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Reviewer’s report:

This paper is a protocol for a systematic review of economic evaluation, resource utilisation and utility studies in paediatric patients with drug-resistant epilepsy

The objective of the review is clear and the systematic review method appear to be appropriate.

Please find below some minor suggestions that the authors may want to consider:

- It would be useful for the authors to clarify whether a date limit will be included for the searches, and consider whether the inclusion of such date limit is appropriate. In particular, do the authors expect studies conducted 20 years ago to be applicable to the current context? The inclusion of a date limit may make the review more manageable.

- the authors are planning to exclude non-english studies. Whilst this is commonly done, does this represent an important limitation given the focus appear to be on the Canadian setting, whereby both French and English are used (and possibly studies)?

- the authors are planning to exclude abstracts. This may be a limitation as a number of studies may only published in abstract form, as typically the case for utility and resource studies. The authors should consider whether conference abstracts should be included.

- In the method section, the authors state that "associated costs will be extracted only from studies performed in Canada". For completeness, and for the review to be used by researchers in other countries, the authors may want to extract costs irrespective of the country where the study was conducted.

- Finally, the authors are proposing to use the Drummond and CHEERs Checklist when assessing the quality of each study. Whilst these checklists are commonly used, these are limited to reporting. The authors may also want to consider using an additional checklist more focused on modelling, such as the Philips checklist (2014) if the aim is to assess the validity of the modelling, rather its the reporting.
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