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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper "Cost effectiveness analysis of a cluster randomized culturally-tailored, community health worker home-visiting diabetes intervention versus standard care in American Samoa".

The paper reports a comprehensive cost-effective analysis for the context addressed, with an important level detail in the data collection and Methods reporting. It also contributes to supporting this approach from an important point of view, i.e. that of cost-effectiveness, which is perhaps even more important for low-resourced settings as the few available resources need priority allocation to those approaches that provide the best outcome for the money spent. The Introduction is compelling on the "why" of this whole study and the paper particular, while the methods and results seem appropriate, including the discussion of related limitations.

My comments for improvement refer essentially to some aspects of reporting, which seems incongruent or haphazard at instances (I provide some examples below). I also did not find the mention or citation to an appropriate reporting guideline (e.g. https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/recommendations-for-reporting-cost-effectiveness-analyses/), which can be part of the reasons for the mentioned above.

The examples of issues with the reporting, or for which improvements are specifically suggested, are as it follows:

* The Abstract and the respective sections of the paper do not always match in content: e.g. the first element of the Results in the full paper equates to the Methods section in the abstract. Elements of the Conclusions of the abstract are not represented in the Conclusions of the paper. A comprehensive revision of congruence must be performed with such regards.

* The Results section in the full paper take too long to come to the main result, i.e. the ones reported in results of the Abstract. I'd recommend an inverse reporting approach - beginning with the main result and, eventually, provide then information on the underlying components.

* It is immediately awkward to observe citations in the Results of an original research paper. Likely the underlying content pertains to the Methods (that in the first paragraph -
as in the Abstract) or in the Methods or Discussion (that of the last paragraph), depending on whether you define different levels of thresholds upfront (in the Methods) or you do that a posteriori (in the Discussion) after sticking to only one in the Methods. Either reporting approach seems better than the current.

* It is also immediately awkward to observe a Conclusion starting with "Future studies". Overall the Results and Conclusions would benefit from a more incisive approach. With such regards, for example the Introduction and Methods do a better job.

* A minor issue: redundant language in the Abstract, results section: "increase of 0.05 QALYs gained." Either only 'increase of' or only 'gained'.
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