

Reviewer's report

Title: Potential Cost Savings with Terrestrial Rabies Control

Version: 3 **Date:** 15 November 2006

Reviewer: Jakob Zinsstag

Reviewer's report:

General

This is a well done and detailed study using official data.

Some comments:

Page 5 last paragraph. The authors make reference to the high cost of ORV. In Europe ORV led to the elimination in Switzerland, Austria and large parts of Germany and France. The determinants for this success were 1. A highly concerted, nationally coordinated action to achieve a sufficient vaccination coverage. 2. This could only be achieved because of detailed knowledge of wildlife habitats and demography. These points should be mentioned here.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Benefit-cost assessments should address also the notion of sufficient vaccination coverage to achieve elimination and not only the blunt comparison of PEP cost versus ORV. Do we know the coverage of the ORV? I miss an attempt to relate cost of PEP to estimates of coverage of ORV. This is central to answer the question on cost effectiveness of ORV. Authors should work out how PEP cost reduce in relation to ORV coverage.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Page 7 The description of the rabies reimbursement scheme can be shortened.

Is figure 2 needed?

Page 18. On a mid term perspective it should be more cost effective to invest in ORV+PEP than in PEP alone. This is a non linear process and needs to be modelled by an animal-human transmission model. The provided data could serve for the validation of such a model.

The paper as a whole could be shortened, there is enormous detail.

Recommendation: Accept with minor revision

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests