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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We are pleased to offer our resubmitted and revised article, ‘Exploring the feasibility of Conjoint Analysis as a tool for prioritising innovations for implementation’ for consideration for publication in Implementation Science. We would like to thank both reviewers for their helpful advice and supportive comments. We have made the following amendments to the manuscript and hope that these meet your requirements for publication.

Reviewer A (Scott)

1. There was a lack of clarity in the terms used to refer to ‘innovations’. We agree with the reviewer and have amended the text where necessary (see tracked changes).

2. Recommendation that the abstract be revised to contain more detail. This has been amended for clarity.

3. There was some uncertainty about the exact nature of the innovation selected using conjoint analysis. We have added to this section to clarify what the innovation was (top of page 12, final paragraph before discussion).

4. We were asked to be more descriptive in the final sentence of the abstract. We have made changes to this section of the abstract and hope that this meets the reviewer’s requirements.

5. Page 7 incorrect reference (Grimshaw et al) has been corrected.

6. We were asked to clarify the use of a mixed paper and electronic data collection process and to explain the innovations (A and B) in table 6 (page 11). We have added sentences to the methods section that we hope clarifies our methodology (page 8).

7. We agree that the notion of preference stability is interesting and have expanded the discussion of this potential limitation on page 13 with reference to the literature.

Reviewer B (Hauck)
1. The reviewer requested some mention of competing quantitative evaluation methods. We have added a discussion of alternative methods on page 12.

2. 
   a. Request for more detail about the experimental design. The authors have added reference to the experimental design used in the analysis (page 8).

   b. It was unclear what type of conjoint design was used (ranking/rating/choice). We used a rating-based design in which innovations were individually rated on a seven point scale. Reference to ‘innovation A and B’ is included to illustrate differences between innovations. We have added sentences to clarify this on Pg 8 (stage 4)

   c. The specification of the model was unclear. A paragraph has been added under stage 5 on page 9.

   d. Impact of subjective process of scoring interventions. We agree that this is a subjective process and would affect the outcomes of the analysis. In a future paper we intend to address the impact of changing these values. We have expanded explanation of this in Stage 6 on page 9.

3. We were asked to explain why additional influential factors were not included as attributes (page 10, following table 5). This has been amended on page 11.

4. Lack of variation in attribute value. This has been discussed in greater detail following table 3 (page 10)

5. Lack of reference to ‘usual standard of care’. Whilst we acknowledge the reviewer’s comments about care as usual, in this context the status quo was not a policy option and so the use as a reference point was precluded.