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Assistant Editor Comments:

1. Consent

-- In the section 'Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate', please state whether the informed consent obtained was written or verbal. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

Response: Consent was provided online and this procedure was approved by the institutional research ethics board as stated.

2. Authors Contributions

-- Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Response: Yes, this was the case and this statement is now included.

3. Acknowledgements

Please can you clarify in your response whether permission was obtained to list full names under acknowledgements.

Response: Yes, this has been provided.
4. Questionnaire

-- Please clarify whether the questionnaire used in your study was developed for this study or has previously been published elsewhere. If the questionnaire has been published elsewhere please provide a reference to it in your manuscript, if the questionnaire was developed for this study please upload an English language version as a supplementary file.

Response: There was no questionnaire used in this study. As outlined on line 119, participants were sent an excel spreadsheet with a list of nine core sections and accompanying indicators and panelists were asked to prioritize core sections from most to least important, and also rate indicators within each section from most to least important. A final task was to add any new indicators they perceived were absent from the list, and provide comments that could be collated and anonymously shared with the group. Through several iterations participants then had the opportunity to refine their decisions. We believe the description of the process is sufficient.