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**Reviewer’s report:**

1. The introduction is quite laboured - and takes some time to get to the purpose of the study.

2. We don’t clearly know the criteria or credentials of the chosen ‘experts’ - a main flaw for a Delphi study.

3. It is not clear where and how consensus levels were set. On page 17 the level is identified at 80% - but this is quite low.

4. The 74 statements (which we do not know what they are - they are not appended and scored) emerged in the 3rd-round - but should always come in the 2nd-round after the qualitative analysis.

5. Not sure the reason for round 3. I take it because not enough questions were asked in round 1 - just two questions would be far too few.

6. Picking out 20 'important' statements per expert is not how Delphi's are usually conducted. Each of the 74 statements should be scored.

7. Round 4 identifies the use of Likert scales to score. Typically this occurs in all rounds - except the first.

8. On page 17 - the analysis is missing vital detail. Mean scores are not identified and their appears to be no use of standard deviation measures for distribution. Fleiss kappa is mentioned - but not tabulated or reported anywhere.

9. The discussion section, at 11 pages, is far to convoluted and laboured.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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