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Reviewer's report:

Comments to authors:

The study describes a Pilot Best-Worst Discrete Choice Experiment to explore how men's preferences of receiving diet and physical activity advice following surgery for localised prostate cancer. Overall I thought that the paper was well laid out and the Best-Worst Discrete Choice Experiment of sound concept. I do however think that more details could be included to make the study clearer to the reader. Nevertheless, I feel that these changes are minor and would recommend publication of the manuscript once the comments presented below have been addressed.

1. The authors should consider adding in some additional details on study design and population to the abstract, such as the age group. The authors state that this is a cross-sectional pilot study which was nested within a feasibility RCT. This would be useful information to have in the abstract.

2. In the introduction the authors discuss the use of econometric analysis and an out-of-pocket cost attribute (Pg. 5; Ln. 104-106). Some additional information and references on these would be of use to readers.

3. The authors state that the participants were diagnosed with localised (low risk) prostate cancer (Pg. 5; Ln. 127). Is there a standardised definition for this?

4. The authors use the wording "attribute is no longer attractive" (Pg. 6; Ln. 144). Could the authors explain this more or standardise the wording against what is used in the results/discussion sections.

5. The authors state that they "create a set of questions using a d-efficient design created in NGene" (Pg. 6; Ln. 147), could this be explained in more detail?

6. The authors use the wording "simplifying heuristics" (Pg. 7; Ln. 176), and "heteroscedastic" (Pg. 8; Ln. 183), could this be explained in more detail?

7. The authors talk about "econometric analysis" in the introduction, was this type of analysis conducted?
General comments

1. Standardise the use of follow-up versus follow up

2. Standardise the use of numbers versus words (i.e. 6 versus six)
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