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Reviewer's report:

General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Majors comments:
Introduction need to be more focus and shortened
1) Page 3, para 2 should be at the end with the aim of the study
2) Page 3, para 3 should be in the section method.
3) Page 4, para 2 need to be shortened
4) Page 5, para 2 need to be shortened

Methods Section:
1) Section cost-calculation need to be reworded in order to have a clear picture of how the cost calculations were done.
Sub-section need to be added for clarification and clear reading
2) Thereafter, they should discuss about of the relevance and generability of the cost calculation.
3) Page 9, para 4: They are taking about regular interviews, they should add information about the method used for the regular interview (telephone, questionnaire, etc), what about the number of regular interviews?
4) Page 10, para 4: subsidies for .... give more details.

Results Section:
1) line 256 need to be with the previous para
2) Page 11, line 268 and other, I do not understand this discussion at that point.
3) Page 12, line 281 to 286: such as CE, this is a discussion and a result
4) Page 12, line 286 to 292: They are discussing about the behavioral change, they need to describe the effect (give some number, etc), why there is no method section about the effectiveness was measured, is this a valid measurement?

Discussion Section:
The discussion need to be shortened and need to have a concise focus about the results according the variability, the validity and the tranferrability. How these results could be used for the estimation of CE.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No