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Reviewer's report:

The authors evaluated the cost-effectiveness of the ProActive Heart intervention (telephone-delivered coronary heart disease secondary prevention program) compared to usual care. Based on their findings, the authors conclude that the ProActive Heart program is not a cost-effective intervention in the short-term compared to usual care. There was no intervention effect on SF-6D and it resulted in significantly increased costs (mainly due to higher hospitalisation costs for hospitalisations not related to cardiovascular disease). However, the authors suggest that it is important to consider that this higher cost may result in future cost savings, as patients are better monitored and health problems may be identified at an earlier stage resulting in better health outcomes.

The study is part of a series of publications from this program (Ref. 1 and 2). The paper is well written and scientifically accurate. Most major references are included. However there are some issues that remain to be addressed:

The causes of excess hospitalisations in the intervention group are not provided. What are the reasons for more hospitalisations (unrelated to CV causes)?

Which were the driver for such hospitalisations?

It remains highly speculative that “higher costs may result in future cost savings, as patients are better monitored and health problems may be identified at an earlier stage resulting in better health outcomes.” This statement is not supported by data and should be withdrawn.

Is a longer duration of FU planned for this program? This would give some information on this issue.

The authors should make clear that the telephone based intervention is no telemonitoring program. This difference should be discussed thoroughly.

Minor comments:
No references should be included in the abstract section.
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