```
\begin{split} & Syntax \\ & design \\ & ; alts(M1) = alt1^*, \ alt2^* \\ & ; rows = 12 \\ & ; eff = M1(mnl, \ d, \ mean) \\ & ; bdraws = halton(250) \\ & ; model(m1): \\ & U(alt1) = a.dummy[(n,-0.4,0.1)|(n,-0.6,0.15)]*A[1,2,0] + b[(n,-0.0002,0.00005)] \\ & *B[0,100,300,500] + c.dummy[(n,-0.1,0.025)|(n,-0.1,0.025)|(n,-0.1,0.025)]*C[1,2,3,0] + d.dummy[(u,-0.05,0.05)|(u,-0.05,0.05)]*D[1,2,0] / \\ & U(alt2) = a.dummy * A + b * B + c.dummy * C + d.dummy * D \$ \end{split}
```

	Attribute & Levels	Reasoning based on expert & patient interviews
a^1	Tooth loss within next 10 years	Patients disliked loosing teeth in comparison to
	0= no tooth loss	not losing teeth. Losing two teeth was also
	1= 1 tooth lost	assumed to be less desirable than losing one
	2= 2 teeth lost	tooth. Since tooth loss was assumed to be the
		most important attribute, it has the highest
		(negative) priors.
b^1	Own costs for treatment, follow-up	Costs were expected to be associated with a
	care and re-treatment per year	decrease in utility. This decrease was expected to
	(in Euro)	be low based on patient interviews.
c^1	Complaints & symptoms	Patients disliked having symptoms and
	0= no complaints	complaints in comparison to being free of
	1= occasional gum bleeding	complaints. Interviews did not reveal any
	2= "long teeth" due to gum recession	particular preference order regarding the selected
	3= sensitive tooth necks	symptoms and complaints.
d	Frequency of periodontist visits	Patients did not like periodontist visits, but since
	0= none necessary	they considered them important, no particular
	1= 4 x per year	preference trends could be identified. Therefore a
	2= 2 x per year	uniform Distribution around zero was assumed
		for this attribute or levels, respectively.

¹a normal distribution was assumed for preferences, the standard deviations were chosen to be ¹/₄ of the assumed coefficient