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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to comments for manuscript entitled “The global impact and cost-effectiveness of a melioidosis vaccine”

Manuscript ID: BMED-D-18-01608 (2nd Revision, Apr 2019)

Response to Editor:

Editor: Comment 1

Please note that author Tim Atkins still hasn't confirmed authorship of this manuscript. We have resent the email requesting this, but would appreciate it if you could also remind him to complete this.

Response

We have now reminded him again to confirm his authorship.
Response to Reviewer #2:

Reviewer #2: Comment 1

Thank you for acknowledging and addressing my comments in full.

Response

Thank you very much.

Response to Reviewer #3:

Authors have done a great job in improving the paper, and responded to most of the reviewer suggestions in an adequate way. A few minor remaining issues:

Reviewer #3: Comment 1

Re response to reviewer 3 comment 11: However, regarding with the ICER comparing Vac 2 to base case, we have keep it as it is (Table S3 column 4 in Additional material document). In this case, "base case" means no vaccination programme.

As the term base case was used several times in the manuscript to refer to the main analysis (for instance p3 lines 14/15: “In the base case, vaccines were assumed to have 80% efficacy, five-year mean protective duration and to cost USD10.20-338.20 per vaccinee”), it is extremely confusing to also call a strategy of no vaccination base case. Nowhere it was explained that the base-case comparator would be a no vaccination strategy, although it may seem logical. Please, in the supplementary material reword into: 'no vac' or similar term, to clarify and for consistency.

Response

Thank you very much for this suggestion. We have reworded it in both manuscript and supplementary material as following;

Manuscript

page 22, line 21: from ‘compared to the next best strategy (Vac 2 compared with Base case, Vac 3 compared with Vac 2, and Vac 4 compared Vac 3).’ to ‘compared to the next best strategy (Vac 2 compared with no vaccination, Vac 3 compared with Vac 2, and Vac 4 compared Vac 3).’

page 23, line 2: from ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to base case).’ To ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to no vaccination).’
Supplementary material

page 1: from ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to base case)’ to ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to no vaccination)’

and from ‘Table S5. Results of the base case analysis (compared with base case) by country/territory’ to ‘Table S5. Results of the base case analysis (compared with no vaccination) by country/territory’

page 21, Table S4, Column 3: from ‘(Compared with base case)’ to ‘(Compared with no vaccination)’

page 22: from ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to base case).’ to ‘Figure S2. Regional incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of vaccination strategies (compared to no vaccination).’

page 30: ‘Figure S3(g). ICER by region of each strategy compared to the next best strategy (Vac 2 compared with base case, Vac 3 compared with Vac 2, and Vac 4 compared with Vac 3)’ to ‘Figure S3(g). ICER by region of each strategy compared to the next best strategy (Vac 2 compared with no vaccination, Vac 3 compared with Vac 2, and Vac 4 compared with Vac 3)’

Reviewer #3: Comment 2

Also, in response to Reviewer #3: Comment 10 (on that language checking would be useful), the authors replied they have replaced 'people age over 45' with 'people aged over 45', accordingly.

The question was rather to have a general language check performed. In my opinion, this would still be useful.

Response

We have now proofread the manuscript and the Additional material, making various minor edits to correct grammar or clarify the meaning of sentences. The changes can be seen in the manuscript attached.