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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editors,

First of all, we would like to thank the reviewers for their contributions to improve our paper. In this new version, we have introduced some changes following the suggestions of the second reviewer, as the first one is in favour of its publication.

In this sense we understand -and to a great extent we share- the worries stated by Dr. Eccles. Since the beginning, we were conscious of the different levels of the research findings. We tried to make it explicit along the Results' presentation as well as in the Discussion and Conclusions sections.

Certainly, during the workshop development and, mainly within the Focus Groups, the experts' opinions and their experiences were based on the technical aspects related to the peculiarities of the GRADE method. But those experiences appeared iteratively linked to unsolved worries in relation to the elaboration and development processes of Clinical Practice Guidelines and connected to the contexts where those processes take place.

From the qualitative perspective, we were especially interested in a deeper understanding of that "going and coming back" and gaining an insight into the meaning and the sense of the experts' worries. In this respect we tried to underline the fact that those findings were beyond the GRADE method itself, especially in the Discussion section where the level of abstraction and reflection is higher -particularly within the qualitative studies-. Nevertheless, and taking into account that the research began with the application of that method, we also tried to include some of their particularities within the Results' presentation as well as in the Discussion.

The translation into the English language probably made more difficult to explain clearly enough the differences between levels. We apologize for that and we also would like to be grateful for the support of both reviewers.

So, in this new version we reviewed the editing and we introduced the following changes, according to Dr. Eccles suggestions:

1. Along the Results and Discussion sections, we highlighted the differences among levels in the research findings
2. In order to achieve a better agreement with the research Results and Discussion, the title was modified.
3. We moved the survey results to the Introduction section
4. We corrected some mistakes found in the text and figures.

We hope that these changes have improved the manuscript in order to be published.

Looking forward to hearing from you, sincerely yours:
Carlos Calderon and Rosa Rico