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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor, dear reviewers,

We would like to thank again the two reviewers for their constructive and thoughtful comments and for the time they have invested in order to help us improve the quality of our manuscript. We are happy that both reviewers apparently like the paper. As you can seen we have fully complied with all requests for revision.

Reviewer 1
The authors have responded sufficiently to my comments. I have just one minor comments (see below)
Conclusion in the abstract

Please rewrite the conclusion in the abstract, and include that the result must be interpreted with caution do to the virtual nature of this study.

Reply: Thank you. This suggestion is now integrated in the revised version:

“This study provides evidence that “medical pluralism” (i.e., the integration of ICHA with conventional treatment) is the norm for people facing both mental or somatic illness. However, our result must be interpreted with caution due to the virtual nature of this study. We suggest that taking attitudes toward
ICH A into account is crucial for a better understanding of patients’ motivation to use ICHA.”

James Green (Reviewer 2)
Thanks for your attention to my prior comments. I think for me the remaining issue I have is with the presentation of the results. I find them hard to read and others may as well. Specifically regarding Table 4

1. The effect regarding employment status are not in the Table, but are described in 3.3.2
Reply: We thank reviewer 2 for making us aware of this point. In fact, to make Table 4 easier to read, we decided not to report the results related to employment status but forgot to mention it clearly in the manuscript. We now pick up this aspect (data not shown) in the body text (see sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3).

2. Part of the difficulty in Table 4 is that there are no descriptive statistics alongside the inferential statistics. I'm aware that the Table is already massive (though there are a number of options, including splitting it in several ways, or moving the credible intervals to supplementary materials, or having the descriptives in a separate table). But from an interpretative point of view, it would be useful to for example, where there is an effect for Strong versus Weak complementary in relation to high versus low frequency of relapse to see the percentage of participants choosing each type of treatment for each of these 4 cells.
3. Beyond this, trying to come up with a more intuitive or graphical way of demonstrating the participants' choices would greatly enhance this paper.
Reply: We thank reviewer 2 for this remark. Accordingly, we have added a new and separate table (Table 4) presenting all descriptive statistics related to both categorical and linear variables. The previous Table 4 is now named Table 5.

More minor points:
1. I think it would be clearer (as now is clear to me) to describe your model as a multilevel multinomial model, to make it clear that these are not separate analyses.
Reply: This is a good suggestion. Thank you. Indeed, this help to avoid any confusion about the statistical analyses. We have reworded the sentence as follows: “The pattern of choice for each vignette was analyzed with multilevel multinomial models using choice pattern as Level 1 and subject as Level 2; the weak complementary option was entered as the reference category.”

2. For Table 4, I didn't mean for you to omit the Pr(OR>1) column, but that bolding the OR column rather than the PR column would make the table easier to read.
Reply: In accordance with the suggestion we have bolded the OR column and remove bolding from the Pr column.

3. Mention that you used the package rjags in the text, rather than JAGS
Reply: Thanks. The required modification has now been performed.

4. In section 3.3.2, you've used the word "significant" again, and it might be better to say "clear"
Reply: We thank reviewer 2 for making us aware of this mistake. We have also carefully checked the whole manuscript, removed the term “significant” and changed it by “clear” at several places.

We would like again to thank the two reviewers for their constructive comments and the Editor for
orchestrating the review process. We hope that both the clarity and the quality of our paper has improved thanks to their constructive comments.

Yours,

Fabrice Berna (on behalf of all authors)