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Reviewer’s report:

A Cost-Consequences analysis of the effect of Pregabalin in the treatment of peripheral Neuropathic Pain under medical practice conditions in Primary Care settings
Navarro et al
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes
3. Are the data sound?
   Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   No – there are some clarifications to be made.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   For the most part – there are still some errors requiring repair
The below represent Major Compulsory Revisions
Suggestions:
Abstract
“Methods: PCS included subjects above” should be “Methods: Subjects from PCS were older than”

Introduction
“All of this influencing the” should be “All of this influences the”
“alpha2-delta ligand that displays analgesic” should be “alpha2-delta ligand of voltage gated calcium channels that displays analgesic”
“naturalistic” should be “real world”

Methods
How was the decision made to use PGB or not to use PGB for each subject?
Who paid for the PGB or non-PGB for each subject?
What is the LIDO Study?
Why was a blinded study not performed? Were there particular reasons for this?
The measurement of % of labour disability is extremely subjective and has limitations which need to be discussed.
What survey tool was used to capture health care resource utilization?
Was the analysis performed by Pfizer or was this at arm’s length?
With such a large percentage of patients not working, how reliable is the use of work-related cost measurements?
What is metamizol? I realize that this is an NSAID, but many British and North American readers will not recognize this.

Discussion
“capture out-of pocked cost” should be “capture out-of pocket cost”

Table 1
How was the cost per lost-workday arrived at? What typical daily salary was used to derive this? Did this use white collar and blue collar incomes?

Table 2
P2 looks like p squared rather than p with a reference number – please modify

What were the non-PGB treatments used? This is not clarified in any location in terms of frequency of use.

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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