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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   We would like to know how they calculate their sample size and the process of cluster sampling with 4 sub categories their sample size with the geographical condition such as deserve, mountain...for share their experiences with us. That help us to understand their estimation and inference in their conclusions. They use the questionnaires to collect the economical data that is seem be they need telling us how they solve the recall bias and have a truth data almost in the profit area (that is still deal with secret in business). The questionnaire only pretested in the health level but how about the 3 others subcategories such as trustee, location, capacity that raise a question about the homogeneity of this set of questionnaire. 53/207 (#25%) health facilities drop out to their analysis due to quality of data could be due to the quality of questionnaire. How long they need to get through one set of questionnaire?

3. Are the data sound?
   Lack of many table for economical research that make so hard to follow. That seem be they combine between primary from survey and secondary data (from document of government) if not that means we have a confuse. We do not see the result of survey >1300 patients in target area.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   “Our study demonstrates that the high costs of private facilities is – at least partly – a consequence of low utilization and, thus, could be reduced if the Government of Kenya decided to pay for essential health care services irrespective of the owner of the health care institution.”
   This part of discussion seem be less support by data in this study.
The private sector institutions are significantly more heterogeneous than the public sector with costs for services varying widely. It can only be hypothesised that this is mirrored in the variability of quality, but further studies need to be undertaken to validate this claim. This paragraph in the conclusion seems to match with the paragraph in the discussion above.

We confuse that seems to be the combination of differences studies in the medical economic field of Kenya. And there are subjective idea and suggestion like in policy research.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Not mentioned enough.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
“Concluding from this, health care reforms are required to focus on regulating and strengthening private-for-profit providers” conclusion in the abstract do not match with conclusion in the full text.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
In the discussion the author included their suggestion before their discussion p 16. In budget impact this will be impressive if they give us the GDP and compare with the other countries in Africa and developed. We are interesting in the impact of investment the health resources we are impressing if the author confirm that Kenya have the same situation with the other developing countries such as there is the gap in the use of health resources between the poor and the rich, urban area and rural area, different levels of the health care. Beside of these finding whether Kenya have their situation, problems. We would like to have the data direct cost from 3 common diseases based on their data of morbidity and 3 specifics disease because this is seem be the deal with the situation of overload patient at central

They could have the problem with health care man power that means the good quality doctor concentrate in private and highest level of health care and they are influence by economical impact by abuse of high technology in diagnosis and managements their patients.

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

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