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Reviewer’s report:

I provided editorial and peer review comments in my earlier review (pasted below). I consider that authors have responded to my peer review comments and made any changes where appropriate. I think the article should be accepted.

General

Trials policy asks that all protocols attach a completed SPIRIT checklist. I realise that COS-STAD is more relevant here, and there is a protocols checklist in the pipeline from the COMET group too. Nonetheless, for the time being please complete and attach a SPIRIT checklist.

All ethics and funding documents are appropriate and supplied as requested.

Methods

The protocol follows the recommendations from the COS-STAD statement and guidance from the COMET Handbook closely.

Good to see that the systematic review study type inclusion criteria and 10-year time limits takes a pragmatic approach rather than over-inclusive.

Stakeholders involved in the Delphi are justified and appropriate.

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.

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field
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Acceptable

Quality of figures
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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