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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. Methods. Further description of the two programs compared in this economic evaluation is needed. Reference to previous publication may help alongside an overview of key elements of each program. A sentence or two justifying choice of comparators is needed. This is raised later in the paper as being an important component of economic evaluation, so some upfront discussion is needed to tie this together.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The terms control group, control intervention and intervention are used interchangeably throughout the paper to refer to the CogniPlus group, I recommended using just one consistently.

2. Abstract. Some additional words are needed to make clear what is meant by HADS eg. difference in overall HADS score was measured?

3. Eligibility criteria. Explain what is meant by complaints in the eligibility criteria.

4. Table 1: Table is currently formatted across two sections and needs to be combined. I am unclear on how costs reported here compare with costs in Table 2.

5. Results/Discussion. Some review of wording needed when reporting results. Statement regarding the high probability of cost effectiveness in the discussion needs to be tied closer to the results reported. Reword sentence to make clear non-health care costs were higher for the control group as reported in Table 2. Use consistent wording when defining what falling in NE, SW quadrants means in the results section. In your Discussion, you could also include a sentence or two about the wide confidence intervals around costs, and how this impacts on your discussion of results.

6. Table 3 and Table 4: Define SM and Edu.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Introduction. Clarify that an incremental analysis is performed and not two separate cost effectiveness analyses

2. Use the term Resource use instead of cost data throughout. Include a sentence to relate the self report questionnaire to the cost categories collected, I
presume it only covered selected categories.

3. Sensitivity analysis: Specify for EQ5D instrument when reference to tariffs is made.

4. Table 2: Can source of unit prices be added easily to this table? Column heading could read Unit of measurement rather than Unit price.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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