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Reviewer's report:

General
With respect to the second point raised by this reviewer, the authors have added material to a paragraph concerning the estimated savings produced by the project. This paragraph contains a simplified approach for estimating project savings and is acceptable.

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

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)
This reviewer has still encountered some problems identifying a response to comment #1. The material referenced by the authors appears to be in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Results section. The authors have adequately described their strategy for data abstraction across the sites of the study. I would still suggest that the authors state that there were no control or intervention strategies in the study. This could be done in one sentence.

What next?: Accept after discretionary 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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