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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this paper. The paper compares the approaches taken to consider health in policy making in two Australian jurisdictions – using Health Impact Assessment in New South Wales and Health in All policies in South Australia. This is a useful addition to the literature. There are few papers that demonstrate how HIA or HiAP apply in a specific context and none I have seen that directly compare the approaches in this way.

I am happy to support publication of the paper, and have just a few suggestions that the authors may consider as discretionary revisions.

1) It is helpful to have examples in the text for both HIA and HiAP. The HIA example (line 237) states that recommendations were made and their implementation is being monitored, which suggests the HIA had a positive impact. The HiAP examples (lines 270-287) describe how the focus of the work was developed but it would be helpful to state whether, and how, this had an impact on policy and/or practice.

2) The table in box 3 showing the stages of HIA and HiAP could be presented in a way that shows more clearly how the 5 stages of HIA relate to the 5 stages of HiAP. Although the paper makes it clear that HiAP engagement begins at an earlier stage of policy making and continues beyond the technical analysis, the table does not show that. I think it would be possible to present it in a way that shows that:
   # Much of the 'engage' stage of HiAP takes place at an earlier stage than screening in HIA but possibly some of this is equivalent to screening and scoping in HIA
   # The 'gathering evidence' stage of HiAP is similar to the 'identification/analysis' stage of HIA
   # The 'generate' stage of HiAP is similar to 'recommendations and reporting' in HIA
   # The 'navigate and report' stage of HiAP takes place after that and is not included in HIA.

3) This paper describes the situation in two jurisdictions and concludes that the differences reflect differences in the organisational position of the two approaches. The authors might want to suggest that similar analyses could
compare these findings with the use of HIA in places where it is positioned within government rather than through external organisations.
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