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Dear editors,

Please find enclosed a new version of the manuscript. We would like to thank the referees, whose comments have been considered in this new version. Below, the main modifications are indicated by paragraphs, which follow the same order as in the paper. We indicate the major and minor corrections suggested by both referees.

1) The research objective has been more precisely defined and consequently, the title has been changed.

2) GPC is defined when first mentioned in the Abstract and some translation mistakes have been corrected.

3) The characteristics of the GRADE method have been more extensively described. This way, we expect that it will be better understood by a broader reader.

4) "Our country" has been substituted by Spain or Spanish context to avoid confusion.

5) Participants and Methods paragraph has been revised and the following changes have been included:

5.a. This paragraph has been divided into two subparagraphs: a) Context, participants and data collection and b) Analysis and validation. This way, the different phases in this study are better explained.

5.b. The participants consent has been explained more clearly.

5.c. The fact that the participants translate their original expressions is explained.

6) The link between Figure 1 and the categories that are obtained from the information analysis is better explained and is indicated in Results paragraph.

7) The inclusion of Appendix 2 is justified to show the relevance of the results, with the aim to explain the findings obtained in the questionnaire that was filled in the workshop and published before this paper.

8) The abbreviations for Focus Group (FG) and Technical Consensus Meetings (TCM) have been corrected.

9) The verbatim extension has been reduced as much as possible. Only those that were needed as an empirical reference for the interpretation and results discussion have been kept.

10) The headings for Discussion and Conclusions have been placed as in the Spanish original manuscript (there was a mistake in the English text). In Discussion, the meaning and relevance of the results is stressed and they are compared and discussed considering the existing literature about this topic. In Conclusions the main findings and the most important recommendations are outlined.
11) At the start of the Discussion the main results are mentioned and the main points to be discussed are explained.

In general, the writing style has been repeatedly revised so the use of English was improved and it was better understood. Two native translators have been involved in this task, which have corrected the errors on verb use and the most sophisticated expressions have been either modified or eliminated.

We hope that this new version of the manuscript fulfils the referees and BMC editors' requirements. We would also like to thank them again for all their help

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of all authors,

Carlos Calderon and Rosa Rico