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Reviewer's report:

Major:
Pg 2 Ln 42: Not clear if the first results for both countries are combined, especially in light of the second sentence. This should be made clear for the majority of readers who will only look at the abstract (obvious in full paper).
Pg 2: It would be good to state the perspective for the CEA and time horizon.
Pg 3 Ln 78: There are some important CEA on maternal health interventions in sub-Saharan Africa not included that should be in the intro or discussion.
Pg 4 Ln 105: More explanation of covariate-constrained process for randomization that was used – what co-variates were used?
Pg 5 Ln 127: Was age-weighting used for DALYs? If not, it should be stated.
Pg 6 Ln 147: The perspective taken for the costing should be stated.
Pg 6 Ln 160: 10 years seems a long time for the longevity of training – a justification should be stated.
Pg 7 Ln 188: Better explanation of how and what covariates were controlled for in the regression models is needed and the authors should be more explicit in the effects in the model from Pg 8 Ln 210 – 220.
Pg 12 Ln 284: It is not clear how the sensitivity analysis was performed.
Pg 13 Results: The paper would benefit from a tornado diagram to see the relative importance of input variables in the model.
Pg 15 Ln 354: There is no mention of the assumptions made in the limitations of the study.

Fig 2 and 3: These are not explained adequately in the text.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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