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**Reviewer's report:**


2. I believe that the inclusion of some comment in introduction or discussions about Nixon BMJ. Jun 30, 2001; 322(7302): 1596–1598 paper might improve the paper discussion. This paper from Nixon discusses about the relative merits of commonly used methods and to offer a new descriptive approach that makes interpreting the evidence easier for decision makers who require a clear overview of the findings.

3. On page number 6, row 159 there is a missing C, SO the right wording should be: \( C(u,1)=u \) and \( C(1,v)=v \)

4. On the same page there is a mistake in row 141. It should be:  
   \[ C(u2,v2)-C(u2,v1)-C(u1,v2)+C(u1,v1) \neq 0. \]

5. As part of the methods chapters, (on page 10 mainly), there is a description about the use of willingness to pay thresholds. This is a “hot topic” among health economists and it would be good to introduce short description about what these thresholds are and about its usefulness in resource allocation processes.

6. As part of the discussion in lines 363 and 364, the authors stated that the measurements for calculating the net monetary benefits to make calculations should be done by using bootstrap in case of have access to individual patient data and with Monte Carlo Simulations when patient data level are not accessible. This is true, but there should be better to reference that statement with appropriate references and to go explain in a more detailed way.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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