to 1st Review by Mrs. E J Ayres.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? YES
3. Are the data sound? YES
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES, but the text should be revised for English and clarity in some places (eg. P. 8, “group thinking” not “group think”).