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Reviewer's report:

The authors of this manuscript (Estimating the Direct Costs of Ischemic Heart Disease: Evidence From a Teaching Hospital in Brazil, A Retrospective Cohort Study) have made significant revisions to the earlier version of their manuscript which I reviewed. I have no further concerns that need addressing, however there are a few minor corrections.

1) Line 94: should read "We used a bottom up…"

2) Line 95: I believe this should read "microcosting methodology for 330 estimating direct costs during more than…"

3) Line 126: I think the word "prescribed" would be better suited than "requested". I leave that to the authors' discretion

4) Line 126-128: I believe the sentence should read "the drugs included in the study were the ones prescribed by the cardiologists who tended to the patients while the study was ongoing as well as hypoglycemic drugs"

5) Line 205: should read "and constitute the study population" or alternatively "and constitute this study's population"

6) Line 307: should read "using the IPCA index, it should be equivalent to…?"

7) Line 308: should read "However, the reimbursement system…"

8) Line 317: when the authors mention 'high prevalence of drugs', did they mean a high rate of adherence?

9) Line 383: should read "Considering the 2012 demographic census for the population over 18 years is….."

10) Line 463: "Who" should be "WHO"
11) Figure 1: add "(US $)

12) Figure 1: considering renaming y-axis to "total yearly median cost to SUS" or something similar

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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