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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors make an excellent justification for the publication of these data in their introduction. Such detailed costing studies are a useful addition to the literature for the reasons they give. I would like to see two additions (see below) to the paper before it is published, which should be very easy for the authors to do.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. It would be very helpful to have an overview of what the Hartslag Limburg prevention programme entailed in the introduction. A reference is given, but no details are provided. It is essential to have a description of the programme. As the authors state in their justification, community programmes comprise large and complex interventions, and without some description of what type of programme this is, it is not clear to the reader whether or not this is relevant to their own programmes. For example, table one lists the 21 types of major intervention, but it is not clear to me how they were derived at, who decided to use them etc.

2. The methods gives a description of their philosophy of collecting cost data, but it does not actually explain how they collected costs. This detail must be provided. For example, the cost of a nutrition party is given as 399 euros. Table 3 provides the detail that presumably allowed this cost to be calculated, but it is not stated in the methods how this was done.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. P4: the authors refer to three justifications for publishing detailed costing studies. Better sign-posting would make it clearer what the three justifications are - perhaps list them all up front, and then a para on each? (the actual justifications are sound and clear)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research
interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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