Reviewer’s report

Title: Prostate Cancer Survivors Preferences on the Delivery of Diet and Lifestyle Advice. A Pilot Best-Worst Discrete Choice Experiment

Version: 0 Date: 06 May 2019

Reviewer: Ayse Kuspinar

Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written and worthwhile study. There are a few suggestions to improve the manuscript for readers:

- Clarifying whether each questionnaire included the same 12 scenarios and providing further information on how these were exactly selected.

- Providing further information on how out of pocket/indirect cost of receiving information were determined for the scenarios.

- What were the response options for the 3 questions: 1) how difficult they found making choices; 2) whether they used all attributes in their decision; and 3) which attribute they found most important in their decision?

- Further discussion on the point "further work might need to evaluate the reliability of the BWDCE"

- Discussion regarding the implications of sample size on their findings. Could it have an impact on whether a level of an attribute reached statistical significance or not?

Minor typo:

- We conducted a pilot best-worst discrete choice experiment questionnaire to explore how men's preferences of receiving diet and physical activity advice following surgery for localised prostate cancer…remove 'how'
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