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Reviewer's report:

The paper is clearly presented and the logic for the model, and assumptions are explained. The analysis of bias and sensitivity analysis is helpful.

While a number of limitations of the study are discussed, I think more consideration needs to be given to the time horizon and measurement of utilities.

The short time horizon of 28 days is appropriate from the point of view of costs, as this will pick up differences in inpatient costs. However, this does not seem appropriate for benefits, given the the higher risk of long-term scarring for patients requiring a re-graft could presumably have life-long consequences.

The lack of QALY information in this respect needs to be considered in more detail. Given the very short time horizon it is not surprising that alternative QALY values do not have an impact on the results - this needs to be discussed.

It would also be helpful to know if patients/families are among the stakeholders who were included in validating the assumptions (page 9).
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