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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written paper and the use of conjoint analysis is applicable to answering the research question. This article would be of most importance to health care professionals and regulators in Asia but is also of interest to their counterparts in other countries.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Some researchers are using best-worst scaling (BWS) methods to address a research question like yours. Please include in the background section why conjoint analysis was the better approach over BWS for your study.

2. Please address sample size calculations in the methods and include it in the limitation section if necessary. Was 80 respondents enough for the aggregate model? A sample size of approximately 20 for each country seems small.

3. There were 12 scenarios in total and 11 attributes with 2 levels each. However, given the example choice question shown in Figure 1, how did the authors control for the fact that the same number of strategies did not appear in each plan (Plan A had 5 items and Plan B had 6 items)? Respondents may think the plan with more strategies is better by default.

4. Please mention that the independent variables were categorical and indicate how they were coded (dummy-coded or effects-coded). If dummy-coded, which strategy was the omitted one?

5. Please justify the use of linear probability regression modeling to analyze the data. Most discrete-choice practitioners use random-parameters logit, hierarchical Bayes, or latent-class models in their analysis of choice data.

6. In the aggregate model, I would have expected the inclusion of dummy variables for the sites or stakeholder groups. Please comment on why these were not included.

7. Different methods of survey administration were used: email, phone, or face-to-face interviews. Each of these methods have advantages and disadvantages. If this has not been done, please include some information on testing for differences in the priorities by survey administration method. Please report the summary statistics for the various survey administration methods in Table 3.
8. Did the authors follow best-research practices for conjoint analysis applications in health? If so, please state so and add the correct reference to the reference list.

Discretionary Revisions:
1. Please report the R-squared and any other goodness-of-fit statistics for each model.
2. It may be useful for the reader to know what the total number of strategies evaluated in the previous qualitative study was.
3. Please cite the exact source for the main-effects orthogonal experimental design.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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