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Reviewer's report:

This is a manuscript on the preferences of renal transplant patients for receiving their immunosuppressant drugs, in one region of Wales.

Detailed comments are provided as bubble comments in the pdf itself.

The article is well written and organized. Several areas should be improved (see details in manuscript comments):

1. Accuracy of the article title

2. Incorporation of the essential concept of medication adherence regarding this project

3. Clearer and more detailed definitions of some key concepts in the study, especially 'waiting time'

4. Clearer and more compelling objective. currently it is weak to the point of appearing to be a methodology (DCE) in search of usefulness in some clinical group. What was the real purpose of this study? it is not at all clear.

5. Better description of the focus group - both methods and results, as this appears to form the backbone of the DCE itself.

6. Better description of the utilities, in Methods, Results and Discussion.

7. Currently the major problem with this manuscript is generalizability. This study was carried out in a small region in one of the small countries in the UK. What generalizability does this have to, for example, the much larger geography challenges of Canada or the USA? In addition, since community pharmacy home delivery is routine in North America, what is the international message from this work?
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