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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been considerably improved. However, there is one major point from the previous review (point 11) that I still think needs to be adapted. These are my comments:

Comment 10 from the previous review: I still do not get why it is not CHOICE=-1. In Table 2 it is clearly written that CHOICE=-1 corresponds with: 'you cannot choose whether to vaccinate your child with or without the hepatitis B vaccine'. To get the predicted utility value you then have to fill in -1 in the equation to multiply it with the estimated coefficient of CHOICE and not zero as the estimated coefficient is obtained with effects coding. Please also check again the consistency of the variable names used in the Tables and text. E.g. CHO is used in the text, but in Table 2 one uses CHOICE, SIDE is used in the table and SID in the text, INFR in the table, INF in the text etcetera.

Comment 11 from the previous review: This is still not correct. In case of a mixed logit one usually obtains a mean value for the estimated parameter and an associated standard error in case of random parameters. These estimates do not differ between the scenarios within a respondent. So for the described scenario one can calculate one predicted utility value based on the predicted mean parameters and not four. In this way the step for getting the stated preference for vaccination per respondents is also easier, but should be adapted in the manuscript.

Page 7, formulas: The index j, which I assume refers to a given choiceset (within a respondent j) is neither used or explained. In fact, the deterministic part of the utility, V, does not depend on j. V is only a function of the attribute levels with some of the parameters that are constant between respondents and the other ones differ between respondents (as indicated by an index i). It is the random error # and therefore the utility U that should have indices i and j.

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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