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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper on priority setting for HIV/AIDS interventions in Thailand, using a particular methodology, a discrete choice experiment. The paper is well written and laid out. However, I have some questions on the methodology and comments on the discussion:

How were the PLWHA actually selected? The authors state "The PLWHA were represented by their formal representatives from each region ...". This implies there was one PLWHA organisation representing all of them. Is this in fact the case? How were the other 74 PLWHA selected?

The lay people were represented by health leaders in communities; village health volunteers. Was this all over the country? What about the urban people? I also assume that the prevalence and risk of HIV is not evenly spread across the country. How was region/ethnicity taken into account?

Who conducted the surveys, what training did they have etc?

A key group in actual allocation may be the service providers. Yet this group did not seem to be represented in this study. Perhaps we can have an explanation.

Finally, while the authors state this this experiment is a starting point, how does this approach meld with political science approaches, which focus on competing and sometimes complementary groups/views? How might overlapping and differing views be reconciled?
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