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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript of Widmer et al is improved. Several remarks mentioned by the reviewers are revised appropriately. However, there are still some points to clarify:

1) Abstract (background, last sentence): suggest taking this sentence as the second sentence.

2) From my point of view, information provided for Supracycline and Malarone is still too much and also confusing for readers. Why not make some remarks about these drugs in the introduction. If I understand the model correctly, the analysis was run with Mephaquin. Data in the method section should be limited to data which is important for the cost-effectiveness analysis. If Supracycline and Malarone were not evaluated in terms of cost-effectiveness, they should only be mentioned at the beginning or in the discussion part. Maybe I am wrong but in my opinion, the 2 other drugs here are overrepresented. The same is for figure 1. Please clarify.

3) Methods, para 5: There is an additional sentence provided (“because there is no accepted willingness…”). To compare the results of an analysis with other analyses does not require knowledge about willingness to pay. In addition, the authors have compared their results with those of others (discussion). This is confusing.

4) For the probabilistic sensitivity analysis, the authors have chosen a triangular distribution. I am not much experienced in statistical details but this distribution appears to be peculiar in this case. The reason(s) for using a triangular distribution have to be provided.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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