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Reviewer’s report:

General

I appreciate the work that the authors have applied to revision of this manuscript. They have provided material addressing each of the reviewer comments. With respect to Comments 3, 4, 5, and 6, I believe that their responses have adequately addressed the comments. With respect to Comments 1 and 2, I am suggesting some limited additional revisions.

---------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I am categorizing these revisions as Major because they were addressed as Major revisions in the first set of comments. These are not extensive revisions. I am recommending, however, they be made before publication. When these revisions are incorporated, I will support publication of the manuscript.

The first revision concerns Comment 1. The authors indicated that the issue of control and intervention strategies was addressed in the second paragraph of the Results section. I did not see the wording concerning control and intervention strategies in this paragraph. The authors’ language needs to appear in this section.

With respect to Comment 2, the authors have added a sentence concerning the estimated savings produced by the project. I believe that this subject deserves more than a single sentence. I suggest that the authors translate their methodology in calculating the savings into a single paragraph and add it to the Results section.

---------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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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