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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study about an underestimated issue. The model appears to be comprehensive and appropriate. Although the style is scientific and the manuscript is well understandable, from my point of view, various sections are too long. For example, some aspects in the method section are mentioned both in tables and in text. Not for all of the data provided in tables additional information in written form is needed. The manuscript should be thoroughly revised because redundant aspects were found in all sections.

Before the manuscript can be recommended for publication, several points have to be clarified (see points 3 and 4 which I did not understand with the information provided).

1) Methods, study design, para 5 (“To make the model probabilistic…”): the model was probabilistic by applying triangular distributions. Why the authors had not performed a probabilistic sensitivity analysis running all variables simultaneously? This would be an appropriate method to confirm the robustness of the results. Or: why the model was made probabilistic if no probabilistic sensitivity analysis was performed.

2) Methods, analysis, para 2: the sentence “The lower the ICER, the more cost-effective the intervention” is dispensable.

3) What is the reason for providing details on Supracycline and Malarone although the analysis is made for cheaper Mefloquine. From my point of view, this makes only sense if a cost-effectiveness ratio is provided for all drugs in the base-case. Otherwise, it is sufficient to mention these drugs as more expensive therapeutic options. Providing detailed data such as in table 2 is confusing.

4) Strengths and weaknesses, para 4: “In our model we considered the three recommended …agents”. This also is a little bit confusing. If I understood the authors right, the analysis was performed only for Mefloquine? At least this is stated (for example in the abstract). I think more information is needed here.

5) Sensitivity analysis, para 2: it should be “cost saving and more effective” (not efficient)

5) The term willingness to pay is mentioned first in the conclusion section at the end of the manuscript. This point should be discussed earlier.

6) Table 1 and 2: While in table 1 the direct costs of mefloquine for 2 weeks in the 80% strategy are €17.77, in table 2 these costs are €4.20. What is the reason
for this difference?

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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