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Dear Editor,

Thank you for the email, dated 30 June 2012, to our revised manuscript, which was submitted on 15 June 2012. Our detailed response to the reviewers’ comments follows. We have highlighted in yellow all revisions in the manuscript for your easy reference.

Referee 1

Comment:
“I agree that the authors have provided a comprehensive response and the revised paper is considerably improved. However, I still have concerns about the language of the discussion (as pointed out in my original review). I have therefore taken the unusual step of attaching how I think the text should be edited - I would propose that these revisions need to be made before the paper is acceptable.”

Response:
We appreciate Referee 1’s efforts in providing suggestions for editing the Discussion section. We have followed all suggestions except for the following:

a) We write “USD” instead of “US$” to be consistent with that written in the Introduction (Page 5).

b) On Page 14, beginning with “Comparisons between home-based and centre-based programs …”, as equivalence in consequences between alternatives were demonstrated statistically in these studies, rather than assumed by their authors, we have re-worded the sentence as follows:

“In all these studies, the consequences of both alternatives were equivalent, so the authors sought to only compare their costs.”
Comment:
“I don’t understand this sentence – my reading is that although these cost-minimisation studies have been conducted in different settings and considered different scope costs, they consistently show home and centre based CR to be similar in cost. I would suggest the sentence is rewritten to simply say this”

Response:
This is now rewritten this way:

“Despite different settings, these studies consistently showed that home- and centre-based cardiac rehabilitation to be similar in cost.”

Once again we would like to thank Referee 1 and the Editor for the opportunity to revise our manuscript, and hope that the responses and revisions are made to the satisfaction of both.

We have noted that the reference numbering in Additional File 1 has changed as a result of an addition of a reference made in the last revision. We have addressed this and updated the reference numbering.

If you need any clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Wai Pong Wong, PhD, on behalf of all authors