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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) the gap that this article fills is unrelated to that it was unique in not only focusing on clinical outcomes since other papers have already done that. Nor, in its economic evaluation approach. The addition to the literature relates to the health-social intervention. As such, the authors should highlight this as their contribution and revise accordingly.

2) It is unclear why the authors chose the 28 and 84 days interval. Similar studies examined 30-days, 90 days, 120 or 6 months. I understand that the intervention lasted for 4 weeks but what is the explanation/relevance of 12 weeks?

3) Methods – health care costs:;Two comments/questions:
   a) Where these readmissions related to the index/original admission? It is always better if there is a way to make sure they do
   b) Why the only cost factored in was hospital days. One would assume there would be different payment schedules of different procedures were done

4) It is unclear how the intervention differs from others. The ‘social’ part should be further described in the methods section.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Abstract - conclusions: the first two statements are supposed to be associated, i.e. the study did not focus on clinical outcomes, etc.

2) Background - 'rehospitalizations place a financial burden..' on hospitals and/or payers depending on the payment model

3) background - 'executing proper economic evaluation' ....the use of proper economic evaluation can be modified as articles cited as well as others’ methods cannot be considered inappropriate

4) It is unclear why the authors chose the 28 and 84 days interval. Similar studies examined 30-days, 90 days, 120 or 6 months. I understand that the intervention lasted for 4 weeks but what is the explanation/relevance of 12 weeks?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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