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Reviewer's report:

I congratulate you in dealing with the majority of my earlier comments. However, as a matter of record I need to say that I cannot support your assertion that the TTO procedure as you describe is IN FACT equivalent to the standard procedure. I am personally not in favour of TTO (or for that matter SG) procedures but I do consider it imperative to distinguish between the classical, generally accepted standard form of such procedures and analogue versions that appear (somehow by magic) to replace them.

Where, where, where is the evidence to support the scientific legitimacy for such action?

It is a real pity when such a key failure is present in otherwise well-conducted research (albeit as part of a PhD or "feasibility" exercise).

Please reconsider both the use of TTO and in particular your "strain" of it in future work. Health economists who demand the use of social preference weights for economic evaluation need to be confronted with the need to provide a proper rationale for that requirement; clinicians and patients cannot/should not be bound by such constraints.

There are better ways to establish the "value" of health!

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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