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Reviewer's report:

I. General view
The paper was well prepared and well written. Following the points recommended in your guidelines, I can make the following remarks:
- the answers to all 9 points is affirmative; maybe for the question 6, concerning the limitations – this item was not addressed in details, but, in my opinion, this fact did not influence the good overall understanding of the paper.

II. Comments
I have some short recommendations for the authors:

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

2. Minor Essential Revisions
2.1. I could not find indications or references about the software used for data processing.
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.
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