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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)

Abstract: You should have more details in the methods section regarding the target of population, type of intervention and finally the costing calculation

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

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

Page 5, para 2, line 1,2,3,4: I am wondering of the pertinence of this section.

Page 5. The section Background: Instead of using the word 'background' I suggest to use Methods.

Thereafter, I suggest these changes for the sections in the Methods part:
1- Target population
2- Development of community programme
3- cost calculation
3.1- Identification
3.2- Quantification
3.3 Valuation
4- Statistical analysis: such as descriptive analyses

Page 8, Para 8: These three phase are discussed...: Is this an useful sentence?

Page 11, para 4, The prices of the material... : You should add a reference

Page 12, para 3, line 11: A sentence never start with a number.

Page 13, para 5: List the three most expensive interventions.

Page 15, para 5: You certainly have other desavantages such as the generalibility to other countries, etc.

Page 16, para 2, line 1,2,3: Is this relevant for the present study?
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No