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Reviewer's report:

Some background information on the various practice options and their prevalence around key propositions would be helpful in framing the study and choices presented to participants. For example, how common are various procedures, potential costs and other considerations.

Methods and findings for Delphi approach were described clearly. It would be helpful to state how many people were eligible to participate in the Delphi rating process to give some perspective on representation; although later it looks like you have 15% represented, but are there individuals with expertise who may have been excluded? A little more detail on how the characteristics collected among participants compares to the larger membership groups would be helpful if available.

It would help to provide the question presented and what was rated to the tables; in addition to preposition response options in the tables (i.e., tables should be understood on their own).

It would help to also discuss various benefits/limitations for implementation and potential effectiveness of highly rated prepositions. This is mentioned briefly in discussion, but could be expanded upon.

Authors discussed potential bias with ratings. Are there options that may have been "better" but not practical or difficult to use at the moment?

I appreciate the authors discuss potential outcomes; are there other metrics in addition to quality of life measures that could be expected to differ based on various options?

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.

Unable to assess
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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