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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The use of so many acronyms in this paper makes it so hard to read. I would argue that only internationally accepted acronyms such as UK and NHS be used and that no methodological acronyms (DCE, WLS) or substantive acronyms (GPSI).

I know that many use the term dicrete choice experiements, but I think that the authors should also use the more general term conjoint analysis. For me these are both forms of conjoint analysis.

The paper is very verbose for applying a simple comparison of two methods (especially the abstract). Cutting back about 30-40% of the text would make the point of the paper so much more apparient.

Minor Essential Revisions

The tables are poorly organised, one really needs only the coefficient and something to so with the standard error (the standard error itself, the t-statistic, the P-value or the confidence interval). Using all looks like the auhtors have just cut and pasted everything from their output.

What types of standard errors are being reported? Would it be suitable to make Hubar-White corrections?

Discretionary Revisions

NA

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the
statistics.
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