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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors mention that the highest-cost figures between NGO- and government-run community nutrition centers (CNCs) were used in the analysis but the footnotes in Tables 1, 2, and 3 state that reported costs come from NGO-run CNCs. Which is it?

I agree with the authors’ choice to use the highest-cost estimates for the main results of the paper as this is the most conservative. Nonetheless, this scenario does not reflect an actual mode of delivery.

I would therefore like to see the incremental cost effectiveness (ICE) analysis under three cost scenarios: (actual) NGO-run CNC, (actual) government-run CNC, and (hypothetical) highest cost scenario, combining highest cost items from either mode of delivery. The cost sensitivity analysis could be added to the existing tables. Results could be discussed in a separate section in the paper.

2. My second suggestion is to additionally report the ICE analysis based on the limit points of the 95% confidence interval for the intent-to-treat effect of moving from UFe60F to EMMS. The goal would be to quantify the uncertainty regarding the true ICE and facilitate comparison with existing studies.

The analysis should be done separately for each cost scenario above if it turns out that the cost scenarios matter a lot. Again, the ICE estimates based on the limit points of the 95% confidence interval could be added to the existing tables. Results could be discussed in a separate section in the paper.

Minor Issues not for Publication

p.6 line 14: extra space in front of period sign.

p.8 line 10: “There were…”

p.8 line 12: I was unsure why 29.36 was used instead of 24.22.

p.10 line 2: Which adherence levels? They are given in Table 2 but not discussed in the text.
Table 2, footnote a: “to prenatal” repeats.

Table 2, line 7: “number 15” not numbers.

Table 2, footnote b: “women” not woman.

Table 2, footnote e: this should be c instead.

Table 2: The cost per 1000 women with UFe60F is sometimes written as 42878 and sometimes as 42,878. Idem for the other cost and Table 3. Using the comma throughout might be preferable.

p.11 line 22: missing period sign and omission of “the” in “Hossain et al. questioning the…”

p.13 line 4: missing per cost and LY saved: “our estimate of US$31 cost per LY saved”

Table 3, footnotes b and c: what group does “iron folic acid” refer to exactly? Was there a treatment arm that was only offered iron folic acid without food supplementation?

**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, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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