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Dear editor, dear reviewers,

we would like to thank you for your review and the constructive feedback provided that helped us to present the findings more clearly and improve the quality of the manuscript. Please find attached below point-to-point replies to the issues raised. Also, please let us know if you feel any of the issues has not been addressed properly or if there are any further corrections that you feel would improve the manuscript’s quality.

Best regards,

Rade Iljaž

FEEDBACK:

Reviewer: Peter Yellowlees

(1) there needs to be a short description of delphi methodology as many readers will not understand this, and it is core to the paper.

Re: a short description has been added in 'Backround' section as well as a new reference (under the 24).

(2) The findings of the study are of great potential interest to a number of countries who are investing in informatics, but the implications of the findings are inadequately discussed - especially the potential feasibility of the high ranking choices

Re: discussion about the implication of consensus findings has been added in 'Discussion' section

(3) All six tables have been submitted twice in error

Re: this has been corrected. Tables are now included at the end of the main manuscript file after the reference list and figure legends, in the order that they are referred to in the text.

Reviewer: George I. Mihalas

1.1. For the data you have collected, a factorial analysis could reveal the answering patterns of the different professionals included in your study (I know this feature was not targeted in your study, but it would have fit).

We have incorporated all comments bar the 'Discretionary Revisions' suggestion to conduct factorial analysis. We have considered this at the inception of the study but felt that methods we deployed while simpler present a more clear picture and importantly give a general reader greater transparency in relation to findings.
2.1. I could not find indications or references about the software used for data processing.

**Re: reference has been added under the number 42.**

2.2. I think some of your questions / items in your questionnaire were, in a certain extent, in relation with some regulations or legislative provisions of the Slovenian Ministry of Health. If this was the case, can we consider that the answers do represent the personal opinions related to those items, or just an acceptance of a regulated issue? However, I have to admit that your final goal, about "building consensus" was affected less than would have been in a regular study about opinions shared by different groups of professionals. My opinion is that some comments on this issue would eliminate any doubts.

**Re: short explanation on this issue has been added in “Discussion on methodology section”.**

3. Executive Editor

3.1 We also ask that you revise your abstract so that the Background clearly states the aims of your study.

**Re: we revised our abstract so that the Background clearly states the aims of our study. We also revised the Background section with the same purpose.**

3.2 Please also highlight (with 'tracked changes'/coloured/underlines/highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript to make it easier for the Editors to give you a prompt decision on your manuscript.

**Re: we highlighted all changes made in the manuscript with 'tracked changes'**