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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for your further consideration and the chance to do minor corrections. I apologise if the previous response and the changes to the manuscript were challenging to evaluate; the reduction was meant to be helpful. Regarding the comment that some of my responses were hostile, I do apologise for that. Reading them back again I can see that they could be construed as passive aggressive, however I did not mean them in that way. I have autism and unless I have sufficient time to consider my responses (which I did not), what is meant to be matter of fact can, I appreciate, come across as hostile. So apologies for that. I would appreciate it if my disclosure here was not included in any material the public can see as it is highly personal, thank you.

1. Figure 1 was unnecessary and can be explained in the text. As a general guide if it would take up less room to fully explain what the figure presents in manuscript text then in most cases it is better to just present it as part of the manuscript text.

I agree. The figure was already fully described in the text. If I recall correctly, I added the figure in a revision to make it easier to understand the flow of the study at a glance because the reviewers were unclear about the design. I have removed it without any text amendment except the reference to it.

Table 2 is not a table and could be included in the text

I have incorporated table 2 into table 1. I hope this is OK, I actually feel it is helpful. I felt that if I incorporated it into the text then I would also have to explain table 1 in the text at length to avoid imbalance, and I did not feel that was appropriate. I appreciate that the reviewers all considered that the DCE needed to be better placed within the context of the larger study, since this influenced it. However we had originally tried to avoid adding too much detail from the rest of the study to avoid detracting from the DCE.

Table 4 is not a table and I would recommend including it as supplementary information.

Removed to supplementary information as suggested.
For Table 12, use an alphanumeric indicator rather than colour to indicate Level of Agreement and remove the key.

Amended as requested and now table 10

My personal preference is to avoid unannotated screenshots in manuscripts. Consider moving these to supplementary material or improve the layout and readability on screen.

I have annotated the screenshots and enlarged the shots in the hope that this avoids them becoming supplementary material, but I appreciate that some of the text is still hard to read.

Improve the consistency of the use of "DCE" and "Discrete choice experiment" - typically after the first use of the term the acronym would be provided and then used throughout the manuscript. There is a mix of the use of the terms and the acronym throughout.

Thanks for spotting this, have amended throughout.

Check spacing near "p.p." (the use of "percentage points" in this format is unfamiliar to me but I am going to assume it is standard in the area; if it isn't please modify).

It is indeed standard; I have checked the spacing, thank you for spotting. I have amended the spacing where it was wrong.

While I agree that DCEs are a very useful tool, I recommend avoiding the use of the word "very" in scientific writing.

I agree! I have removed.

While formatting is less important, it is worth being consistent with the justification of the text in the manuscript. It is often easier to use left-justified text throughout to make it easier to spot erroneous spacing.

I agree! Thank you for spotting this, I think the inconsistency arose from the two leads working on amendments separately and having different spacing preferences; I have left-justified all the text.

Going through the reviewers' previous comments I thought it was entirely reasonable to suggest the inclusion of other references related to dashboards. A systematic review of published work on dashboards (and an update from the authors) could be used to show that there has been little or no work in the same space previously. For example, where the designs of these dashboards were informed by formal user-centred design methods (where the reviewer is an expert), it is likely that they would have been described in the articles included in the systematic review. A quick summary of the methods that were described in these articles would be an excellent way to place the work in context, to provide reasonable evidence of a lack of previous work in the area, and to establish the need for the approach presented in the manuscript (as an aside, remember it would be very rare for readers/reviewers to complain about an article having too many references!)
I have now added some text to cover this and hope that it suffices. I did not include articles from the review because it was the review itself that provided useful context i.e. the synthesis of the state of the art. This review considered aspects of design as an aim, but only to collate them whereas our review considered studies that specifically tested different designs. For clarity I have also added this to the text also. I hope this is all OK.