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October 9th 2014

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please consider the re-submission of the enclosed research paper following final minor comments from the editor - The cost of anal cancer in England: retrospective hospital data analysis and Markov model. Responses to the comments can be found on the following pages.

Competing Interests:

SK and SC are employees of Sanofi Pasteur MSD. MT and ST are employees of Pharmerit Ltd, which has received funding from Sanofi Pasteur MSD. KN and SOD have received honoraria for attended advisory boards run by Sanofi Pasteur MSD.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Tempest

Research Consultant
Minor Essential Revisions

1. Could you please add a table to the paper, or make clear in another way, what the values were that you used for the one-way sensitivity analysis of which the results are presented in figure 4? Ideally, a figure should be interpretable as a stand-alone item, so adding it in there would be better still, if you can. But at least the information should be in the paper itself, rather than only in the appendix.

Response – Table 3 has been added to the paper including the upper and lower values implemented in the one-way sensitivity analysis and cross-referenced within the text. Upper and lower values have been included in the figure (4) where possible.

2. Also, could you briefly explain in the paper itself why you did not apply discount rates? Both reviewers asked about that, and doubtless, other readers will, too

Response – addition of text “The aim of our approach was to estimate realised costs as opposed to modelling an investment decision, therefore discounting was deemed to be inappropriate.”