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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors have addressed most of my comments. However, it is now clear that their main analysis does not consider labor costs for local implementation of the program (and possibly not at the national level either). This is a major flaw in the analysis. The accepted practice in cost and cost-effectiveness analyses is to consider all opportunity costs associated with an intervention or program. This includes labor costs for individuals who implement the program--whether or not they are hired specifically for the program--because they could otherwise perform other activities. The authors should include labor costs for implementation at both the local and national level.

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors compare the cost of their screening initiative to costs in several other programs. This is useful. However, at least 3 of the programs cited are U.S. programs, and it is not surprising that U.S. costs are higher. The authors should at least note that cross-national comparisons of program costs are difficult to make because of differences in input prices (including labor) and differences in resource use. The authors also may have to revise their cost comparisons once they include labor costs in their analyses.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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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