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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have considered the comments of both reviewers and have done a good job incorporating those remarks into the current manuscript. My concern was the language around demand vs. need. The language is still somewhat confusing early in the manuscript (the authors still seem to imply that demand plus demographic adjustment are providing information about needs). However, the discussion of unmet need does show that current methods are inadequate in considering needs. I think the manuscript is fine in its current form and may be helpful as a resource for comparing resource allocation approaches for different jurisdictions.

1) Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The purpose of this paper is clearly stated.

2) Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Yes. However, it is still not entirely clear how the sample was derived. The authors state that it is a sample of convenience, and then state that it was to represent diversity. Both can be true, but it reads as if the authors are trying to satisfy the reader rather than seek a sample with purpose. This is not a fatal flaw of the review.

3) Are the data sound?

This study does not use primary data collection. They present information from healthcare resource allocation models in different jurisdictions.

4) Does the manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

N/A

5) Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

For the most part, yes. However, the authors do claim that the development of the formulae are in part political. I am not sure they can make any value claims on methods of development, as their purpose was to present what information is utilized and not how each jurisdiction came to use such information when
deciding how to allocate resources.

6) Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7) Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, the document is well referenced.

8) Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, they seek to compare formulae, and that is what they did in the manuscript.

9) Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.
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