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Reviewer's report:

This is an ambitious project with a great deal of international support. I also think the goals of the project have wide applicability across the globe. The methodology outlined seems comprehensive and appropriate for the aims. I only have 2 comments for consideration:

1. The goal of step 4 (chart review) is to identify the prevalence of certain outcomes for use in powering future trials. I am unclear as to why the data abstraction is limited to Australia and New Zealand. It is not unreasonable to assume that many of these outcome measures will vary significantly across the globe. Since you have access to the entire PERN network, why limit the data collection to just 2 countries (which will likely yield very similar results)?

2. I don't have a lot of experience with Delphi procedures, but I would be a little concerned about the consensus definition. It seems like it would be not unlikely for a measure that is extremely important clinically (ie clinical asthma score) to be removed because it didn't show value to the families. Is it typical to essentially allow "veto power" by both groups? I understand that definition 2 essentially allows one group to over-rule the other if they reach 90% consensus, but that is a pretty high bar. If this methodology has proven successful in the past then it should probably remain as is.
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