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Reviewer's report:

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

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.

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.

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.

3. Mention that you used the package rjags in the text, rather than JAGS

4. In section 3.3.2, you've used the word "significant" again, and it might be better to say "clear"
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