**Maria feedback A1**

Definetely a pass. Well done. Some comments:

* "The goal of the simulation process was to investigate which model would best describe our real data." More to assess whether the model could recover the true parameter values of the simulation, so that we could trust it more to do the right inference on the real data
* "1.5 with a sd of 0.5 for ASD and 0.3 for TD, the change in MLU for ASD subjects was set to 0.15 with a sd of 0.1, and 0.2 for TD with a sd of 0.08. The error was set to 0.2. The parameters where set on a logscale." You are describing a mix of log and outcome scale
* Looking at the weight of the models in the model comparison, model 3 also has the highest weight (1.00) (explaining most of the variance?) Technically: if we take the variance explained by the three models, there is no variance explained in model 1 and 2 that is not also explained in model 3. But there can still be unexplained variance.
* "If we were to make more informed priors based on the estimates from the fitted model (model 3) in the simulation process". I appreciate you implementing an informed priors approach, really well done. However, I'd like to make a caution very explicit in this context: the informed priors from a simulation are generally a risky choice: you chose the parameter values, and therefore they don't come from data.