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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The research question posed by the authors is clear and concise. It is original to the best of knowledge. However, more detail is needed on how the private sector chronic disease management model would be implemented in the public sector. This would help the readers better understand the intervention under analysis.

2. The data are sound and well controlled.

3. The interpretation of the results and conclusions are supported by the data. References are provided where necessary.

4. The standard methods used for economic modelling are applied. They are well described and could easily be replicated in other settings.

5. The strength of the methods lies in its application. The weakness, however, is with the choice of ‘the comparator’ model – a tertiary level private sector hospital setting – which has higher costs/overheads than a primary health care public sector setting which is used as ‘the intervention’. Clearly, the hospital level costs will be higher compared to the clinic level ones. On top of that, the prices in the private sector are much higher than in the public sector in South Africa. All this might have contributed to underestimating the real cost of implementing the private model of diabetes treatment in a public sector setting. The authors should re-work the analysis using the cost estimates that are at the same level of service provision for both alternatives compared in the study.

6. The writing and organisation of the manuscript is fine.

7. Revision of the manuscript relating to the suggestion under point 5 above is requested.

8. I am not aware of any ethical or competing interests relating to this study.

9. No additional files are necessary.

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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