Reviewer’s report

Title: Assessing value in health care: using an interpretive classification system to understand existing practices based on a systematic review

Version: 0 Date: 09 Jul 2019

Reviewer: Claudimar Veiga

Reviewer’s report:

The authors state that the purpose of their manuscript was to "understand which approaches to value assessment have been used in developed countries.", In addition, the authors "sought to comprehend the contexts in which these initiatives emerged and what definition of value underpinned it". To achieve this objective the authors used performed a rapid literature review and a gray literature search focusing on existing value assessment frameworks of health care technologies within the context of developed countries. The results found by the authors showed: "1176 references were identified and 38 papers were selected for full-review. Among these 38 articles, 22 distinct approaches to assess value of health care interventions were identified and classified according to four points. The authors conclude that "the contextual nature of value assessment in health care becomes evident with the diversity of existing approaches. Despite the predominance of cases relying on the Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio as the measure of value, this approach has not been sufficient to meet the needs of decision-makers. The use of multiple criteria has become more and more important, as well as the consideration of patient-reported measures. Considerations of costs are not always explicit and consistent. The article is well written, interesting and brings contributions to the literature in the area. However, the authors should invest more effort in the development of work to make the article publishable, essentially for the following reasons:

1. The authors are already beginning their speech addressing a specific market: developed countries, without arguing the reasons why they chose this market. Is not this research question critical to underdeveloped countries? Why study developed countries and not any other market? What is the reason for studying this particular period? And not another period (2007-2017)? Justify the choice of Ovid MEDLINE base.

2 - Figure 1 is cited but does not appear in the text or in the annexes.

3- Table 1 is cited but does not appear in the annexes. I believe that Figure 2 that is presented in the appendix be Figure 1. I suggest a review in detail for the Figures, Tables, and Appendices.

4 - I suggest the inclusion of abstract graph and also a Diagram summarizing the methodology of the systematic review.

5 - Include in the conclusions the suggestions for future research.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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