**CREDES checklist items. Selection of experts, definition of consensus and quality of reporting [1]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Transparency and quality of reporting** | | |
| **Item** | **Manuscript Section** | **Page No.** |
| Purpose well defined | Introduction | 2 |
| Rationale for Delphi Selection of experts clearly justified | Methods | 4 |
| Clear description of methods | Methods | 4-5 |
| Flow chart | Methods | 5, Figure 1 |
| Clear definition of consensus | Methods | 5 |
| Pilot test of instruments | Methods | 4 |
| Data analysis clearly justified and reported | Methods | 5 |
| Information of rounds | Methods | 4-5 |
| Transparent reporting of results | Results | 9-11 |
| Discussion of limitations | Discussion | 15 |
| Adequacy of conclusions | Discussion，Conclusions | 15 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Selection criteria expert panel** |  |
| Member of organisation |  |
| Recognised authority | 🗸 |
| Relevant clinical academic expertise | 🗸 |
| Geographical scope | 🗸 |
| Setting/work field | 🗸 |
| Profession/ stakeholder | 🗸 |
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