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Reviewer's report:

There are no page numbers on my version, which explains some imprecisions.

This is kind of a frustrating article. At any given point it is well written, fluent, informative, provocative, and very easy to critique. I suggest review and resubmit so that the authors can have an opportunity to join their intelligent writing and useful research with a better explanation of what everybody can get out of it.

1. I just do not understand the logic that binds together the new technologies in question. Is it just that we can't run unlimited Delphi processes, so we might as well lump together quite different things? That strikes me as an honest if unglamorous justification for the juxtaposition of issues that from many perspectives look quite different, such that they wouldn't benefit from being part of the same Delphi process.

2. Methods questions:

   - Why Delphi?

   - What is this "increasingly influential network?" Seems important but I don't understand.

   - What is "framework analysis"- can we at least have a citation if we want to find out what it is and does?

3. Limitations/ external validity questions. Now we know what a carefully interrogated set of Australian elites think. What does this tells about how Australians think, and what does this suggest about how non-Australians would think? The bigger limitation is probably the mass-elite divide rather than the Australian/non-Australian: do elite (informed, engaged) Australians understand non-elite (uninformed, unengaged) Australians?
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