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Reviewer’s report:

A well written and interesting article. It would be strengthened however, if the difference in weights noted was linked in some way to the methodological design choices. Was there any trend noticed in terms of e.g. respondent panel and higher or lower weights? Were the weights consistently high in some studies or were there differences in ranking.

There is some discussion regarding the use of weights based on trade-off as opposed to valuation. In some cases, e.g global disability weights study, trade-off was used in a more limited sample and paired comparisons were used in the large sample. This combination of methods should be noted.

The major weakness of the paper seems to be the lack of critique of the studies and the conclusions do not really guide anyone who wishes to choose an appropriate set of weights. I would like to see more analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches documented, but this may be beyond the scope of this paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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