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Reviewer's report:

The changes made are clear and have improved the manuscript considerably. Only formatting issues remain, with there being too many tables/figures containing minimal information that could easily be incorporated into the main text.

Major compulsory revisions
None.

Minor compulsory revisions
Table 1 should be removed, with the selected figures or ranges being reported in the text.

Figure 2 should be removed, with the three estimates reported in the text.

Model inputs in Tables 2-6 should include references (as is the case in Table 3) to allow the reader to quickly access the source, rather than searching through the text.

Discretionary revisions

Within the discussion, it isn't easy to identify in what way your methods differ from those of other studies. Why is it better? More cost categories covered? Updated estimates? Better quality evidence? Better methods? A short description of this would help the reader assess whether they should use your estimates or ignore them.
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