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**Reviewer's report:**

I am happy with the author's clarification of the properties of the design of the study.

**MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS**

The other major point I made in my first review - namely the interpretation of the attribute impacts - has not been addressed as per my recommendation. The relative importance column in Table 2 is not a theoretically justified method of measuring attribute impact (unless the authors can clearly reference a theoretical paper that justifies this). Whilst the main effects model used here means the ordering of the 6 differences in utilities can be read straight from the point estimates, the calculation of such percentages in the final column has no basis in theory (to my knowledge). If the authors wish to make statements on a ratio scale, they must use predicted probability analysis as per Lancsar et al.

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS**

Figure 6 appears to be just a repeat of the regression results and is unnecessary.

Regarding the rating scale responses the authors should note that rating scales do not incorporate the trade-offs inherent in real-life decision-making and should also note the growing literature that has found differences in how people use rating scales, e.g.
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