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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for the review of my manuscript. Please see below the changes we have implemented for your consideration.

I have updated the title and authors contributions.

Attach a SPIRIT checklist- Please see attached

Would you be able to be more specific about the target number of participants from each stakeholder group you intend to invite to 1) the Delphi survey and 2) the consensus meeting? Sampling for the latter is particularly important unless analysis stratified by stakeholder group is intended also for the consensus meeting. If the analysis is done as a single heterogeneous group then a stakeholder group with a larger number may drown out the opinions of other stakeholder groups-

We have addressed this now by proving greater clarification on our aims with regard to sample size and by introducing a section on who we will ensure that public important outcomes are less likely to be overwhelmed by other groups (pages 9 & 10)
Please explain why pregnant women are excluded- Amended with thanks pg 6

Consider simplifying/clarifying the criteria for the outcomes to be included in round three. The description "…by 15% or less of respondents in round 2” is not immediately obvious-

We accept the reviewers reservations however this is a criteria that has been suggested in other protocols and follows the guidance of the COMET handbook, therefore we have not changed this text.

Consistency of terms - are healthcare professionals (p8 line 20) and practitioners (p8 line 36) the same? The use of 'key stakeholders' and 'stakeholders' implies that there are some stakeholders that are more critical to the process than others, if so can this be described or the description of the stakeholders made consistent

We feel that all stakeholders are equal so will refer to them as stakeholders and will remove all references to Key Stakeholders.

We hope that we have addressed all your queries and do not hesitate to contact me if you seek further clarification.

Kind Regards,

Sinead