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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We thank you for your comments and the opportunity to resubmit our article to Health Research Policy and Systems. We hope that our changes will meet the standard required for publication in your journal. In response to the reviewer comments, we have made the following revisions:

Reviewer #1: In general the (author's) reply sounds adequate.

Reading the revised Conclusions section, I wondered whether this section really was reworked as said in the reply, because it still is quite/too long for a conclusion section (as the second reviewer also mentioned) and still has a lot of references in it-making it more a prolonged discussion section. I think this should be adapted still.

-- We have moved the sections with references into the discussion and made the conclusion clearer in line with these comments. The conclusion now discusses the "so-what" of the paper and discusses the gaps filled.
Reviewer #2: The manuscript has improved essentially in the revision. Now some more recent and relevant references have been added, terms and frameworks clarified. Also the scientific article structure is now better.

However, there are still some issues needing correction.

1. The introduction paragraph already (too early) states what the paper will add to the field. That should be in the discussion/conclusion.

   -- This discussion of the gaps has been moved to the conclusion.

2. The conclusion is still like discussion with comparing, providing references etc. So there is no actual conclusion (=and so what?).

   --This has been rearranged now to move the comparison sections into an extended discussion and the conclusion sums up what the paper achieved and the gaps filled.

3. Discussion (now discussing one by one the three models used) and conclusion (somewhat more general discussion) could be combined. However, still very little comparison with the previous literature is done.

   --With the restructuring mentioned previously, the references to other literature that were previously in the conclusion are now in the discussion so that there is a greater reference to the previous literature in the discussion.

4. Health in All Policies deserves also a real (academic) reference, not only WHO.

   --In response to this comment, our reference was to "Health for All" rather than "Health in All Policies". These policies are different and only the former is relevant here and it does not have an academic reference.
Please let us know if there is any further comments or revisions you would like us to make. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Camille La Brooy, PhD
The University of Melbourne