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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The proposed article is to check whether econometric assessment instruments could be used to evaluate quality of life for a specific dermatologic disease as melasma.
   Why not validate a existing instrument specific as Melasqol and try relates-it with clinical indices as MASI and facial area affected?
   Introduction long and arduous. Data deleted or placed in the discussion. It is important to remember that the community which will make the reading is dermatological.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Which the real content of the questionnaire for the evaluation of socio demographic data, which really was asked to the patient and as was made this analysis. It was not clear.

3. Are the data sound?
   No, changes are necessary

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   No, changes are necessary

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Socio demographic data are little discussed, as well as its origin. It seems that the correlation between the DLQI and the standard TTO does not exist and therefore not permanence inconclusive.
   The tables are described in the body of the text, this description shall be summarised. The table must have the power to be self explanatory.
   The correlation between mean monthly WTP and WTP in terms of relative monthly income were significantly correlated with the total DLQI score, but very low (only 22%). Therefore, I think that these instruments do not reflect quality of life in melasma.
   In relation to DLQI has not been performed internal consistency to check whether
the population is homogeneous and the better representation of scores would by median and does not mean.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Partly.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
No

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title is long and inadequate. Probably a title shorter would be more appropriate as "WTP and TTO methods in melasma, un Siriraj Hospital, Thailand.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The article needs important changes to be published.

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

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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