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Dear editor

RE: MS: 4361275571168208 - The development of a public optometry system in Mozambique: a Cost Benefit Analysis

Thank you for the opportunity to complete some final revisions on the paper, to make the manuscript stronger. The comments have been received and carefully considered. Please see below for our response to each point. In our Revised Manuscript we have addressed the comments made by both Reviewers. We have made changes where appropriate, indicated by track changes. We have also highlighted any changes made to our Revised Manuscript in this response. Our responses here are made in bold text, while changes to the manuscript are highlighted in bold italic text.

Comments from Roger Chung
• Table 5 would be much easier and more meaningful for comparison if to be made into a Figure Plot. Please do so.

We have displayed the data in Table 5 in Figure 2. This should allow for meaningful comparison.

Revision – Page 9, line 226

“Figure 2 illustrates the results of the sensitivity analysis, showing the NPV of societal benefits at 3% discount rate for the four scenarios analysed.”

• Again, I would think that the figures in Table 4 can be presented in a schematic manner (i.e., Plot)

We have displayed the data from Table 4 in Figure 1.

Revision – Page 8, line 200

“The results are illustrated in Figure 1.”

• Please check grammar for this sentence: “Without any including any discounting at all, by 2049, a total of $2.5 billion in societal benefits are recorded.”

We have revised the sentence to clarify its meaning.

Revision – Page 8, line 210

“Without any discounting, a total of $2.5 billion in societal benefits are recorded by 2049.”

Comments from Kevin Frick

• The phrasing in the sentence in lines 128-129 does not make sense. I believe the authors meant to say that effectiveness was considered 100%/100%/75%/50%
and then zero. However, they say it was diminished by those amounts. This must be fixed.

This is an important point. We agree with the Reviewer. The manuscript has been amended accordingly.

Revision – Page 5, line 127

“To take into account prescription instability and spectacle frame/lens durability, effectiveness was assumed to be 100% in years one and two, 75% in year three and 50% in year four.”

In addition to the amends suggested by the Reviewers, the sub-titles in the costs section of the results have been amended to include the word ‘cost’ for consistency. The amends start on page 6, line 143 and are recorded by track changes.

Please contact us if there are any further suggestions.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Thompson

(On behalf of the authors)