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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor essential revisions
1. IT is important to have a section defining all important terms and their implications for CEA. These include terms such as sensitivity, specificity, predictive value (both negative and positive) of a screening test and how these influence the results of the cost-effectiveness analysis. This will make the article more readable and accessible to all concerned.

2. Given the lack of consistency in the critical assumptions (e.g. different assumptions on specificity) and measurement of costs and effectiveness, it is important to discuss the limitations of the review study. Moreover, what is the authors' critical opinion on the evidence presented using different assumptions?

3. Repetition: instead of repeating in the text information that is already contained in the tables, it is better to focus on the interpretation of the figures.

4. Page 7, Paragraph 1, Line 5: “effectiveness” is missing between cost & ratio.
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