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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript. I believe this is an important paper demonstrating best practice techniques for indicator selection - this is relevant for surveys and indexes. Often, work of this nature is relegated to a technical report or an appendix. Academics and government researchers need to be exposed to these methods with real-life worked examples. The manuscript is very well written and clear, but I have a few minor suggestions for improvement.

Comment 1: More context for using Delphi

I think providing a little more context for the Delphi method might be useful for readers. I thought it might be useful to highlight how the Delphi method fits in with best practice. Highlighting how important it is to get input from subject experts and members of the target population (the student voice panel), how the Delphi method is one of a handful of techniques for synthesizing responses from multiple experts and why this was the most appropriate method to use.

Comment 2: Discuss the limitations and give examples of lessons learned

If you could include any discussion of 'lessons learned' or things that you would do differently next time in the discussion that would be fantastic. What advice would you give to somebody about to undertake a similar study?

There needs to be some discussion of the limitations of the approach. I have put some questions/comments below here that might help:

How did you ensure that you got the 'right' experts involved? Was there adequate representation - are the 12 post-secondary institutions chosen at random or are they potentially selective in any way? Could the selected priorities be different if a different group of experts from different post-secondary institutions were chosen?
You didn't always get consensus - there is no clear instruction on what to do in this situation and you have chosen to retain some of these. For example, there was less consensus on what to include for academic achievement and nutrition. You made a decision to keep these in the framework and note the degree of consensus - what are the advantages/disadvantages to this? What is your advice?

Sometimes the experts who shout the loudest about their particular area of expertise get more input - how did you handle this? What advice can you give?

Maybe make some comment on the time it took to collate this information and again give advice for speeding up the process.

Comment 3: characteristics

It may be useful, if you have the data, to provide some information of the characteristics of the experts and/or the institutions they belonged to.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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