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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions - Nil
Discretionary revisions

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?
The study design is appropriate for the research aims.
Line 233 – aim needs re-wording. Also is there an opt out in the design of the DCE? Otherwise how will this aim be answered?

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?
Sufficient details are provided.

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?
Line 215 quantitative. Provides for rank order of importance only. Using nominal group technique allows use of distributing votes for each factor which would identify strength of preference. Suggest using to enhance findings from focus groups.
The DCE analysis is appropriate.

4. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is of a good standard.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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