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Reviewer's report:

Re the authors' amendments can I first say that I totally agree that knowledge of ADRs is a prerequisite for certain outcomes although will not be visible on the written prescription and hence not appropriate as an outcome-based indicator in your study. However if the Delphi aim was as stated 'to identify what should be included or considered when a doctor writes a prescription', I am still very surprised it did not appear in the list as an important thing to consider. This was what made me query the issue and why I wanted a clearer explanation of why it did not appear. I certainly don’t question the importance of its incorporation in the curriculum.

Minor essential revisions: I conclude and accept, therefore, that the Delphi outcomes successfully helped to 'inform' the development of the content of the programme. I think that 'inform' still needs further stressed in the method as well as the discussion. This would help alleviate the jump from Delphi to curriculum which I originally found difficult. In addition I feel a little smoothing out of this issue is still needed in the discussion. As it stands para 5 ends with the question 'Why wasn’t ADR identified as an outcome?'. Para 6 goes on to say why ADRs are in the curriculum. The question is not answered until para 7. I feel the discussion around the transition from Delphi to curriculum needs smoothed out.
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