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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed my concerns in a satisfactory way. I only have some questions still with respect to the opt-out, and the randomness of the intercept.

As regards the opt-out questions the authors should describe the percentages of respondents who chose the opt-out. The opt-out was actually included in the model (U opt-out=0). So am I right that if respondents chose Situation 1, but chose the opt-out as well, that this was included in the model as opt-out =1 (=chosen), and Situation 1 and 2 as = 0 (=not chosen). This means that the constant in the model represents a general positive (constant is positive) or negative (constant is negative) attitude towards using EMS, irrespective of the attribute levels. Can I assume that physicians were generally neutral towards the use of EMS as the constant was not significant, and nurses were generally positive towards the use of EMS? This seems strange as slightly more nurses chose the opt-out than physicians did. The authors should address how the opt-out was included in the estimation of the mode, and what this means for interpretation of the model.

The author's response to my question about the randomness of the intercept is that the SD of the intercept is significant. I think this is a mistake. The intercept is indeed significant in the nurses group, but the SD of the intercept is not (Table 4, last row).
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