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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper describing the development of a case-mix funding system for adults with vision and hearing loss. The paper is well written and the analysis has been conducted carefully and appropriately. My comments focus on statistical issues. I have several queries but no substantial concerns with manuscript.

1. The sample appear to have been split into two samples (a derivation and replication sample) based on year of survey (2005-2006 and 2008-2010). Why didn't you use randomisation to select the two samples?

2. Once the decision-trees were developed, was pruning used to remove any predictors?

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
None.

Discretionary Revisions

3. The scatterplot comparing the CMI in the derivation and replication samples is interesting. I wondered whether it might be clearer to show this information in a Bland-Altman plot (Bland JM, Altman DG. Comparing methods of measurement: why plotting difference against standard method is misleading. The Lancet. 1995;346:1085–7).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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