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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you for the new compliments and suggestions to our work. We have accepted all of the suggestions as described point-by-point, in the list below:

Reviewer: Fernanda Queirós

#Reviewer's report:

The responses to our comments substantially improved the manuscript. However, your discussion and conclusion are still not sound. See below some points that still need to be clarified before publication. The paper needs to be reviewed by an English native speaker - there are several grammar and style errors that compromises clarity. I listed a few below, to give you an idea of the errors I am talking about.

#Major Compulsory Revisions

1. "When total costs were analyzed, the disease severity seemed not to influence.", stated your previous conclusion, which is what one sees at your Table 3. Now you conclude "The findings of this study make an important contribution to the existing MS literature in Brazil highlighting the economic impact of the disease, especially when patients move upwards on the disease severity scale. "You did not discuss why the overall costs with the disease do not vary by disability level. Why would the costs vary at the 3 different Cost's category and not on the total cost? You now cite studies with similar findings, but continues to not explain your findings. And concludes that disability level influence economic impact, despite of not finding statistical difference for total costs. Your policy suggestion "the need for investments in technologies that delay disability progression, consequently reducing the impact of MS to the Brazilian society." is not clearly based on your findings. Review your discussion and conclusion in terms of your findings for cost's category AND total costs.

R.: These parts were reviewed and some paragraphs were rewritten to clarify the concepts described.

#Minor Essential Revisions

2. Pg. 3, line 88: "MS can substantially and adversely affect an individual’s quality of life (QOL)". Remove this part because you don't talk about QoL in this paragraph.

R.: Modified as proposed.

3. Pg. 3, lines 96 - 98: the numbers, I think, should be presented in USD. It's confusing to see them in BRL.

R.: Modified as proposed.

4. Pg. 4, line 103-104: "the private (for-profit and non- profit) subsector, in which public or private finances the services; ". This part is not clear - review it.

R.: This paragraph was reviewed and some parts were rewritten to clarify the concepts described.
5. Why you didn’t talk about the private sub-sector? It needs to be clear for the reader. Review the paragraph about the health system in Brazil to make this clear to readers.

R.: This paragraph was reviewed and some parts were rewritten to clarify the concepts described.

6. Pg. 4, lines 124-125: "and may also help health-policy making to quantify the total impact of the disease". This part is not clear - review it.

R.: Reviewed and rewritten as proposed.

7. Pg. 6, lines 157-163: long statement (several sentences, not a period before the one in line 163). Break it in at least two separate statements.

R.: Modified as proposed.

8. Pg. 15, line 408: convert the value in BRL to USD. All your results are in USD and this should be consistent in the whole manuscript.

R.: Modified as proposed.

9. Pg. 15, lines 415-416: "This study was the first to investigate the economic and overall economic impact of MS in Brazil". In your introduction you mentioned three other studies that analyzed the economic impact of MS in Brazil. What did you want to state here, giving this is not the first study to do so?

R.: This statement was removed from the text.