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Reviewer's report:

I'd like to thank the authors for their responses. They have addressed many items well. However, my major concern is still the paper's organisation. I think a clearer organisation of the paper is still needed.

Please see below a few points requiring more clarity:

* I'm still a bit confused about the presentation of the data collection activities (presented before the methods part). The methods are presented in a confused way with their outcomes leading to the presentation of DCE.

* The paper states that "due to a lack of previous work in the field of healthcare dashboard feature preferences". Could authors please provide evidence that there is a lack of previous work in this area? A quick search on Google Scholar can give the following review on healthcare dashboards: Dowding, D., Randell, R., Gardner, P., Fitzpatrick, G., Dykes, P., Favela, J., ... &amp; Currie, L. (2015). Dashboards for improving patient care: review of the literature. International journal of medical informatics, 84(2), 87-100.

* The following sentence on P3 is not clear: "We confirmed a gap in methodology in conversations with other researchers in a 'learning set' set up to foster collaboration between research teams developing similar systems and funded, as we were, by the UK National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)."

* The following statement is still not helpful and not convincing. "The use of the terms 'mainly' and 'implies' bring ambiguity to the contribution formulation. The contribution is in the use of a structured way in creating and evaluating dashboards that is mainly guided by the steps of the DCE which implies the identification of attributes and levels, as well as the data collection and analysis of respondents' preferences."

* The following point was not addressed sufficiently. There are still not enough details. Are these activities supposed to be formal methods? If so, more precise descriptions are needed "Cognitive interviews with two stakeholders were performed to get feedback on features and potential prices (no details on this)."

* The following new section is not helpful. Another data collection activity with imprecise descriptions and outcomes: "Synthesising the DCE results with those from previous and subsequent stages of the PRESENT project"
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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