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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Nº1: I would suggest to explain why the authors refer to HTR only for non-drug technologies (this is indicated in the title but the authors don’t explain why in the text).

Nº2: HTR could not necessarily be only related to the waste of resources... Effective technologies could be underused, and reassessment also would be needed in those cases...

Nº3: In relation to the survey, I would suggest to explain why the authors selected the mentioned 8 domains (are they related to the main challenges that have been described for reassessment programs?).

Nº4: Sometimes, it is not easy to follow the results section. I would suggest adding the total number of participants answering to each question (for example, line 112: “Seventeen of the 49 respondents…”

Nº5: Consider rewriting:
- Line 111, for example: “The main reasons argued by the 49 participants not to consider the development of an HTR program were the following: a) Reassessment was not within their mandate (n=9); b) …”
- Another example: line 128: Nine of the 16 individuals that had an active program noted that...
- Line 163: the authors could indicate the total number of participants belonging to each one of the categories: “Those affiliated with government (n=...)
- Line 264: “This study has limitations…” consider rewriting, something like this: “On the other hand, the study has some limitations. First of all, a low response rate was obtained, although this was anticipated because this is a new area of research”.

Minor Essential Revisions

Nº6: I would suggest change the title (for example: “Current Status of Health Technology Reassessment programs: Survey and Key Informant Interviews”.

Nº7: There are no more references related to HTR for the introduction?
Nº8: The authors could mention the existing discussion about which is the most suitable term to describe this issue (disinvestment, reassessment, reallocation …).

Nº9: The authors should consider including the survey as a figure or as a supplementary file.

Nº10: This is a question for the authors: did you ask the participants about real health technology reassessment examples they have done (it could be an interesting information to be presented).

Nº11: The authors could include a table to summarize the methods that participants used for HTR (similarities, differences…).

Nº12: I would also suggest the inclusion of a figure explaining the number of participants answering to each of the questions (as a diagram), or the number of participants that answered to the different online survey set of questions (for example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No HTR program</th>
<th>Beginning to discuss</th>
<th>Developing a program</th>
<th>Established program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=49 (55.6%)</td>
<td>n=21 (22.1%)</td>
<td>n=9 (9.4%)</td>
<td>n=16 (16.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.....

Discretionary Revisions

Nº 13: Eliminate n=1 from line 87 (material and methods).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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