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Reviewer's report:

Dear Miss Hayley Hewitt,

Thank you very much for letting me review this manuscript again. I believe the changes to the manuscript proposed by the authors are satisfactory. The authors provided the rationale I was looking for when deciding to base their analysis primarily on the costs. They also changed the emphasis of their conclusions.

I would like a few further changes before this manuscript goes for publication. These are:

1. I believe the authors should change back to "similar" their proposed change to "equal" (abstract and page 14/36 Quality of care section). This reviewer was asking the authors to provide rationale for their interpretation and not asking them to prove or state equal effectiveness.

2. This reviewer would like to see 95% confidence intervals for the differences between study groups in addition to the p-values already presented (Tables 4, 5 and 6). P-values are ok but I believe CIs provide more information.

3. Finally, at the end of Table 3: "The composition of the unit costs per type of hospital visit in euros (2007)" the authors stated that different unit costs were used for each study group (e.g. "The costs of the GDx performed during GFU visits, consists only of the GDx imaging device. In the usual care group, the GDx was performed during an extra visit to the perimetry department. In that situation, the costs of a GDx image included personnel and overhead costs as well and were €61.61 based on a duration of 13.30 minutes"). This difference in the way the authors calculated the unit price for GDx testing is due to the particular way the service is organised in their setting. The authors should provide reassurance that Hospital visit costs difference as well as the Total Hospital Costs difference between groups (Table 5) do not heavily depend on this (e.g. change to not being statistically significant). I would run the analyses using the same unit cost for GDx in both groups to check this up. A couple of lines in the manuscript discussion referring to this should overcome the issue.

Sincerely,
Rodolfo Hernández
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