International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, Manuscript Revisions, ijerph-2396998

Titled “A scoping review of economic evaluations to inform the reorientation of preventive health services in Australia”

Table of changes:

Reviewer Comment	Response to reviewer and revision to manuscript	Location
Reviewer #3		
1. The authors did not clearly formulate the research problem. Please emphasize in the introduction why your research is important.	We have now articulated the research problem in the introduction section of the manuscript: *“Both the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and the Productivity Commission have highlighted the need to ensure sustainability of Australia’s health expenditure by addressing the growing disparity in investment in preventive health compared to clinical services, specifically noting that despite the potential for significant returns from investments into preventive health, the field suffers from a relative lack of funding [6, 7]. This review specifically seeks to identify where there is evidence of cost-effectiveness or returns on investment in preventive health.”* *"To our knowledge no scoping reviews have been conducted that have identified and mapped the evidence for preventive health strategies for multiple health risk factors and/or health conditions for predominately high-income countries. This review is important to provide a synthesise of relevant findings and draw conclusions based on the strength of the evidence to support translation.”*	Page 2, Lines 69-75 Page 2, Lines 80-84
2. The article is very interesting and quite well prepared methodologically. Literature research was very well conducted. Moreover a peer-reviewed manuscript is clear, relevant to the field, and presented in a well-structured manner. Limitation, implication include necessary elements and information. The discussion refers to other research and has references to the theory that the author wants to develop. The figures and tables are appropriate.	We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback for the manuscript.	No change
3. The purpose of the article is clear, in line with the journal's profile, but improvements should be made to the text of the article: 1) before formulating the purpose of the article, the research problem and research questions should be presented. Please indicate why your research is important and what research gap it is trying to fill. In the introduction, or in a separate section, it should be outlined what	We have now articulated the research problem in the introduction section of the manuscript which was raised by the reviewer #3 in point 1: *“Both the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and the Productivity Commission have highlighted the need to ensure sustainability of Australia’s health expenditure by addressing the*	Page 2, Lines 69-75

problem the authors want to solve? In this case, it is most likely to be about the cost-effectiveness of preventive strategies. If so, please outline the theory behind the problem. For example, from an economic point of view, what is the functioning of health organisations. Why an organisation should determine its cost-effectiveness. Please emphasize in the introduction why your research is important.	*growing disparity in investment in preventive health compared to clinical services, specifically noting that despite the potential for significant returns from investments into preventive health, the field suffers from a relative lack of funding [6, 7]. This review specifically seeks to identify where there is evidence of cost-effectiveness or returns on investment in preventive health."* *The theory of behind the problem is outlined in the introduction: "Economic evaluations can assist local public health services identify strategies and interventions within their local framework that demonstrate cost-effectiveness, representing value for money. Such evaluations need to consider local contextual factors, like resource allocation, and what is within jurisdictional purchasing power [5]."* We have now described the gap in the literature and highlight the importance of the study: *"To our knowledge no scoping reviews have been conducted that have identified and mapped the evidence for preventive health strategies for multiple health risk factors and/or health conditions for predominately high-income countries. This review is important to provide a synthesise of relevant findings and draw conclusions based on the strength of the evidence to support translation."*	Page 2, Lines 64-67 Page 2, Lines 80-84
4. The article is very interesting and quite well prepared methodologically. Please consider the following improvements to the methodology : In this article, section 2.1 describes the key categories with an indication of their importance in the study of efficiency. In section 2.2 research strategy - what were the steps in searching for articles, which bases, etc. Please formulate in more detail what the next stages of the study will be beyond the selection of journals according to the PRISMA model. e.g. in points - what will be done in sequence and what results are expected. How the results will be grouped, what will be obtained on this basis, etc.	In the methods, Section 2.1 provides definitions of key terms and describes their importance in the study of efficiency. The next stages of the study are outlined in sequence in Sections 2.2-2.6 (Lines 165-241). Section 2.2 provides details of the search strategy including databases (Medline, Embase, APO and MedNar) and time horizon. Section 2.3 describes the approach to the selection of articles - reviews of economic evaluations for primary and/or secondary level prevention or health promotion interventions within or relevant to a local health service setting. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 detail the evidence screening and data extraction processes. The expected results are not anticipated, rather it is proposed that the economic evaluation evidence from the reviews be classified into categories based on the criteria reported in Table 3 (Lines 244-245). From this process, the	No change

	strength of evidence of economic efficiency of preventive interventions can be determined and is presented in disaggregated and aggregated form in the results section.	
5. Conclusion development. Once the research questions have been formulated in the introduction, address them appropriately in the conclusion	The aim of the scoping review is reported in the introduction section: *"The aim of this scoping review was to identify and synthesise the available evidence from systematic reviews on the cost-effectiveness of preventive health strategies with relevance to local public health services, to inform the reorientation of preventive health services and delivery of value-based healthcare."* We have now revised the conclusion so it addresses the research aim: *"This scoping review identified a large amount of evidence from systematic reviews on the cost-effectiveness of preventive health strategies, however for most reviews there was a lack of evidence or the evidence was unclear. Interventions targeting obesity, type 2 diabetes, smoking cessation, and fractures were found to be cost-effective. We found limited evidence related to equity in priority populations. Local contextual factors need consideration in the translation of these findings into practice including local public health services."*	Page 25, Lines 607-617
6. Limitation, implication include necessary elements and information. The discussion refers to other research and has references to the theory that the author wants to develop.	We thank the reviewer for acknowledging the elements and information that were in the discussion section of the manuscript.	No change
7. Please add more new literature in the references. There are too many references older than 5 years.	We have now added some more recent references to the discussion section in the manuscript: 65. Pascale Guerre, Laure Huot, Cyrille Colin, Adrien Marrel & Hugo Rabier (2023) Perspectives in prospective comparative economic evaluations: a systematic review, Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research, 23:3, 273-280. 66. Weise, A., Büchter, R.B., Pieper, D. *et al.* Assessing transferability in systematic reviews of health economic evaluations – a review of methodological guidance. *BMC Med Res Methodol* **22**, 52 (2022). 72. Cookson R, Robson M, Skarda I, Doran T. Equity-informative methods of health services research. Journal of Health Organization and Management. 2021 Jul 2;35(6):665-	Page 24, Line 555 Page 24, Line 555 Page 25, Lines 597

	73. Cookson R, Griffin S, Norheim OF, Culyer AJ, Chalkidou K. Distributional cost-effectiveness analysis comes of age. Value in Health. 2021 Jan 1;24(1):118-20. 76. Ali Jalali and others, Econometric Issues in Prospective Economic Evaluations Alongside Clinical Trials: Combining the Nonparametric Bootstrap With Methods That Address Missing Data, *Epidemiologic Reviews*, Volume 44, Issue 1, 2022, Pages 67–77.	Page 25 602
8. The figures and tables are appropriate.	We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback regarding the figures and tables.	No change