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Reviewer’s report:

The topic of this manuscript combining cost-effectiveness results into a coherent league table could provide useful information.

However, it would need to be strengthened from its current state.

Major/general comments

Revise the manuscript to create a clearer key message with a succinct storyline by reducing information in tables and describing the methods and results in more detail

1. Restructure tables

   Table 1 consider incorporating as text, column 1 contains different units

   Table 2 is not referred to in text and can therefore probably be moved to supplement

   Table 3 reduce to key information, put the rest in a comprehensive supplement table

     Table 3 rename current relevance column. Currently this assessment seems very subjective, please elaborate on the methodology of this assessment. Easier for the reader to understand if the information in this column is presented in simple 3-4 word categories with details in the supplement

     Table 4 is % average?

     Table 5 consider moving to supplement and add quantifiable restyle where applicable

     Tables must be stand alone and complete, please add NZ and years where applicable to Tables 2, 4 and 5
2. Please elaborate more on the methods, particularly the analysis. This section should include details on the data bases searched, language restrictions, independent screening; more clearly present inclusion and exclusion criteria. Describe the literature search on page 3 in text format rather than bullets.

3. Please check for consistency and typos e.g.
   a. Search date in abstract (page 2 line 10)
   b. Some numbers 1,000s are missing a comma $9,290 (page 3 line 1)
   c. Decimals e.g. 3\% or 3.5\% discount rate (page 5 line 28)
   d. Start sentences with "However" rather than "but" (page 15 line 25)
   e. Check journal formatting style for abbreviations such as e.g.

4. Be sure to clearly define all concepts.

5. Strengths and limitations
   a. Outcomes are also diverse. Are current methods most applicable? (page 16 line 3)
      b. Last bullet refers to "simple approach". The authors could rework the analysis to attempt a more complex approach using a valid tool if possible (page 16 line 25), then report whether this is applicable
      c. Describe the strengths and limitations in text format rather than bullets

6. In the conclusion the authors refer to individual studies using standardized methods. The authors of this paper could also apply standardized methods for evaluating. This point links with the limitations section.

Minor comments/questions

1. Consider replacing "one developed country" with "New Zealand" in title and text (e.g. page 15 line 24, page 16 lines 3-4)
2. Add database to abstract (page 2 line 9)
3. Why did you start the search with 2010? (page 3 line 20)

4. "Previous New Zealand (NZ) work" rephrase (page 2 line 58)

5. Why was only Tufts Medical Center Registry searched not other specific databases? (page 3 line 51)

6. Why was CRD only searched until 2015? (page 3 line 58)

5. What do you mean by "may not be particularly material" (page 15 lines 23-30)
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