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Reviewer’s report:

The submitted manuscript is intended to define WHO’s C4P tool and to test its usefulness in estimating the costs of a nationwide HPV vaccine program in Tanzania. This is an exciting project and of great interest for health authorities and primary health care professionals in GAVI eligible countries and beyond.

However in its present form the paper lacks important information and needs fundamental significant revisions before being considered for publication in BMC medicine.

1. Methods. There is no clear definition of the C4P tool. How can it be accessed? How to use it? The authors should follow the screen shot to explain C4P step by step and to show that it can be adopted to different simulations in different countries. The methods chapter is only announcing what C4P is able to do instead of describing how it is able to produce reliable estimation. Furthermore what is the thesis of this original work? To confirm that C4P is useful? Is it intended to compare real life costs with C4P estimations at the end of the project in 2015? Are there other projects that will challenge the C4P reliability in other countries?

2. Results. C4P is based on known figures and assumptions. Assumptions should be explained (e.g. why is it estimated that two thirds of the target population will receive a full course of 3 vaccine doses)

3. Discussion, conclusion. These chapters are more like a repetition of the introduction. Are there already any real life cost data to confirm the reliability of C4P. Will there be critical reviews by WHO to optimize C4P over time? Is this tool suitable to estimate the costs of any kind of vaccination program or are there limitations?

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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