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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for your thorough attention to the comments that were initially provided in your article’s review. It is evident that you have strongly considered the points raised and have truly aimed to address all relevant comments in your revisions. My remaining comments are outlined below:

# Major Compulsory Revisions--the author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example additional necessary experiments or controls statistical mistakes errors in interpretation.

- The review and inclusion of the statistical theory underlying DCEs provides helpful context and proper attribution of previous work in this area. However, the equation included under “Data collection and analysis” paragraph six seems to be a probability distribution function of the utility of i and does fully reflect the probability that an individual choses option i from a set of two options (e.g. probability that the utility of i exceeds the utility of an alternate choice j). In this case, it might actually be best to leave the equation out entirely as you refer to the theory literature and have included a written summary.

- The willingness to pay (WTP) seems to be a marginal rate of substitution (MRS) calculation, dividing the marginal utility of an attribute over the marginal utility of the salary attribute (utilizing conditional logit beta coefficients as marginal attribute estimations). Interpretation of MRS results can be clear when continuous variables are being considered, however, the interpretation has limitations when applied to noncontinuous
variables such as the attribute levels in consideration in the study. Please include a discussion on the limitation of utilizing MRS in determining WTP estimates.

- When reporting WTP in all relevant areas of the article, please include confidence intervals. While these are provided in the table, it is very helpful to have them in the article’s text as well to help ensure more accurate inferences made on differences in point estimates vs. statistically significant differences. This particularly applies to the “Willingness to Pay” section, where it is not made evident that many of the attribute WTPs are not statistically different from each other and examples utilizing the estimates are only relevant for WTPs that are different from one another and different from 0.

- The explanation included in the cover letter of why two housing-related attributes were included provided helpful context. Including a brief discussion of this would add to the discussion as readers may also wonder about whether those attributes are truly discrete and practical policy implications from the inclusion of both attributes.

- Please include a brief discussion of alternative models for analyzing DCE responses by subgroup (i.e. transforming data, obtaining separate conditional logit regressions for subgroups, and conducting Wald tests for true differences), why the models using interaction terms were used instead of other approaches, and the possible limitations and strengths of this method.

# Minor Essential Revisions—the author can be trusted to make these. For example missing labels on figures the wrong use of a term spelling mistakes.

- In tables 3-7, please include the n values for all overall and subgroup estimates.

# Discretionary Revisions—these are recommendations for improvement which the author can
choose to ignore. For example clarifications data that would be useful but not essential.

- None

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report bearing your name that will be passed on to the authors and published on the website if the article is accepted.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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