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Major Compulsory Revisions:

This is a good piece of work in the area of casemix development in disability services. This study provides useful information on the costs and services provided for people with vision and hearing disabilities. There are a few problems to be fixed before it can be published:

1. Background (p4): There is a lack of clear definition about the costing. What is included and what excluded, eg equipments, pathology, medication etc.

2. Methods (l-6, p9): Should the replication sample be independent from the derivation sample, to assess external validity? If there is overlap between replication and derivation samples, how much?

3. Methods (p7): There are no clear descriptions on survey design, outcome measures and statistical analysis.

4. Results (l-5, p12): “…exhibited a 38-fold range for formal costs and a 35-fold range for the combined formal and informal costs.” This is likely to be corrected by log-transformation. Have you tested log-transformation?

5. Results (l-7, p13): It is unclear to me why there should be strong agreement between the two samples, given that they are not arbitrarily selected.

6. Discussion (p14): There is a big difference in terms of variance explained between derivation sample and replications. Is this indicating the method is not reliable? What are the likely reasons for this difference?

Minor Essential Revisions:

7. Use of acronym: The acronyms need to be defined and consistently used afterwards. For example, l7, p6 CM needs to replace “case-mix”

8. L-6, p8, no need to underline text to define abbreviations

9. Table 4 should be reformatted in line with others
10. Figure 2 title: There is no indication which is formal and informal. This seems to be analysis by groups.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.