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Author's response to reviews:

Drs David Moher and Paul Shekelle

Editors, Systematic Reviews

August 22nd, 2013

Dear Drs David Moher and Paul Shekelle:

We are pleased to submit our revised manuscript entitled “Early Economic Evaluation of Emerging Health Technologies: Protocol for Systematic Review and Qualitative Companion Study” for considerations as an original protocol.

Reviewer's report: A couple of comments that the authors may find useful: I would suggest some mild rewording of the second important question mentioned on page 9 of the protocol as below: "Whether and in what ways has early evaluation contributed to decision making and or policy development".

Please note the change to the second question: “The second question is whether and in what ways has early evaluation contributed to decision-making and policy development.”
Grammatical change: There appears to be a change in tense between the first and second paragraphs of the "Literature search" section. This may be because the second paragraph refers to exploratory searches already undertaken; if this is the case then it could be made clearer for the reader.

Please note the added line between the first and second paragraph of the “Literature search” section: “Exploratory literature searches have been already undertaken, the search used both Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) as well as keyword variants of all relevant terms, including keyword terms derived from MeSH scope notes to increase retrieval of citations from Medline In-Process.”

Editor’s comments: The authors should consider the two suggestions made by the peer reviewer and also revise the first sentence of the abstract to aid clarity (primarily, but not solely, due to the length of the sentence).

Please note the change to the first sentence of the abstract: “The concept of early health technology assessment, discussed well over a decade, has now been collaboratively implemented by industry, government and academia. It can help select and expedite the development of emerging technologies that may address the needs of patients and health systems, as well as fulfill investment expectations.”

Editorial requests:

1) Please include a competing interests section at the end of the manuscript, before the reference list. If the authors have no competing interests, please state: "The authors declare that they have no competing interests."

Please see the “Competing interests” section after the “Discussion” Section.

2) Please include an Authors’ Contributions section at the end of the manuscript, before the reference list.

Please see the “Authors’ Contributions” section after the “Competing interests” section.

Sincerely,

Ba’ Pham, MSc, PhD (Candidate)
Senior Research Associate

Toronto Health Economics and Technology Assessment Collaborative

Departments of Health Policy Management and Evaluation, and Pharmacy

University of Toronto

Leslie Dan Pharmacy Building

6th floor, Room 651

144 College Street

Toronto, Ontario M5S 3M2

Phone: 416 946 3717

Fax: 416 946 3719

Email: ba.pham@theta.utoronto.ca