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Reviewer's report:

General comment

This manuscript is well written with all the background, methods, analysis and results described and discussed. Implications of their findings are also well articulated. Here are a few suggested edits.

Abstract
The authors use 'low friction bedding' interchangeably with 'low friction environment' in the abstract and throughout the paper. I think this may be a bit confusing. Sometimes 'sheets' is used. I think 'bedding' is a better word and should be used consistently.

'The resulting relative risk on the primary outcome for the non-randomised study provided no evidence of effect but had a large standard error'. It may be useful to state (or restate) the primary outcome here.

Some consistence in the reporting of costs may be preferred - decimal values are included in some but not all costs.

Introduction
Define NHS & RCT at first use.

Materials and Methods
£20k - not sure if this is formal. Perhaps use 20000

Results
The axis labels on Figure 2 may have been mixed up.

Figure 3 - CEAC - I would consider more information to the figure legend to make it more self-explanatory

The statement 'Probability regraft is probability regraft (low-friction)' on Table 4 is not clear.
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