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Reviewer's report:

This is a nice and well written article.

Major Compulsory revisions:
- I would suggest to discuss also the following point: if instead of the different weights of the criteria equal weighting is used an overall value estimate that is very closed to 0.48 is found. What does this mean? This probably has to do with the use of the five point scale and/or the large number of criteria.
- p5, line 22/23: 'DCE ... participants'; please provide references and/or more explanation for this statement.
- Check Fig A and especially fig B (from the additional files) as it seems that sometimes weights or performance scores are given that are below the cut off point.
- On page 17 (line 1 - 9) : this text fits more in the results section. In general I advise to carefully reread the discussion and results and strive for redundancy.
- Add a line in Figure 1 to display the equal weight (one divided by 14).
- the lines that are given in Figure 1, Figure 2 and 3 are these confidence bounds or standard errors. And do they display the variation in the individual values or are they based on the standard errors of the mean?
- Why do the values in Figure 3 not count up to the overall value estimate?

Minor Essential revisions:
- please use in the text and Table 2 only one decimal for percentages.
- please use 'Table' and 'Figure' instead of 'table' and 'figure'.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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