Reviewer's report

Title: Measuring the Costs of Outreach Motivational Interviewing for Smoking-Cessation and Relapse-Prevention Among Low-Income Pregnant Women

Version: 4 Date: 19 May 2009

Reviewer: Pierre Alexandre

Reviewer's report:

Measuring the Cost of Outreach Motivational Interviewing for Smoking-Cessation and Relapse-Prevention among Low-Income Pregnant Women.

The present article uses a micro-costing system to estimate resource costs of outreach motivational interviewing for smoking-cessation and relapse-prevention among low-income pregnant women and report results from a randomized controlled trial employing the method. This paper can potentially makes significant contributions to the literature, but there are several significant weaknesses that need to be addressed.

1- The literature review is weak. There are publications on costs associated with smoking as well as detailed methods on how to estimate costs when conducting RCT. Moreover, this paper is on cost measurement and the authors seem to ignore most of the economic literature on cost issues.

2- The title of the paper refers to … low-income pregnant women. When allocating salaries and wages to estimate time costs for patients, it is important to have socio-economic data on the individuals, including age, education, employment, ect. The authors should provide a section describing the samples of the study. We also need to know more about the RCT; at least the authors should provide published references where we can read more about the RCT.

3- Throughout the paper the authors refer to the societal perspective of the estimation. The relevance of the discussion is not clear. Are the estimates based on that perspective? Future costs savings discussed on page 13 do not seem to enter the result calculations and I do not understand the relevance. Something seems to be missing. On page 10, there is discussion about extending the cost analysis to the societal perspective by including next resource costs, but it does not seem to incorporate any of these items into the results.

4- Finally, it might help to conduct a sensitivity analysis of the results and if this is not important please discuss.

Minor Issues

a) Background section: Provide reference for “Smoking imposes …… life at low costs”

b) Not sufficient to note that for low-income women, we used the minimum wage. Please report the number used.
c) Page 14; use ‘adjusted’ instead of ‘updated’
d) Discussion: Please discuss policy implications of the findings.

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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